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1. Welcome and President's Report (12:00-12:15PM)

(Typically, this is done orally, and there is no written report. The president’s report on the state of ISA is delivered at the annual business meeting.)
CONSENT AGENDA (12:00-12:15PM)

2. President Elect’s Nominations

A Note on the Procedure for Selecting the Nominees:

Over the course of the summer months in 2017, I carried out a process of consultation. This began with a request to members of the Governing Council (GC) for committee nominations. I received about 70 nominations. I then put together a preliminary list of nominations for respective committees. Consultation continued with the three Vice Presidents-elect, who responded favorably to the list of nominations I had passed along to them.

I sent out requests to those on the list of nominees, along with others who came to mind independently, and received five refusals. Given that I received many nominations for the same committee position, in some instances I moved GC suggestions to other positions. I took into account existing responsibilities within ISA in putting together the list of nominations. This meant in some instances that someone with significant service in progress did not receive an invitation to take up an additional position.

My principal criterion for nominating those who appear below is academic excellence. I also have tried for geographic and intellectual dispersion among nominees.

I am very grateful for the willingness of these nominees to help ISA. I look forward to working with everyone.

President Elect’s Nominations

2018 Program Chairs
Nukhet A. Sandal, Ohio University
Jenifer Whitten-Woodring, University of Massachusetts Lowell

Members-at-Large to ExComm
Nanette Archer Svenson, Tulane University
Victor Asal, State University of New York at Albany
Maria Rost Rublee, Monash University
Shannon Lindsey Blanton, University of Alabama at Birmingham

UN-NGO Representative
Nanette Archer Svenson, Tulane University

Academic Freedom Committee
Kristian Skrede Gleditsch, University of Essex [chair]
Erin Jenne, Central European University

Committee on Rosenau Post-Doc
David W. Blagden, University of Exeter
Carmela Lutmar, University of Haifa
Efe Tokdemir, The Ohio State University

Committee on the Status of the Global South (*Pending GC Approval)
Jorge Alberto Schiavon, Centro de Investigación y Docencia Económicas (CIDE)
Faten Ghosn, University of Arizona
Kristina Hinds, University of the West Indies
Audie Klotz, Syracuse University
Folashade Soule, University of Oxford
Jason Strakes, OSCE Academy in Bishkek
Pichamon Yeophantong, University of New South Wales
Committee on the Status of Representation and Diversity
Nassef Manabilang Adiong, The Philippine International Studies Organization
A. Burcu Bayram, University of Arkansas

Committee on the Status of Women
Andrea Den Boer, University of Kent
Kathryn Marie Fisher, National Defense University
Zaryab Iqbal, Pennsylvania State University
Jamie E. Scalera, Georgia Southern University
Timothy M. Shaw, University of Massachusetts Boston

Evaluation Committee for ISA Executive Director
Thomas G. Weiss, CUNY Graduate Center

Finance Committee
Kyle Beardsley, Duke University
Mark Crescenzi, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
Andrea K. Gerlak, University of Arizona
Zeynep Taydas, Clemson University

Junior Scholar Symposium Co-Organizer
Ozgur Ozdamar, Bilkent University

Long-Range Planning Committee
Sabine Carey, University of Mannheim
Jarrod Hayes, University of Massachusetts Lowell/MIT
Steven B. Redd, University of Wisconsin – Milwaukee
Duncan Snidal, University of Oxford

Nominating Committee
Jeff Pickering, Kansas State University [convener]
Yasemin Akbaba, Gettysburg College
Jeffrey W. Taliaferro, Tufts University

Professional Development Committee
Soumita Basu, South Asian University [chair]

Professional Rights and Responsibilities Committee
Edward Mansfield, University of Pennsylvania [chair]
Audie Klotz, Syracuse University
Laura J. Shepherd, University of New South Wales

Publications Committee
Norrin M. Ripsman, Lehigh University
James M. Scott, Texas Christian University

Research and Workshop Grants Committee
Carolyn M. Shaw, Wichita State University [chair]
Desiré A. E. Nilsson, Uppsala University

Best Book of the Year Award
Hemda Ben-Yehuda, Bar Ilan University [chair]
Fabricio H. Chagas-Bastos, Universidad de los Andes
David G. Haglund, Queen’s University
Vanja Petricevic, Florida Gulf Coast University
Zlatko Šabić, University of Ljubljana

Carl Beck Award Committee
Imad Mansour, Qatar University [chair] V. Spike Peterson, University of Arizona

Gerner Innovative Teaching Award Committee
Ralph Carter, Texas Christian University [chair]

J. Ann Tickner Award
Jordan Branch, Brown University
Maya M. Eichler, Mount Saint Vincent University
Jennifer Ramos, Loyola Marymount University

Karl Deutsch Award
Håvard Hegre, Uppsala University and Peace Research Institute Oslo
Ideen Salehyan, University of Texas at Dallas

James Rosenau Award
Balkan Devlen, Izmir University of Economics
Luba Levin-Banchik, University of California Davis
3. NOMINATING COMMITTEE REPORT

This report was prepared by Birol Yesilada, acting as the chair of the ISA Nominating Committee (members include Sabine Carey, Tricia Lynne Sullivan, Kelly M. Kadera, Burcu Savun, Hendrik Spruyt, Galia Press-Barnathan, Kamal Sadiq, and Benjamin O. Fordham). The report was submitted July 31, 2017 for the 2018 Governing Council meeting in San Francisco.

After careful review of nominees and careful deliberations, the International Studies Association Nominating Committee (Birol Yesilada [chair], Sabine Carey, Tricia Lynne Sullivan, Kelly M. Kadera, Burcu Savun, Hendrik Spruyt, Galia Press-Barnathan, Kamal Sadiq, and Benjamin O. Fordham) agreed on a single slate of candidates for ISA Officers:

- President: Cameron Thies (Arizona State University)
- Vice President: Navnita C. Behera (University of Delhi)
- Vice President: John Ikenberry (Princeton University)
- Vice President: Laura Shepherd (UNSW)

We also selected nominees for at-large representatives to the governing council from outside the recognized ISA regions. Our charge is to forward five candidates for three positions. We recommend the following candidates:

- At-Large Representative: Soumita Basu (South Asian University)
- At-Large Representative: Halvard Buhaug (PRIO)
- At-Large Representative: Sinem Akgul-Acikmese (Kadir Has University)
- At-Large Representative: Jorge A. Schiavon (Centro de Investigacion y Docencia Economicas)
- At-Large Representative: Imad Mansour (Qatar University)

All of these nominees have been contacted by the Committee Chair and have agreed to serve if elected. I have attached their CVs to this report.

The committee followed procedures very similar to those of previous years. We met and organized at the 2017 annual meeting and prepared calls for nominations that were distributed to the full membership. ISA headquarters emailed section and caucus chairs and workshop chairs to solicit nominations for at-large positions. ISA headquarters also sent calls through the newsletter and other social media. We set a deadline of June 15, 2017 for nominations and asked for a letter in support of each candidate, a CV, and a statement of willingness to serve. We made decisions via a skype conference on July 24, 2017.

We had three nominations for president, eight for vice president, and seven for at-large representative. The committee was pleased to have multiple strong candidates for each position. We are pleased with the final slate of candidates and believe they will serve ISA well in their capacities as officers and representatives of the association. If you have any questions or concerns please feel free to contact me.
4. REPORT ON OREIS

This report was prepared by Renée Marlin-Bennett, acting as the ISA OREIS Editor in Chief. The report was submitted on March 2, 2018 for the 2018 Governing Council meeting in San Francisco.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The past year has involved intensive work by the editorial team and our Oxford University Press colleagues as we made the transition from the previous publisher, Wiley Blackwell, to Oxford. The Oxford Research Encyclopedia of International Studies (OREIS) went live online in November 2017. All articles that had been previously published in International Studies Encyclopedia (the ISA Compendium Project) were successfully transferred to the new platform by the end of January 2018. In addition to these older articles, we have published new and updated articles, we have commissioned new articles, and we have a path forward for making this publication an essential reference for our scholarly community.

TRANSITION PROCESSES

Wiley Blackwell agreed to sell the International Studies Encyclopedia to ISA and the Governing Council agreed to the purchase in 2016. ISA signed a contract with Oxford University Press in January 2017 to jointly publish the successor to International Studies Online as an Oxford Research Encyclopedia. This required four processes.

1. Assembling the Editorial Team and setting editorial policies. As I described in my previous report, the system of each ISA section designating a section editor had become unworkable. Oxford also anticipated working with a smaller number of senior editors. I am grateful to be working with an excellent team of senior editors and a managing editor, who were appointed with the consent of the Publications Committee. (I would like to add one more senior editor, preferable someone not from North America or Europe, to our team.)

Since the editorial structure is new, we also have developed new editorial policies and operating procedures. We have discussed editorial judgements and rigorous standards for our publication. A review of the previously published articles has led to the decision that we may, on occasion, ask authors for revisions to bring an article up to the standard of quality we expect if they choose to update.

OREIS Editorial Team

Editor in Chief

Renée Marlin-Bennett  Professor of Political Science, Johns Hopkins University

Senior Editors

Michelle Benson  Associate Professor of Political Science at the University at Buffalo, SUNY
2. **Transfer of the manuscript submission system.** Although Wiley had also used ScholarOne for manuscript submission, their installation of the system and Oxford’s were not compatible. (There was no button to press that would allow us to instantaneously move files from Wiley’s ScholarOne site to Oxford’s.) We (the editorial team) had to identify all submissions on the Wiley site that were active (submissions had been made), export and download all the information for each submission individually, and then transfer the files to Oxford. Oxford then had to upload the information into the new OREIS ScholarOne manuscript submission database. This was not a straightforward process, but we succeeded with almost all the stubs. The process did not go smoothly for a few submissions, which caused some consternation for authors and editors. We believe that we have now resolved all these transfer problems, though the result has been that moving these submissions to reviewers or to the editorial decision stage has been slowed.

We do know that a few manuscripts that had been submitted at various points in this transition period are “stuck in the pipeline.” In some cases they were not sent for review, in others a final decision was made but not executed, and so forth. We are working to move those manuscripts along as quickly as possible.

3. **Launching OREIS manuscript submission/editing.** The ScholarOne site for OREIS became operational in August 2017. Oxford provided training at that point and then again in February 2018. There were some initial problems with the system to be worked out, and we still need to revise the automatic letters that ScholarOne sends out, but the system seems to be functioning.

4. **Launching OREIS online.** OREIS was designed to include the articles previously published in the ISO. Authors of selected previously published articles were invited to do what we called a “quick refresh” of their publication within two weeks. For those who agreed, Oxford published the refreshed version when OREIS came online. A few authors accepted this invitation, others asked for more time to do a more substantial revision (which was granted), and others declined or did not
respond. For those who asked for more time, declined, or did not respond, OREIS launched with the version of their article that had been published in ISE.

In addition, the initial launch included 43 new or updated articles. The articles came from a diverse group of countries.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country of Origin for 2017 New or Updated Articles</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Country published</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unavailable in ScholarOne</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. **Maintaining access to the ISE for purchasers and subscribers.** Wiley Blackwell continued to make the *International Studies Encyclopedia* available on their website until early 2017, when Oxford had successfully formatted all articles that had been published online into an ebook, available at oxfordre.com. This publication will not be updated but will be available to any purchaser or subscriber who chooses to access it. Customers will not lose access to a product that had paid for. The ebook is also freely accessible to all ISA members, via the ISA member portal on the ISA website. This process was handled by Oxford.

**Work in Progress and Initiatives**
We are now out of the transition mode and have begun our regular work in progress and initiatives.

1. **Work in progress.** We now have 11 manuscripts in process. These were submitted between 28 to 177 days ago (as of March 2, 2018).

2. **Annual themes.** Each year, we will be commissioning a group of articles around a theme that cuts across the various topics of International Studies. The 2018 theme is “Leadership.”

3. **New general articles.** The senior editors and I will consult with the Advisory Board and ISA section leadership about what is missing in OREIS. In particular, we will seek to reach out to the ISA sections that were established after 2010 (when ISE was initially published) and were not well integrated into the Compendium Project. We also encourage scholars to submit ideas for new articles.

4. **Database for managing invitations to update.** We will be inviting authors to update their articles regularly (a practice that we had with the ISE). Authors will also have the opportunity to include multimedia features and color illustrations. We will keep track of authors who no longer
wish to update an article. When authors “retire,” we will decide, drawing on the expertise of our Advisory Board and ISA sections’ leadership, whether a new article on the subject should be commissioned.

5. **Diversity of our authors.** We will continue to be mindful of many dimensions of diversity, including gender, race, and national origin. We will draw upon the ability of Oxford to do “heavy copyediting,” which is especially helpful for those needing help with English language. I will be working to convince Oxford to allow authors to publish an abstract of their article in their own language on the website. In addition, we may, in consultation with ISA Headquarters, consider paying for translations of exceptional foreign language manuscripts into English, which Oxford can facilitate.

**IN CLOSING**

I am thankful to our editorial team, to ISA (and especially Mark Boyer), and to our partners at Oxford. It is wonderful to see the *Oxford Reference Encyclopedia of International Studies* come to fruition.
5. ROSENAU POST-DOCTORAL FELLOWSHIP COMMITTEE
REPORT

This report was prepared by Erin Hannah, acting as the chair of the James N. Rosenau ISA Post-Doctoral Fellowship Committee (members include Kerry Crawford, Megan E. Bradley, and Elizabeth Thurbon, with ex-officios Mark Boyer and Brett Ashley Leeds). The report was submitted February 20, 2018 for the 2018 Governing Council meeting in San Francisco.

COMMITTEE COMPOSITION

- Erin N. Hannah, Chair, February 2017 - March 2019
- Kerry Crawford, Member, February 2017 - March 2019
- Megan E. Bradley, Member, March 2016 - April 2018
- Elizabeth Thurbon, Member, February 2017 - March 2019
- Brett Ashley Leeds, President, International Studies Association, Ex-Officio member
- Mark A. Boyer, Executive Director, International Studies Association, Ex-Officio member

SELECTION PROCESS, NOVEMBER 2017 APPLICANTS

The Rosenau Postdoctoral Fellowship Committee received 43 applications by 1 November 2017. Each application was read and ranked by two committee members. From those rankings, a short list of twelve applicants was chosen. All four committee members then read and ranked the short listed applications. The committee chose the top ranked awardee, Jamie Hagan of University Massachusetts, Boston and she accepted the decision. The committee was very impressed by the high quality of the applications. In future, we would like to see more total applications, more diversity in the applicants, particularly from women and applicants from developing countries.

The deadline for the next application is November 1, 2018. The call will be announced in the ISA’s electronic newsletter, via social media, and posted on the committee’s ISA website: https://www.isanet.org/ISA/Governance/Committees/Rosenau-Fellowship/Call

The committee recommends that the deadline be moved to 1 August 2018 to allow sufficient time to consider the applications before taking the decision by 1 December 2018 for inclusion in the ISA Annual Conference print program.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The competition is open to scholars in the social sciences and humanities who have received their PhD within the past two years, that is, between 1 July 2016 and 1 July 2018. The Committee aims to announce the successful applicant by 1 February 2019.

TERMS OF THE FELLOWSHIP

The 12-month stipend is $50,000 and it does not have an in-residence requirement. The successful applicant will spent 3/4th time (30 hours per week) pursuing their own research projects, and 1/4th time
(10 hours per week) conducting research (remotely) on behalf of ISA. The ISA Executive Director will supervise the fellow.
6. ACADEMIC FREEDOM COMMITTEE REPORT

This report was prepared by Anthony F. Lang, Jr., acting as the chair of the ISA Academic Freedom Committee (members include Nicholas Kiersey, Marie Breen-Smyth, Galia Golan, Mahmoud Monshipouri, Helen Kinsella, and Shogo Suzuki, with ex-officios Mark A. Boyer and Brett Ashley Leeds). The report was submitted on February 13, 2018 for the 2018 Governing Council meeting in San Francisco.

The Academic Committee this year considered six cases and proposed statements to the Executive Committee of ISA on two of them. The Executive Committee approved those two. The most controversial and involved was the statement on the US Travel ban which was issued prior to the 2017 meeting in Baltimore (though after the writing of the previous year’s report, so was not reflected in that report). Because of the discussion it generated, this statement will be discussed separately in the report.

This report is divided into three sections: 1) Reflections on procedures; 2) Cases considered; 3) US Travel Ban; 4) Panels proposed for 2018 Convention.

1. REFLECTIONS ON PROCEDURES

As noted in last year’s report, the AFC changed its procedures in order to streamline the process. With the help of the ISA IT team, the new system is designed to encourage ISA members to submit reports via its website which is then directed to the AFC Chair’s email. This has generated very few requests for cases to be considered; in fact, contact has been more often through the Chair’s direct email, Committee member suggestions, or the ISA Executive Director’s suggestions. There perhaps needs to be a more active campaign by the ISA or the Committee to make known to the ISA membership the existence of the website and the procedures for proposing cases to be investigated.

A member of the LRPC reached out to the AFC to suggest four procedural changes for ISA to consider. The AFC Chair was consulted on these, and he then forwarded these proposal to the Committee as a whole, along with the ISA Executive Director and ISA President. There was discussion among the Committee members about this, but as these would be decisions for the ISA Governing Council to make, no decision was made on these. The Executive Committee did not choose to pursue these proposals, as they raised concerns about the AFC and ISA more generally being accused of partisanship. In the view of the Committee Chair, some of these proposals may have been worth pursuing, but he recognizes that some of the concerns expressed by the ISA Exec are legitimate and need to be considered.

2. CASES CONSIDERED

The following cases were considered by the committee:

1. Travel ban in US. Statement issued by ISA Exec in January 2018 (prior to Baltimore meeting, but issued after the report from 2017 drafted).
2. [Redacted] (not considered enough evidence to send to Exec)
3. General situation in Turkey. A number of requests, none of which were acted upon, either by the AFC or ISA Exec. The AFC proposed three statements, which were all issued by ISA.
Exec. following the coup attempt in July 2016 which led to massive levels of persecution among Turkish academics, largely around the issue of Kurdish autonomy.

4. Threats to Central European University (Hungary). Statement issued by ISA Exec in April 2017

5. AFC discussed via email, but no proposal sent to ISA Exec. Issue did not seem to be one of academic freedom

6. AFC considered this case, which comes from the Danish Government seeking to impose limits on what non-native academics can do publicly. After an extended email exchange, the AFC did not consider this case one of academic freedom, though there is certainly something worrying here. Nothing was sent to the ISA Exec for consideration.

3. US TRAVEL BAN

As noted above, the ISA issued statements on the Trump Administration’s executive order concerning a travel ban. After understanding the implications of the travel ban, the ISA realized this would prevent some scholars from attending ISA. The ISA issued an interim statement in mid-January 2017 indicating it would refund scholars not able to attend the convention as a result of this, and reiterated its position that it must remain non-partisan.

After consultation between the ISA Exec and the AFC, the AFC drafted a second more focused statement on the threat to academic freedom that the travel ban had created. This statement, with some additional edits, was approved and issued by the Executive Committee. This resulted in part from initiatives from the committee. After a great deal of deliberation, the AFC sent a statement to the ISA Exec. It changed this only very slightly, and then issued a statement on 31 January 2017 based on the threat to academic freedom. It also created a process by which ISA members could appeal their non-attendance at ISA and be refunded.

The chair of the AFC responded to a number of queries on the travel ban and the refund. These were handled very efficiently by the ISA staff. The AFC chair also responded to concerns about the travel ban, both some that supported it and some which opposed it and wanted more action from ISA.

4. PANELS PROPOSED

For the 2018 convention, the ISA gave the AFC three panel slots. The following panels have been proposed for the 2018 convention:

1. TD 39 Panel: Academic Freedom and Freedom of Speech
2. FA34 Roundtable: “Kill All Normies?” Academic Freedom, the Alt-Right, and the Decadent Left
3. SA61: Roundtable: Academic Freedom: Activism, Politics and the Classroom

Thanks to committee members Galia Golan and Nick Kiersey for proposing and chairing the two roundtables.
7. Professional Development Committee Report

This report was prepared by Mlada Bukovansky, acting as the chair of the ISA Professional Development Committee (Members include: Peace A. Medie, Jeremy Youde, Krista E. Wiegand, and Arturo C. Sotomayor, with ex-officios Giorgio Shani, Chris Hendershot, Stephen Quackenbush, Daniel J. Levine, Aart A. Holtslag, Amy Below, T. V. Paul, Brett Ashley Leeds, Patrick James, Mark A. Boyer, and Jennifer Fontanella.). The report was submitted January 25, 2018 for the 2018 Governing Council meeting in San Francisco.

Over the past year, the Professional Development Committee continued its work developing resources to support the professional development of the broad and diverse array of scholars who form the ISA community. Focal points which oriented our panel organizational work included managing the transition between administration and scholarship, dealing with work-life balance issues, and discussing the challenges of embarking on an entirely new research direction when one is already an established scholar. We also continued to work on focus areas identified in the previous year, especially reaching out to and acting on concerns of scholars from the Global South. The Committee worked with representatives from the Global South Caucus to develop a common position on revising the ISA travel grant program to more fully meet the needs of scholars coming from the Global South, and to develop clear and transparent criteria for allocating ISA travel grants. The Professional Development Committee strongly supports the efforts by the Global South Caucus to enhance the resources available to scholars who lack adequate resources to attend the Annual Conference, and understands that developing mechanisms and criteria to that end is a challenging but important task.

ISA Annual Conference

Panels

The PDC organized and/or sponsored the following panels for the San Francisco 2018 Conference:

- Qualitatively Different? Problems and Approaches in Non-Positivist Research Presentation
- And Now for Something Completely Different: Reflections on Scholarly Self-Reinvention
- Moving between Research/Teaching and Academic Administration: Opportunities, Pitfalls, and Trade-Offs
- Integrating Global South Scholars into Mainstream International Studies: Strategies, Opportunities, and Obstacles
- When Life Gets in the Way of the Profession and the Profession Gets in the Way of Life

The Committee has also provided support for the Critical Methods Cafe, which continues to draw a diverse array of active participants.

Career Courses (Appendix A)

The Career Courses are designed to be half-day courses that provide in-depth instruction on advanced topics. The instructors receive a stipend for organizing the course ($250 for an individual instructor, or
$300 divided among multiple instructors). Participants pay $25 to register for a course. Each course is capped at 35 participants. The first Career Courses were offered at the 2015 annual convention. In 2017, the PDC sponsored three career courses. For the 2018 convention the PDC reviewed and agreed to fund the following Career Courses:

- How to Successfully Implement Active Learning in your Classroom
- Case Writing and Case Teaching in International Relations
- Teaching the Intro Course: Approaches to the Comparative and International Relations Survey Course

**Professional Development at Regional Conferences (Appendix B)**

The PDC has a budget of $12,000 to fund ISA regional panels. For 2018 the PDC reviewed and agreed to fund the following proposals from the regional sections.

**ISA SOUTH - $1,875.00**

- Teaching by Doing

**ISA WEST - $2,000.00**

- Emerging Scholar Forum

**ISA NORTHEAST - $2,000.00**

- Methodology Workshop

**ISA CANADA - $2,000.00**

- Navigating the Academic Job Market
- Perfecting your Application Dossier
- Teaching IR with and through Popular Culture

**Professional Resource Center**

In 2015 ISA launched its Professional Resource Center online (http://www.isanet.org/Programs/PRC) and it has expanded those resources in the areas of Teaching and Learning, In the Profession, and Jobs and Employment. The PDC does not have any responsibility for this content, but members have been contributing and encouraging the regions to provide content when they sponsor professional development events.
APPENDIX A: CAREER COURSES FOR ISA 2018

HOW TO SUCCESSFULLY IMPLEMENT ACTIVE LEARNING IN YOUR CLASSROOM

Instructor: Kathryn Mangino

International relations and related fields often use the term "active learning" to describe teaching beyond PowerPoint - a better way to ensure information retention and inspire learners to reach beyond summarization of information and move towards greater levels of analysis. But what does "active learning" mean? How do you do it? This career course will begin with a brief explanation of active learning, including some qualitative data collected in 2017 regarding student perspectives of active learning. Then we’ll use the rest of the time as a working session - to not only introduce participants to a variety of teaching methods, but also to give participants the time, space and structure to practice new methods and share experiences and strategies with each other. This session works to help attendees to focus on their role as educator - to inspire ideas for new learning that can be applied in the classroom and lecture hall immediately after the conference. This career course is highly interactive and allows participants to learn from each other, share best practices, and meet other ISA professionals with similar interests.

CASE WRITING AND CASE TEACHING IN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

Instructor: Volker Franke

This half-day course introduces participants to the case study method and exposes them to ways for developing and using case studies effectively in an academic classroom. This course presents a number of different teaching cases (historical, fictional, decision-forcing) and engages participants as both active learners and potential instructors. The course will also discuss how to adapt the case teaching method for using novels and films in the classroom.

TEACHING THE INTRO COURSE: APPROACHES TO THE COMPARATIVE AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS SURVEY COURSE

Instructors: Victor Asal and Amanda Rosen

This course will focus on tools, ideas, and approaches to use for teaching introductory courses in Comparative Politics and International Relations. Participants will discuss useful approaches to thinking about syllabi components, assignments, grading techniques, and innovative approaches (such as the flipped classroom and using simulations and games) that can be used to enliven and enrich classes for students while meeting learning outcomes. The workshop will be appropriate for instructors of classes of all sizes and student populations cover tools for small as well as very large classes (and will include advice on teaching with and without the assistance of TAs).
Appendix B: ISA Professional Development 2017 Budget for Regional Panels and ISA Panels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ISA West</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISA South</td>
<td>$1,875.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISA Northeast</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISA Canada</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: $7,875.00

Potential Remainder: $2,125.00
ISA WEST

EMERGING SCHOLAR FORUM

Funds Requested: $2,000.00

This forum will place four small groups of four emerging scholars with a senior person in the field. The junior scholars and their senior scholar mentors will be grouped together with similar papers into panels. The panels will be oriented around themes such international security, international political economy, international ethics, and international relations theory. The junior scholars will make brief presentations of their work, which will be followed by comments from the senior discussant and a broader discussion of their work and its relationship to the relevant subfield.

Senior scholars will receive a full night at the conference hotel, and junior scholars will receive the equivalent of a half a night (but may cover one or more full nights by sharing rooms).

$685.76 = one night at conference hotel for four senior scholars ($171.44 per night, taxes incl)
$1371.52 = one-half night at conference hotel for 16 junior scholars

If all participants request the maximum amount, the total would be $2057.28. In the past, however, not everyone has requested the maximum. If they do, the West can cover the remaining $57.28.

Total requested: $2000.00

Participants will be encouraged to submit their papers presented at the Emerging Scholar Forum to appropriate ISA journals, ideally as special sections themed around each panel. Ultimately, the publication of those papers is beyond the control of the ISA West leadership, so this cannot be guaranteed.
ISA-SOUTH

Teaching by Doing: Developing Effective Active Learning Strategies for the College Classroom

Funds requested: $1,875.00
A kind of double-level professional development goal informs this proposal aimed at (1) helping teaching professionals in higher educational institutions in the ISA-South region to develop or hone their professional teaching skills relating to effective active learning assignments, and (2) by using simulations, debates, and cases with role-playing exercises, helping our students to develop critical thinking and problem-solving skills needed for key jobs relating to international studies/international relations in the 21st century.

The workshop would feature two or three guest presenters on such active learning methods as role-playing simulations, use of case-studies, impromptu versus planned in-class debates, and other active learning techniques. Key questions to be addressed might be: What tools already exist to make incorporating active learning in my classroom without creating a huge new time burden for myself or losing control of my course? What balance between active learning exercises and traditional lecture is most beneficial? How can I “flip the classroom” on the spot when what I had already prepared for that day is not working? Can active learning projects work in a large auditorium-based class? How do I assess students fairly in active learning settings, especially the quieter or shier students?

Budget:

Travel: $325 per person for up to three presenters/speakers: $ 975 (estimated airfare and ground transportation)

Accommodations (2 nights at $150 for up to three presenters): $ 900 ($134 plus taxes per night)

Conference Registration (to be covered by ISA-South): $ 255 ($85 x 3)

Total request of ISA Professional Development Committee: $1875

Total request of ISA-South $ 255
**ISA-Northeast**

**Methodology Workshop**

*Funds Requested: $2,000.00*

For 2017, we are requesting the following funds:

- For the four faculty participants, up to $500 each in documented travel and lodging expenses.
- Total not to exceed $2000.

As in past years, we intend to use under-requests from some workshop participants to help offset cost overruns by other workshop attendees—it has been our experience that not everyone uses all of their $500, while some exceed it by a bit.

Participants Include:

- Matt Hoffman, University of Toronto-Scarborough
- L.H.M. Ling (The New School)
- Brent Steele (University of Utah)
- Fourth mentor (TBD)

All attendees of the conference may come to the workshop sessions, the graduate students officially participating in the workshop will have the opportunity to receive detailed feedback and specialized instruction in the methodologies under discussion.
ISA CANADA

THREE WORKSHOPS

Funds Requested: $2,000.00

**Workshop I (Navigating the Academic Job Market):**
Travel subsidies for faculty mentors:
Faculty Participant $500
Faculty Participant $500

**Workshop II (Perfecting Your Application Dossier):**
Travel subsidies for faculty mentors:
Faculty Participant $500

**Workshop III (Teaching IR with and through Popular Culture):**
Travel subsidies for faculty mentors:
Faculty Participant $500

Travel subsidies will be prioritized for those participants who leave the furthest away from Regina.

**TOTAL:** $2000

ISA Canada is proposing to run the following three professional development (PD) workshops for its 2018 regional conference. Two workshops are targeted at doctoral candidates, post doctoral and junior career scholars, while the third workshop is aimed at all International Relations Scholars. Each workshop will be designed and delivered by different experts in the fields of professional development, and teaching and learning.
8. COMMITTEE ON THE STATUS OF WOMEN REPORT

This report was prepared by Kathleen Cunningham, acting as the chair of the ISA Committee on the Status of Women (members include Gigi Gokcek, Debbie A. Mohammed, Priya Dixit, Ritu Vij, Heidi Hudson, and Jessica Weeks). The report was submitted February 2, 2018 for the 2018 Governing Council meeting in San Francisco.

The members of the Committee on the Status of Women met at the ISA 2017 Annual Convention. This report provides information about our current activities in pursuit of the advancement of women in the discipline.

CURRENT ACTIVITIES

ISA 2018 PRECONFERENCE ACTIVITIES

• We have organized the fifth annual “Pay It Forward” workshop. This is a full-day workshop that focuses on mentoring junior women scholars on professional development. Thanks to the ISA Governing Council’s support, this event is a recurring workshop. This year we have 30 junior scholars (out of 105 applicants) and 10 senior scholars participating. The junior participants are awarded travel funds to help cover the expenses of coming early to the conference and we have also encouraged them to share rooms.

• This workshop will be followed by an informal happy hour instead of a funded reception this year because of the high costs in San Francisco.

ACTIVITIES AT ISA 2018

The Committee on the Status of Women organized and sponsored three roundtables for ISA 2018:

Beyond Gender: Intersectionality and Women in International Studies

This roundtable centers on the challenges and issues that arise for women that are underrepresented in multiple ways, including citizenship, race, and sexual orientation. Scholars from a variety of different institutions will relate experiences and thoughts on best practices related these issues.

• Chair: Kathleen G. Cunningham (University of Maryland)
• Participant: Ana Carolina Garriga (Centro de Investigación y Docencia Económicas (CIDE))
• Participant: Jacqueline Braveboy-Wagner (City University of New York)
• Participant: Shirin M. Rai (University of Warwick)

Navigating Life Events in Academia

This roundtable centers on how to manage major life events (such as death in the family, divorce, illness, childbirth, adoption) and career challenges in academia. Scholars from a variety of different institutions will relate experiences, evidence, and thoughts on best practices related to these issues.
Empirical Studies and Best Practices for Mentoring

This roundtable centers on empirical studies of gender bias in the career and on mentorship of women. Scholars from a variety of different institutions will relate experiences and thoughts on best practices related to these issues.

- Chair: Kathleen G. Cunningham (University of Maryland)
- Participant: Sara McLaughlin Mitchell (University of Iowa)
- Participant: David A. Lake (University of California San Diego)
- Participant: Heidi Hardt (University of California, Irvine)
- Participant: Sabrina Karim (Cornell University)
- Participant: Suparna Chaudhry (Christopher Newport University)

OTHER ACTIVITIES

Following the CSW meeting in 2017, Kathleen Cunningham has compiled a crowd sourced database of faculty accommodation. This is designed to provide information for scholars negotiating with their own institution. Fifty-seven scholars have contributed information.
9. Research and Workshop Grants Committee Report

This report was prepared by Maria Rost Rublee, acting as the chair of the ISA Research and Workshop Grants Committee (members include Louise Olsson, Aigul Kulnazarova, Rajesh Basrur, Maria Fanis, and André Broome). The report was submitted February 20, 2018 for the 2018 Governing Council meeting in San Francisco.

The ISA Research and Workshop Grants Committee received 60 proposals in this funding cycle, which is an increase of 67% from 2016, when we received 36 applications. Due to budget constraints, we were only able to fund 12 proposals for a total of $127,606, out of the $734,143 requested by the 60 proposals.

During this cycle, 37 proposals were for Catalytic grants (up to $10,000) and 23 proposals were for Venture grants (up to $25,000). The committee recommended funding for 8 Catalytic grants and 4 Venture grants for a total of $127,606 (out of a $130,000 budget). If previous years are any guide, not all of this money will actually be spent as late cancellations will lead to lower actual costs incurred by ISA.

Following norms established in previous funding cycles, the committee decided to recommend projects based on quality, regardless of the category under which applications were made. As reflected in the list of successful projects below, the committee ended up recommending a wide range of proposals that address many different issues using a variety of theoretical and methodological approaches. In addition to the substantive merits of the proposals, those benefitting from grant funding were also quite diverse in terms of gender, seniority level, and geographic location of scholars’ home institution.

As in previous years, a small number of the grants fund actual research costs and “off-site” workshops. But the vast majority of money continues to be spent to fund workshops at the ISA conference location on the day before the annual meeting. The following proposals were funded:

**Catalytic Workshops (Up To $10,000)**

- Refugees, Forced Migration, and Conflict ($8,887), Alex Braithwaite
- African Order, Global Order: A Scrutiny of Diplomatic Borderlands ($9,890), Markus Kornprobst
- Cultural Diversity and International Order ($5,051), Andrew Phillips
- Developing Pathways through the International Polarization of LGBTIQ Rights ($9,983), Momin Rahman
- Popular Culture Matters! Exploring the Links between Popular Culture and World Politics ($8,640), Nick Robinson
- Becoming War: Assembling Collective Violence ($6,017), Nisha Shah
- Sustainable Commodity Governance and the Global South ($6,326), Yixian Sun
- Peacebuilding in Conflict & Post-Conflict States ($8,528), Krista Wiegand
- Innovations in Comparative Capitalism ($9,206), Tabitha Benney
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VENTURE WORKSHOPS (Up To $25,000)

- Just and Unjust Norms of Warfare: a View from the Social Sciences ($10,855), Ariel Colonomos
- Gender, Global Health, and Violence: Feminist Perspectives on Peace and Disease ($19,266), Catia Confortini
- Modelling Spatial and Network Interdependence in International Relations ($24,957), Kristian S. Gleditsch

COMMITTEE BUDGET

The most urgent policy issue facing the committee relates is budgetary. While the membership of the ISA has increased over the past decade and the number of proposals being evaluated by the committee has increased even more rapidly, the size of the grant budget ($130,000) has not kept pace. Strikingly, in 2013 the committee funded 16 of the 22 proposals (73%) it received, whereas this past year, the committee was only able to fund 12 of the 60 proposals (20%) received. The number and quality of proposals has been going up, but the budget has not. For example, in prior years, there was often a natural breaking point in evaluation scores between those grants that were funded and those that were not. This year, however, the last grant that was funded was awarded an overall score of 8.0, and the first grant that was not funded was awarded an overall score of 7.95. In other words, many high-quality grants are not being funded because of budget limitations.

Therefore, the committee recommends that ISA significantly increase the budget for research & workshop grants, starting for the 2018 cycle. This is particularly the case because the grants provide professional opportunities for younger scholars and academics from outside the Global North. One of the criteria used in evaluating grants is whether they include junior scholars and scholars from diverse geographic regions. Through this grant program, ISA not only directly supports these scholars, but also encourages a norm of reaching out to junior and more diverse colleagues when devising collaborative projects.

OTHER POLICY ISSUES AND IMPLEMENTATION ISSUES

At the 2017 ISA Meeting in Baltimore and over the course of the year, the committee discussed several issues and agreed on a number of changes:

- First, the committee agreed that its policy of ensuring previous workshop leaders cannot apply for 2 years was worth continuing. In fact, one proposal that had been selected for funding was disqualified because a workshop leader had already received an ISA workshop grant for the past four years in a row.
- The committee also unanimously agreed to continue providing feedback for unsuccessful applicants. Providing such feedback is not particularly onerous, and the applicants were extremely grateful to receive it from the committee.
- The committee also agreed to move up the timing of the grant application deadline, so that committee decisions could be made in time for announcements along with ISA annual conference notifications. While ISA members may be used to a later deadline, the early ISA
meeting in 2017 gave the committee plenty of time to remind people of the earlier closing date.

- The committee decided that all proposals would need to have two identified alternates for all workshops. This was due to the fact that at times, people dropped out of workshops when no alternates had been specified, and that could enable workshop leaders to substitute participants who had not been approved by the committee.

- The committee agreed to clarify and strengthen language in the grant application regarding budget issues, particularly regarding the fact that any changes to budgets had to be approved by ISA before spending occurred.

- The committee chair, in consultation with the ISA Executive Director, agreed to formalize the rule that committee members could not be part of any grant applications to appear before the committee while they were still members, due to concerns about perceived conflict of interest.

- The committee also agree on the need to evaluate the impact of the grant program. Anecdotal evidence shows the clear impact of the program in producing high-quality publications, creating scholarly networks, and encouraging participation by junior colleagues. However, a formal survey of prior grant recipients would also be useful.

- Finally, the committee discussed adding an optional demographic collection section to the application form. At present, the committee does not collect any data on the number of women, under-represented minorities, junior scholars, or scholars from developing countries – either as workshop leaders or participants. It was agreed that such collection would be useful, but would need to be done in conjunction with advice from ISA staff.

2018 Agenda

My tenure as chair concludes at the start of the 2018 meeting, and Professor Carolyn Shaw has been appointed to lead the committee for the next three years. While Professor Shaw will have ideas about how to move the grant program forward, I would suggest follow up on these matters:

- Evaluation of the grant program: this will not only enable the committee to document the positive benefits of ISA research & workshop grants, but also to see how the ISA membership believes the program could be improved.

- Collection of demographic information: understanding who is applying for, and who actually receives, ISA grants would be extremely valuable.

- Clean-up of all committee materials: ISA has a number of ways to communicate the grant program, including a website, emails, and the actual application form. When we changed the requirement of having 2 named alternates, not all the materials were changed, mainly due the confusion about what materials were provided to ISA membership. It would be extremely valuable for the committee and ISA staff to collect all materials related to the grant program, and update them all at once.

- Continuation of feedback: the application for an ISA research & workshop grant often runs over 50 pages. Providing a few sentences of feedback is important as recognition of the work that applicants put into their proposals. Committee members simply write a few
sentences for each application they evaluate, and then the chair reviews those and puts together a paragraph for each person that asks for feedback on their unsuccessful grant.

- Continuation of Chair’s distance from evaluations: as Chair, I did not evaluate proposals because it was my job to collate evaluations and then come up with a final ranking. Because the person creating the final proposed ranking could always tinker with their own evaluations to, for example, lower the score of a proposal so that a favoured one makes the final cut, I believe it is important that the Chair does not evaluate proposals. I continued this practice from my predecessor, Michael Tierney, and would recommend it to Professor Shaw.

Finally, the Committee, and myself personally, would like to thank all the ISA staff, but especially Lembe Tiky, for providing expeditious responses to all questions from the committee and from workshop organizers and for scrubbing budgets to ensure that we could fund additional proposals. All ISA staff members have been efficient, generous, and helpful in matters that have come before the committee.
10. UN NGO Representative Report

This report was prepared by Melissa Labonte, acting as the United Nations NGO Representative. The report was submitted January 9, 2018 for the 2018 Governing Council meeting in San Francisco.

UN Pass and Conference Registration Requests

The main task of the ISA UN NGO liaison is to secure grounds passes for ISA members who are seeking to conduct research and/or interviews at the UN headquarters in New York or Geneva, or to register them to observe/participate, in their personal capacity and not as official ISA representatives, in global conferences (e.g. UN Commission on the Status of Women; UN Committee Against Torture).

The ISA UN NGO liaison manages the process of obtaining grounds passes by completing pass application, security, and/or global conference registration forms, using the NGO liaison web portal. Appropriate follow-up is carried out to ensure that passes are issued and registrations are completed.

For the current reporting period, the ISA UN NGO Liaison assisted the following ISA members in obtaining successfully their UN grounds passes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arat, Zehra</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>15-20 March 2017</td>
<td>Commission on the Status of Women and additional research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arcudi, Antonio</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>27 February – 24 March 2017</td>
<td>Research and interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fischer, Gregory</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>20 October – 31 December 2017</td>
<td>Research and interviews, UNDP Equator Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garwood, Sarah</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>20 October – 31 December 2017</td>
<td>Research and interviews, UNDP Equator Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillebrecht, Courtney</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>11-15 December 2017</td>
<td>Assembly of States Parties to the International Criminal Court and additional research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macedo, Gustavo</td>
<td>New York, Geneva</td>
<td>7-31 August 2017, 16-31 October 2017</td>
<td>Research and interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nyman, Elizabeth</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>5-9 June 2017</td>
<td>United Nations Conference to Support the Implementation of Sustainable Development Goal 14 the Ocean Conference and additional research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage, Maria</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>20-22 February 2017</td>
<td>Research and interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephenson, Carolyn</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>22-25 March 2017</td>
<td>Commission on the Status of Women and additional research</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11. Committee on the Status of Representation and Diversity Report

This report was prepared by Michael J. Bosia, acting as the chair of the ISA Committee on the Status of Representation and Diversity (members include Brandon Valeriano, Momin Rahman, Erica Simone Almeida Resende, Paul G. Adogamhe, Rekha Datta, and Kristina Hinds, and ex-officio Mark Boyer). The report was submitted February 13, 2018 for the 2018 Governing Council meeting in San Francisco.

Response to the Travel Ban

After the announcement of the travel ban effecting the ability of scholars and members to attend the annual meeting in Baltimore, the incoming committee chair contacted the ISA president, executive director, and incoming and continuing members of the committee to determine if it would be appropriate for the committee to review the effect of the ban on our core constituencies prior to being formally seated by the governing council. With ISA leadership expressing interest in our perspective, we engaged in a series of email conversations around the immediate impact of the ban, and the potential impact of such a ban on future meetings sited in the US. The committee was concerned about the ongoing impact of any ban on the ability of scholars based outside the US to attend, but also raised concerns with regard to travel costs for scholars outside the US without regard to a ban, and encouraged leadership to take those costs into consideration when assessing potential host cities. At the same time, the committee was concerned about US based scholars not holding US citizenship who might be subject to legal restrictions or anxious about travel outside the US because of ambiguous regulations. Because of these conflicting challenges and the cost of the ban to the association and its members, the committee recommended that ISA join one of the lawsuits seeking to overturn the ban. Moreover, some were concerned about the economic impact of a boycott or relocation on facility staff in host cities, including in San Francisco, which is a Sanctuary City and has one of the highest percentages of non-US born residents and workers in the US.

Annual Committee Meeting Summary

At the committee’s meeting in Baltimore, members decided to regroup around key themes and projects after an open discussion of concerns, definitions, and priorities related to diversity and representation within ISA. One of our key concerns was to hone in on the relationship of ISA to scholars from the global South, especially given a current US political climate redolent with rhetoric hostile to foreign scholars and policies placing significant new restrictions on the rights of scholars and others to travel. In practical terms, we discussed conference citing, visa requirements, increasing the use of languages other than English at the conference, and outreach to caucuses, status committees, and sections. We requested further information from ISA leadership regarding the logistical issues related to conference siting, as this would be helpful to the membership in addressing these issues. In addition, discussed the need to accurately and fully assess ISA membership and conference participation in terms of scholars from the global South, but also through a framework that incorporates demographic data about membership related to diversity and representation beyond the cultural specificity both of the US context and of
artificial binaries, inclusive of how we might address race, gender, and sexuality, as well as the collection of data regarding members’ first and second languages. ISA leadership explained the progress on this front, and expressed openness to considering further modifications as necessary. These discussions continued throughout the year as the Committee pursued the efforts outlined below, and came to include mental health issues as well.

The committee agreed to prioritize outreach, panel allocation, language, and data collection, and to have a presence in discussions related to the program events Challenging Oppression. After the annual meeting, there was also discussion among a few members about incorporating mental health issues within our charge.

OUTREACH

The Committee Chair participated in early meetings and conversations about the Challenging Oppression series, and committee member Momin Rahman (Trent University) is participating on the panel series in San Francisco. The chair also met with committee and caucus leadership and has engaged in projects related to the annual meeting with them. These efforts included the Global South Caucus, the LGBTQ Caucus, and the Committee on the Status of Women. The Committee Chair is also participating in a pre-conference workshop on global LGBTQ politics that received ISA funding and was organized by members of the LGBTQA Caucus including Committee Member Rahman.

PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT FOR THE ANNUAL MEETING IN SAN FRANCISCO

The Committee received an allocation of 3 panels for the annual meeting in San Francisco, which augments the previous allocation of two panels, and all three proposed panels were approved. These include the revival of a panel inclusive of scholars from the global South originally proposed for the Baltimore Conference but that was not scheduled at that time, coordinating with the Global South Caucus on special programming, and broad outreach across ISA for a panel on intersectionality.

In San Francisco, the Committee is sponsoring a traditional roundtable entitled A Place for All at the Table: Diversity Matters in the Global, which includes members of the committee and three participants from institutions outside the US.

The Committee is also sponsoring an innovative roundtable on intersectionality that will include short essay submissions and a broad range of voices from across ISA. Entitled Research, Teaching, Engagement: Intersectionality in Global Politics, participants include 6 scholars from outside the US, representing a range of intersectional positions, research priorities, and institutional contexts. The intent is that the individual essays will be published through a newsletter produced by the Committee.

Finally, the primary program-related effort of the Committee was organizing a Mentoring Café workshop for scholars from the global South, drawing one of our committee allocations and co-sponsored with the Global South Caucus, and co-organized with Caucus Chair Arlene B. Tickner (Universidad del Rosario). We also worked with the outgoing chair of the LGBTQA Caucus, Cai Wilkinson (Deakin University), who has organized the Critical Methods Café, and the Chair of the Committee on the Status of Women, Kathleen Cunningham (University of Maryland) to ensure that our new program would complement
others. We see the café as the first step in developing strong mentoring programs for scholars from the
global South modeled on the Pay it Forward program developed by the Committee on the Status of
Women, building on their success advancing diversity to expand such opportunities and increase the
numbers of emerging scholars participating in ISA. In San Francisco, the 18 mentors include 4 from
institutions in the global South, and 5 additional from institutions outside the US. Mentors represent
public and private colleges and universities, working on topics ranging from development to revolution.
Half of the mentors are scholars of color, half are women, and two are LGBTQ. The café will include
tables addressing a number of themes (publishing, English language, building networks and negotiating
academic cultures, race, gender identity and sexuality in a global context, successful proposal writing -
research grants, post-doctoral applications, books - scholarly engagement, and academic freedom and
risk), and mentees will be able to circulate from table to table as meets their needs.

For the 2018 annual meeting in San Francisco, committee member participation includes: Chair Bosia is
serving on one panel, a roundtable, and the Critical Methods Café; member Valeriano will present on
three panels; member Rahman, in addition to the committee’s roundtable on intersectionality and the
preconference workshop on LGBTQ politics, is serving on a panel, the roundtable that is part of the
fighting oppression series, and with the Critical Methods Café; Member Resende is serving on two
panels in addition to the committee’s roundtable; Member Adogamhe is serving on a roundtable on the
study of Africa in IR; Member Datta is chair of the committee’s roundtable on diversity in the global;
Member Hinds is participating on two roundtables focused on power in the discipline, including one as
part of the Sapphire Series.

**DATA COLLECTION AND MEMBER COMMUNICATIONS**

The committee has remained in dialogue with the President and Executive Director, and additional staff,
with regard to the demographic data collected by the association about members, and communications
with membership that include issues related to race, gender, gender identity and sexuality.

Concerns about data collection include two primary areas: culturally appropriate terminology and self-
identification inclusive of primary language; transparency. In terms of the former, committee members
discussed these issues at our annual meeting, and continued our dialogue with leadership during the
year, focusing on terminology seen as US-centric and thus exclusionary, the need to better incorporate
linguistic diversity and gender diversity. During the registration period, the Committee Chair raised a
number of issues based on this conversation, including the omission of scholarly interests in LGBT or
Queer studies, and of Gender or Feminist Studies, from the topical pulldown menu, the broad
terminology substituting geographic designations for race or ethnicity, and the inability to select
multiple categories for race and ethnicity. The Committee and ISA leadership will work on continued
improvements in data collection.

In terms of transparency, the Committee expressed interest in a broad circulation of collected data
related to diversity and representation so that stakeholders could assess our own and the association’s
collective efforts.
Finally, ISA staff and the Committee Chair – working with members of the LGBTQA Caucus – revised the language related to gender in the ISA code of conduct.

2018 Annual Meeting Committee Schedule

*Wednesday April 4*
8:15 A Place for All at the Table: Diversity Matters in the Global
5:00 Committee Meeting

*Thursday April 5*
8:15 Mentoring Café: Strategies and Support for Global South Scholars

*Friday April 6*
1:45 Research, Teaching, and Engagement: Intersectionality in Global Politics
The ISA Innovative Pedagogy Conference Planning Committee has worked steadily over the past year to advance plans for the Association’s first annual conference on innovative teaching and learning. This conference will be linked with ISA Midwest, and held on November 15, 2018, in St. Louis, MO. Our committee has held one formal meeting at ISA Baltimore in 2017, and we have corresponded frequently to advance our planning throughout the year. Pursuant to our charge from the Governing Council for a three-year pilot program, our goal is to create an exciting opening conference and establish the foundations for a successful series of ISA conferences on pedagogy in the years to come.

HISTORY

This pilot project was advanced in 2016 by ISA members Carolyn Shaw and Victor Asal, on behalf of the Long-Range Planning Committee. Their original proposal called for a full-day workshop on active teaching and learning in international studies to be held prior to the annual meeting of the ISA. They ran a successful pilot project as a pre-conference workshop at the 2017 ISA meeting in Baltimore. ISA President-Elect Ashley Leeds and Executive Director Mark Boyer helped advance the initiative to the Governing Board in a new form: a proposal for a three-year pilot program that would offer one or two-day workshops on active teaching and learning and would be held in conjunction with regional ISA meetings. The goal would be to create an interactive workshop format with hands-on exercises, debriefing and discussion. The intention was not a conference that would produce publishable output, but rather offer participants an opportunity to exchange information and perspectives on best practices in innovative pedagogy. This workshop pilot plan was seen as an attempt to mirror the best aspects of the APSA’s Teaching and Learning Conferences—and as a creative extension of alternative formats in the ISA (e.g., Working Groups programs, Workshop Grants, and Career Courses). This three-year pilot project received unanimous support from the ISA Governing Board at the Baltimore meeting in February 2017, and the planning committee immediately began its coordination and dialogue with all interested parties.

2018 CONFERENCE PLANNING

The ISA-IPC Planning Committee has conducted extensive deliberations and coordination with ISA headquarters officers and staff to advance our plans. We have initiated a planning cycle to first launch a one-day conference in 2018 linked to ISA Midwest, and we have begun to explore possible connections to the ISA West and ISA South regional conferences for locating our meetings in 2019 and 2020.

There will be two types of sessions at the first ISA-IPC in St. Louis: workshops and plenary meetings. Workshops will be directed by leading voices on pedagogy, assessment, and professional development. Participants will attend four workshops during the day, chosen from a rich menu, to share innovations
and ideas about different themes in international studies pedagogy. Among the workshop themes for 2018 are: Simulations & Games for Teaching Violence and Peace; Publishing Your Innovative Teaching Work; International Studies Research Literacy; Assessment; International Studies Curriculum Design; Faculty-Led Study Abroad Programs; and Online Course Design. These interactive sessions will provide hands-on experience and materials for ready application, along with opportunities for professional networking and sharing of ideas. Plenary sessions will focus on best practices in innovative teaching and promote opportunities for networking, collaboration, and exchange. A keynote presentation by a renowned teacher-scholar will foster further dialogue on best practices in active teaching and learning. Modest registration fees will cover participation in all scheduled events at the conference, including a plenary morning session, four workshops, and a plenary evening reception featuring a keynote address.

**Promotion and Outreach**

The ISA-IPC planning committee has already begun reaching out to many constituencies to provide early information about the 2018 conference and help build interest in the Association. We have worked closely with our partners at ISA Midwest, and met with and corresponded with leaders of the ALIAS section and the International Education section of ISA. In addition, we have submitted a promotional advertisement to ISA headquarters for inclusion in the ISA Newsletter online and possibly in the printed program for ISA San Francisco in 2018. Committee members also have discussed this idea with leaders of all four U.S. regions. Our goal is to help get the word out early and to encourage our colleagues in regional conferences and ISA sections to buy-in to the model. Not only will this help with general promotion, but we also expect to call on these constituencies for help us in future planning. Across the board, the reception of the new about a future pedagogy conference has been very positive.

**ISA-IPC Planning Committee**

Finally, we are thankful for contributions of the International Studies Association leaders and staff, as well as members of the planning committee in development of this exciting new conference. Committee members include:

- Jeffrey S. Lantis, Chair, The College of Wooster
- Amy Below, Oregon State University
- Paul F. Diehl, University of Texas-Dallas
- John Ishiyama, University of North Texas
- Heidi Hobbs, North Carolina State University
- Ashley Leeds, Rice University, President of ISA, *ex officio*
- T.V. Paul, McGill University, Past President of ISA, *ex officio*
- Patrick James, University of Southern California, President-Elect of ISA, *ex officio*
- Mark Boyer, Executive Director of ISA and University of Connecticut, *ex officio*
13. SPECIAL PROJECT GRANTS REPORT

The Request For Proposals for the 2017-2018 funding cycle of the ISA Special Project Grants went out to all members via email on April 5, 2017. The announcement was also inserted in the April, May, and June editions of the newsletter; it was additionally publicized on social media, Twitter and Facebook during the same months.

The deadline for submissions was July 1, 2017. We received four (4) proposals requesting a total of $31,706.10. Of these, three qualified as small projects (under $2,500 budget) and one qualified as large project (greater than $2,500 but no more than $25,000 budget).

The large project and one of the small ones were not reviewed for funding, because they did not meet the criteria set by the Governing council (GC) for Special Project Grants.

The two proposals that went to the ISA Executive Committee for evaluation were:

- **2017 ISA Northeast Region Pedagogy Workshop** -- $2,000 -- by Dan Levine, ISA Northeast Region President
- **Pay It Forward Regional Programming for ISA West** -- $2,042 -- by Amy Below, Oregon State University, ISA West President

The Executive Committee recommended funding both proposals for a total of $4,042.10 out of a $60,000 budget.

This year, a second call was issued for proposals to access the remaining funds. The deadline for submissions was set for November 1, 2017. We received five (5) proposals requesting a total of $51,232. Four of them were large projects and one was a small project.

Two of the five submissions did not fit within the parameters set for the program; they were not reviewed. Of the three proposals sent to the Executive Committee for evaluation, one was recommended for funding:

**Visualizing Mobility in the Global South: Africans in China** -- $2010 -- by Lina Benabdallah, Wake Forest University and Ilaria Carrozza, London School of Economics.

Total awards for the cycle 2017-2018: $6,052.10 out of $60,000.

As a summary note, in all cases but one, the “not reviewed” proposals were essentially workshop grant proposals and should have been submitted to that ISA program.
14. EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR’S REPORT (12:15-12:45PM)

ACTION ITEMS:

**ACTION ITEM #1: PROPOSAL TO REVISE REVENUE-SHARING FOR LARGER INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCES**
The original policy was developed at a time when ISA often shared the administrative tasks with a collaborating organization
- Proposal to Revise Revenue-Sharing (Pages 43-44)

**ACTION ITEM #2: REQUEST TO CHANGE PRIVACY POLICY TO INCLUDE THE SALE OF EMAIL ADDRESSES TO OUR EXHIBITORS/Sponsors**
We are seeing a dramatic drop in sales of physical mailing list due to companies doing the bulk of their business through email. This change would bring ISA more in line with current business practices of our exhibitors/sponsors.
- Request to Change Privacy Policy (Pages 44-45)

This past year represented a time when ISA HQ UConn has hit our stride. That is not say that our operations are routine, but rather that we now feel comfortable with the tasks before us on a daily and weekly, and yearly basis. As a result, more time has been spent thinking and beginning to move ISA into the coming decades. And as you will see below, we are making substantial progress in these areas with much gratitude owed to the leadership of HQ senior staff members Jen Fontanella and Jeanne White. Their ability to see the big picture and to work collaboratively with me, each other and the rest of the HQ staff is quite remarkable.

**GENERAL IMPRESSIONS**

**Finance:** As can be seen in the graph below, ISA’s revenue and expenditures continue their upward trajectories in healthy ways. In 2017, we witnessed a surplus of over $114,000.
MEMBERSHIP:

We have continued to see the generally upward trend in membership over the past few years, although we seem to have plateaued around 7000 members the past two years. It is worth noting that the large numbers of student members bode well for the future health of ISA’s aggregate membership, assuming those younger members continue their commitment to ISA.
Self-Reported Gender Distribution, Membership Data, 2017

Membership Data (self-reported), by Gender and Academic Rank, 2017

(Data on gender and section membership available at: http://www.isanet.org/ISA/About-ISA/Data/Gender)
**Elections**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Office</th>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Percent of Total Vote Obtained</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>Cameron G. Thies</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice President</td>
<td>Navnita C. Behera</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice President</td>
<td>G. John Ikenberry</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice President</td>
<td>Laura J. Shepherd</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GC At-Large Member</td>
<td>Sinem Akgul Acikmese</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GC At-Large Member</td>
<td>Soumita Basu</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GC At-Large Member</td>
<td>Halvard Buhaug</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GC At-Large Member</td>
<td>Imad Mansour</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GC At-Large Member</td>
<td>Jorge A. Schiavon</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**San Francisco 2018 Annual Convention:**

As of this writing, the number of panels for the San Francisco meeting is 1,248 and the total number of unique participants is 5,839. This basically represents a steady state from the past two years. When the program was released, there was a 25% overall rejection rate (this number went down to 19% after program items were added from the waitlist). The HQ staff was pleased to work with Program Chairs Faten Ghosn and Ismene Gizelis and their team (Joseph Cox, Wakako Maekawa and Marina Petrova) throughout the year. They, in collaboration with President Brett Ashley Leeds and the HQ staff, did a terrific job assembling an interesting and diverse program. We have also continued the highly successful Junior Scholar Symposium program, the Sapphire Series, introduced new digital media elements and continued other mainstays of our annual meeting. We very much look forward to working with incoming President Pat James and his Program Co-Chairs, Nukhet Sandal and Jenifer Whitten-Woodring, in the months ahead.

We also continued a relatively newly featured programming thread that focuses on helping new ISA members and attendees navigate the Association, the annual meeting and academia more generally. Giuliana Franchetti at HQ has done a terrific job of crafting the “First Time ISA Tool-Kit.” We look forward to continuing these and other conversations in Toronto in 2019.
**Host Relationship with UConn**

Our relationship with UConn remains well-supported by the University’s highest leadership, with both University President Susan Herbst and Vice President for Global Affairs Dan Weiner strongly in support of our mutually beneficial relationship. In this context and as you will see later, HQ has renegotiated an extension of the support package through 2025; a new MOU has been signed and will go into effect pending a positive recommendation of the GC in San Francisco. ISA HQ continues to cultivate the positive relationship where possible, including the co-hosting of a UConn Foundation and Alumni Association event in San Francisco at the April convention (entirely paid for by the UConn Foundation, as there are about 800 UConn alums in the greater Bay Area).

**Regarding Staff:**

- **Jeanne White** is irreplaceable. But in a little over two years from now, we will be faced with the reality of “no Jeanne.” Rest assured, however, that we are working toward that inevitability and are planning accordingly.

- **Jen Fontanella** is so much more than ISA’s Director of Operations and Finance. I continually rely on her good judgement, political instincts, pleasant demeanor, attention to detail, and her willingness and ability to challenge me and others to think differently on a recurrent basis. She makes everything about my job easier.

- We remain fortunate to have two PhDs on staff who oversee ISA’s array of programming and help to shape those programs from their perspectives as active scholars in the field. **Dr. Kristy Belton** and **Dr. Lembe Tiky** are becoming increasingly well known within the association and I encourage you to reach out to them with your ideas for enhancing existing programs and thoughts about potential new programming.

- **Melissa Ballard, Liz Fausett-Fuhrman, Giuliana Franchetti, Donalyn Maneggia, Kristin Nacovsky, Alex Walker** continue to serve our members with knowledge, high standards and
good cheer. I feel blessed to be working with such a competent and fun group of folks. We are hoping to hire two new staff members during the next six months.

- Lastly, we are very fortunate to have three dedicated graduate assistants—Ashley Benitez-Ou, Mary Hartford, and Adelina Mkami—working with us. They work very well with the full-time staff and fulfill many staff responsibilities, especially as we carve out more staff needs. They are also receiving some nice value-added to their education by getting to see a professional association from the inside out.

**Technology Transition**

As I have told you previously, one of the early discoveries upon taking over as Executive Director was the need to undertake a significant rewrite of the isanet.org system. This was primarily the result of platform upgrades made by Microsoft for which our software was unprepared. But more recently, we have found the need to develop a more integrative platform across finance, programming and member database management.

After one false start with a company who promised things that could not be delivered, we have contracted with a Michigan software development company, **i2Integration**. I must note that this process of technology rewrite, transformation, and integration is the result of enormous efforts made by Jen Fontanella and Jeanne White. All the staff have been focused at various points on this project, as understanding HQ’s workflow is crucial to **i2Integration**’s effective development. As this rolls out over the next 12 months, you will see changes to the visual user-interface shell, but most of the changes will not be seen by visitors to the site as they will reside in the “back-end. One of the first things you might notice is that we now have an on-line page to accept donations. You can find this at https://www.isanet.org/ISA/Donate and if the spirit moves you, please do consider contributing in support of your favorite ISA programs.

**Continued Focus on Evolving Process**

We continue to see ISA’s body of policies as living documents. These include:

- Code of Conduct – we have had four complaints filed since the Baltimore convention. They have highlighted some minor changes that should be made to the Code to make the process more efficient, logical and effective. These will be discussed under the Committee on Professional Rights and Responsibilities report.
- Refinement of the new Special Projects Fund program – this program accepted submissions twice during this year.
- We will continue to refine policies and procedures as we move forward, when concerns are noted.

**Looking Ahead**

**Conference Planning:**

Some highlights include:
• We have gone to contract with this same pairing of hotels for 2024 in San Francisco. More
discussion of this choice is forthcoming later in the GC meeting.

• Past and upcoming highlights include:
  o A very successful joint international conference in Hong Kong, June 2017 – Marijke
    Breuning, John Ishiyama and our on-site coordinator Richard Hu put together this very
    successful conference. Even amongst the torrential rain, about 1000 participants found
    it a stimulating experience.
  o A successful small workshop sponsored by the GSCIS at the University of Havana in July
    2017.
  o An upcoming conference in Quito, Ecuador in collaboration with FLACSO-Quito in July
    2018. Thanks to Kristy Belton (ISA HQ) and Cintia Quiliconi (FLACSO-Quito) as program
    co-chairs, as they have done a remarkable job of assembling the program.
  o Preliminary planning is underway for a collaborative meeting with CEEISA in Belgrade,
    Serbia for summer 2019 and for a small conference in Accra, Ghana likely also in
    summer 2019.

• I will continue to make my way to a variety of conferences during the year. I attended ISA-
  Canada in Toronto in June 2017, ISA-Northeast and the AMEI 60th Anniversary conference in
  Huatulco, MX during fall 2017; the Hong Kong meeting in June 2017; the GSCIS workshop in
  Havana, Cuba in July 2017, a Publications Committee retreat in San Francisco in July 2017, a
  Global South Taskforce meeting in Montreal in September 2017 and several others. I look
  forward to continuing to make my way around the “regional circuit” and to other special
  gatherings as we move forward. Connecting more directly with ISA members at these
  conferences and other meetings continues to be one of the most rewarding aspects of my role
  as Executive Director.

Other Details of Note:

In addition to the larger issues and trends discussed above, a few more detailed items are worth
noting from the past year.

• We continued to carve out 10 panels for the San Francisco meeting that focus on everything
  from how to get engaged in ISA and a “first ISA tool-kit” to sexual harassment and ISA’s Code of
  Conduct and more. Under the heading “Challenging Oppression” this year, we anticipate that
  this group of panels will be an on-going feature at the annual meeting with variable topics and
  issues addressed.

• Oxford University Press hosted their third Editorial Summit in May 2016. OUP has also launched
  SilverChair as their web support platform and our journal web-sites are all moving to that portal.

• Oxford Reference is now hosting all “old” Compendium content on their platform and is now
  published under the auspices of ISA’s Oxford Reference Encyclopedia of International Studies
  (OREIS). Thanks to our Oxford partners and Renee Marlin-Bennett for the terrific work in
  getting this delivered and our obligations to existing subscribers fulfilled.
• Dr. Efe Tokdemir, Binghampton University is working as the Rosenau Postdoc this year. He is doing work on ISA history for HQ, along with his own work and will be giving a brief presentation at the Thursday business meeting about his work.

**ACTION ITEM #1: PROPOSAL TO REVISE REVENUE-SHARING FOR LARGER INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCES**

The statement shown below has long been ISA policy regarding revenue-sharing of net proceeds from the joint international conferences held by ISA in collaboration with another organization or institution. This policy was originally created when the conferences were small and the proceeds were relatively insignificant. Increasingly over the past decade, ISA HQ has assumed almost the entire administrative burden for these conferences and, as shown below, conference revenues have grown to where they can cover both ISA’s true costs and the provision of financial incentives for collaborating organizations.

**Current Policy: Revenue Generation from Joint International Conferences:** “It is ISA policy that when the association co-sponsors an overseas conference with another association, ISA shall generate no net revenue from the cooperating activity, nor will it be expected to subsidize the conference. Any revenues generated by ISA above and beyond its costs are expected to be turned over to the local organizers, or, to another, mutually-agreed upon recipient.”

But in recent years, the net proceeds from ISA’s international collaborations have increased dramatically from the original expected proceeds from such ventures. The net proceeds for the last four such conferences are:

- 2014 – FLACSO – Argentina - $73,714.48
- 2016 – CEEISA – Slovenia - $19,255.99
- 2017 – Hong Kong University - $41,741.02
- 2018 – FLACSO – Ecuador - $15,000 (projected)

**Proposed Change to Policy:** “It is ISA policy that when the association co-sponsors an overseas conference with another association, ISA shall share the net revenue in the following manner. The first US$10,000 in net revenue will be provided to the collaborating organization or institution. After US$10,000 in net revenue is reached, the remaining net revenue will be split evenly between ISA and the collaborating organization or institution.”

**Rationale for Change:**

- The original policy was developed at a time when ISA often shared the administrative tasks with a collaborating organization. Now the entire administrative burden is on ISA HQ. We are at staff capacity for conference support.
- ISA is constantly being asked by its members for more programs and services. Thus, this would be a small source of additional revenue for ISA programming and could be earmarked for other global outreach efforts.
- This change also allows ISA to offset the staff time for our smaller region/section conferences (e.g., like GSCIS, Human Rights or ICOMM), for which they are not directly charged.
The proposed policy still provides significant financial incentive for others to collaborate with ISA. Table 1 below shows the implications of the proposed policy change based on the four conferences shown above.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Existing revenue to host</th>
<th>Proposed Revenue to Host (hypothetical)</th>
<th>Proposed Revenue to ISA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FLACSO Argentina</td>
<td>$73,714.48</td>
<td>$41,857</td>
<td>$31,857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEEISA Slovenia</td>
<td>$19,255.99</td>
<td>$14,628</td>
<td>$4,628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HKU</td>
<td>$41,741.02</td>
<td>$25,870</td>
<td>$15,870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLACSO Ecuador</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$12,500</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Action Item #2: Request to Change Privacy Policy to Include the Sale of Email Addresses to Our Exhibitors/Sponsors**

As has been practice for more than 10 years and as a benefit for our top level of sponsorship, complimentary (snail) mailing list rentals are available. Premier Platinum $10,000+ sponsors receive 4 complimentary lists, Platinum level $5000-$9999 sponsors receive 3 complimentary lists, and Gold Level $3,000-$4,999 and Silver Level $2,000-$2999 sponsors receive 1 complimentary list. ISA also has a history of selling (snail) mailing addresses of our membership/sections to exhibitors, sponsors, and various publishers.

We are now seeing a dramatic drop in sales of those physical lists due to companies doing the bulk of their business through email. In researching other professional associations, we have found they are routinely selling email lists and have been doing so for several years.

As you will see from the numbers below, mailing list revenue has dropped over 50% in the last fiscal year and with the convention coming in 6 weeks, we are on target to lose even more revenue this year.

- **FY14** - 56 lists, $9875, 22 Companies
- **FY15** – 31 Lists, $6200, 17 Companies
- **FY16** – 35 lists, $8525, 16 companies
- **FY17** – 16 lists, $3750, 10 Companies
- **FY 18** – 11 lists, $3500, 4 companies (to date)

Over the past five years, thirty-three different companies have purchased lists. Fifteen of those companies made a one-time purchase, 9 companies have purchased for two years, 5 companies have purchased for 3 years and 4 companies have purchased for 4 years. These companies are generally our major exhibitors and sponsors.

BRILL/Martinus Nijhoff (1)  
Great Lists (2)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publisher</th>
<th>Publishing House</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brookings Inst. Press (1)</td>
<td>Infogroup (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duke University Press (1)</td>
<td>NAFSA (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elsevier (1)</td>
<td>Paradigm Publishers (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guilford Press (1)</td>
<td>Thor Information Services (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana University Press (1)</td>
<td>University of California Press (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Monetary (1)</td>
<td>W.W. Norton &amp; Company (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack Williams (1)</td>
<td>Ashgate Publishing (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Group Media (1)</td>
<td>Cambridge University Press (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature Publishing Group (1)</td>
<td>Council on Foreign Relations (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford University Press (1)</td>
<td>Lynne Rienner Publishers (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palgrave Macmillian (1)</td>
<td>United States Institute (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paradigm Publishers (1)</td>
<td>MIT Press (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Science Rese... (1)</td>
<td>Routledge - Taylor &amp; Francis (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Washington (1)</td>
<td>Foreign Affairs (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alliance for Global Event (2)</td>
<td>Stanford University Press (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgetown University Press (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

List Types:
- **Active Learning in Intl. Affairs Section Mailin...**
- **Comparative Interdisciplinary Studies Se...**
- **Diplomatic Studies Section Mailing List**
- **English School Section Mailing List**
- **Environmental Studies Section Mailing List**
- **Ethnicity, Nationalism and Migration Stud...**
- **Feminist Theory and Gender Studies Sec...**
- **Foreign Policy Analysis Section Mailing L...**
- **International Organization Section Mailin...**
- **International Political Economy Section ...**
- **International Security Studies Section Ma...**
- **Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgendered, ...**
- **Non-North American Mailing List**
- **North American List**
- **Peace Studies Section Mailing List**
- **Political Demography Section Mailing List**
Full ISA Membership List
Global Development Section Mailing List
Human Rights Section Mailing List
International Communication Section Mailing List
International Education Section Mailing List
International Ethics Section Mailing List
International Law Section Mailing List
Post-Communist Section Mailing List
Scientific Study of Intl Processes Section...
Theory Section Mailing List
U.S. Only List
Women’s Caucus Mailing List

ISA Headquarters is requesting the Executive Committee/Governing Council review and amend the privacy policy to allow for the sale of membership emails only to sponsors in an effort to bring ISA more in line with current business practices of our exhibitors/sponsors.
# HQ Budget Proposal

## General Operating Account

### Assets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>FY17 Actuals</th>
<th>FY18 Expected</th>
<th>FY19 Budget</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Investment Portfolio</td>
<td>$2,536,370.36</td>
<td>$2,605,945.99</td>
<td>$2,700,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rainy Day funds/CD's**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cashing in of CD's for beginning of transition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$800,251.79</td>
<td>$726,251.04</td>
<td>$525,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CARRY FORWARD SAVINGS/INVESTMENT</strong></td>
<td>$3,336,622.15</td>
<td>$3,332,197.03</td>
<td>$3,225,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginning Balance Operating Funds</td>
<td>$1,377,610.82</td>
<td>$1,491,338.82</td>
<td>$1,777,337.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CARRY FORWARD SUBTOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$4,714,232.97</td>
<td>$4,823,535.85</td>
<td>$5,002,337.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>FY17 Actuals</th>
<th>FY18 Expected</th>
<th>FY19 Budget</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Membership</td>
<td>$620,285.00</td>
<td>$620,000.00</td>
<td>$620,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISA Sales</td>
<td>$28,995.00</td>
<td>$30,000.00</td>
<td>$30,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income from Cashed-in CD's</td>
<td>$103,000.00</td>
<td>$203,000.00</td>
<td>$34,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford University Press - Royalties</td>
<td>$828,247.00</td>
<td>$826,286.00</td>
<td>$859,708.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford University Press - Editorial support</td>
<td>$210,000.00</td>
<td>$210,000.00</td>
<td>$210,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compendium Purchase (OUP)</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor &amp; Francis - II Editorial support</td>
<td>$26,000.00</td>
<td>$30,000.00</td>
<td>$30,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor &amp; Francis - II Royalties</td>
<td>$2,562.00</td>
<td>$6,703.08</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Subscriptions</td>
<td>$14,845.00</td>
<td>$15,000.00</td>
<td>$15,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convention Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Convention</td>
<td>$1,139,963.00</td>
<td>$1,200,000.00</td>
<td>$1,300,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OPERATIONS INCOME SUBTOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$2,983,897.00</td>
<td>$3,150,989.08</td>
<td>$3,108,708.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Total Assets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>FY17 Actuals</th>
<th>FY18 Expected</th>
<th>FY19 Budget</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL ASSETS</strong></td>
<td>$7,698,129.97</td>
<td>$7,974,524.93</td>
<td>$8,111,045.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Expenses (Liabilities)

### ISA Publications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>FY17 Actuals</th>
<th>FY18 Expected</th>
<th>FY19 Budget</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>International Studies Quarterly*</td>
<td>$50,000.00</td>
<td>$50,000.00</td>
<td>$57,000.00</td>
<td>Proposed increase*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Studies Review*</td>
<td>$32,000.00</td>
<td>$32,000.00</td>
<td>$36,000.00</td>
<td>Proposed increase*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Studies Perspectives*</td>
<td>$32,000.00</td>
<td>$32,000.00</td>
<td>$36,000.00</td>
<td>Proposed increase*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Foreign Policy Analysis</strong>*</td>
<td>$32,000.00</td>
<td>$32,000.00</td>
<td>$36,000.00</td>
<td>Proposed increase***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>International Political Sociology</strong>*</td>
<td>$32,000.00</td>
<td>$32,000.00</td>
<td>$36,000.00</td>
<td>Proposed increase***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Journal of Global Security Studies</strong>*</td>
<td>$32,000.00</td>
<td>$32,000.00</td>
<td>$36,000.00</td>
<td>Proposed increase***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>International Interactions</strong>*</td>
<td>$30,000.00</td>
<td>$30,000.00</td>
<td>$36,000.00</td>
<td>Proposed increase***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Compendium (operation expenses)</strong></td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td>$20,000.00</td>
<td>Proposed increase***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Compendium Purchase from Wiley</strong></td>
<td>$85,000.00</td>
<td>$20,000.00</td>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Publication Committee Summit</strong></td>
<td>$20,000.00</td>
<td>$22,000.00</td>
<td>$22,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Journal Mailing Expenses</strong></td>
<td>$21,647.54</td>
<td>$22,000.00</td>
<td>$22,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>ISA Member Services</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ISA Annual Convention Travel Grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Conference Travel Grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Care at ISA Annual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISA Workshop Grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development Teaching Resource Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior Scholar Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISA Members access to Compendium - Annual Fee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Projects Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global South Workshop***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ISA Named Awards</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-English Book Award***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>ISA Committees</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee on the Status of Women</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>ISA Meetings &amp; Conventions</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annual Convention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presidential Task Force on Global South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ExComm Meeting November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Innovative Pedagogy Conference</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ISA Operations &amp; Personnel</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personnel</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boyer Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISA Staff*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Development/Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Office Operations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Supplies &amp; Equipment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mailing Expenses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage Rental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank Fees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cloud Web server</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISA Association management system (MemberSuite)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dues Memberships (UN/NGO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professional Services</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Consulting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit Fees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i2Integration (ISAnet upgrade)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Insurance</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Liability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libel Slander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Travel Support</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISA Exec. Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past President: T.V. Paul (yr 3 of 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President Brett Ashley Leeds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President Elect: Pat James</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President Elect: Cameron Thies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer: T. Clifton Morgan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL EXPENSES (LIABILITIES)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Operations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surplus/Deficit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Proposed budget increases

** Moving mature CD's into Investment Portfolio to begin saving for HQ transition
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1st Column</th>
<th>2nd Column</th>
<th>3rd Column</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current Assets</td>
<td>$7,698,129.97</td>
<td>$7,974,524.93</td>
<td>$8,111,045.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Liabilities</td>
<td>$2,870,168.98</td>
<td>$2,864,990.49</td>
<td>$3,051,900.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Liabilities and Equity</td>
<td>$4,827,960.99</td>
<td>$5,109,534.44</td>
<td>$5,059,145.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ISA Treasurer’s Report to the ISA Governing Council

This report was prepared by T. Clifton Morgan, acting as the ISA Treasurer. The report was submitted on February 14, 2018 for the 2018 Governing Council meeting in San Francisco.

Two major changes regarding ISA’s financial practices were finalized in 2017. First, the Governing Council adopted significant changes to the financial policies at the 2017 annual meeting. These altered, substantially, the way in which we treat, categorize, and account for our reserve funds. Second, the major financial and procedural audit that we undertook following the HQ move to Connecticut and the hiring of a new accounting firm was completed.

The most noticeable effect of these changes should be to make the presentation of the annual budget and the annual financial report more transparent and comprehensible. Moreover, rather than separating the reserve fund into several different ‘accounts’ with different stated purposes, it will be reported as a single value.

Furthermore, the Governing Council approved significant changes to ISA’s dues and conference fees. These changes were accompanied with a mandate to the Finance Committee to evaluate the impact of these changes on ISA finances and to recommend changes at the 2019 annual meeting. Because these changes took effect July 1, 2017 (the beginning of FY 2018) FINCOM has not yet seen even preliminary data on the impact of these changes on revenue. Thus, our budget forecasts concerning membership dues and conference fees might be quite inaccurate.

Also, because of the changes to the way reserve funds are treated, this report will look somewhat different than those from the past (and in the future). As is customary, it will report the account status as of the end of the fiscal year, i.e., June 30, 2017, and will offer comparisons with the previous year. These figures reflect the new accounting procedures; so, there might be discrepancies between figures reported last year and in this report.

Finally, the audit for FY 2016 had not been completed at the time of last year’s report. It was clean and clear. The audit for FY 2017 was also clean and clear.

Part I: Year-End Budget Report for FY 2017

The end of year General Operating Account budget figures for the July 1, 2016-June 30, 2017 show a good year for ISA. Actual Total Revenue was $2,983,897, which was an increase from the previous year of $265,333, however this was offset by an increase in spending in the areas of staffing and system upgrades. Actual Total Operating Expenses were $2,870,169, which was an increase of $495,766 over the previous year. Revenue exceeded expenses by $113,728. Total Net Assets as of June 30, 2017 totaled $4,827,961, an increase of $215,746 over the previous year. (NOTE: this now includes all ISA assets: funds in the operating account, cash holdings, investments, accounts receivable, and value of equipment less the value of outstanding liabilities.)
PART II: PROPOSED BUDGET FOR FY 2019

The proposed budget for July 1, 2018-June 30, 2019 anticipates modest changes from the current fiscal year with the exception that a 12.5% increase (14% for ISQ) in the subventions to the journals is proposed and, as per the GC decision last year, we are now setting aside $125,000 to cover the expenses of the next HQ transition. The budget forecasts Operations Income of $3,108,708, which is $42,281 less than that forecast for the current year. This is almost entirely a product of expectations regarding a decrease in convention income (San Francisco vs. Toronto). Total expenses are forecast as $3,051,900, which is $186,910 more than for the current year. The difference will be covered by the 4% draw from the endowment ($108,000 estimated) and the surplus current account balance.

Note that these forecasts might be significantly off this year. As per the Governing Council decision at the 2017 meeting, we have significantly revised our membership dues and conference fees structure, with the intent of increasing revenue. Since these changes just took effect on July 1, 2017, we do not yet know what the effect of these changes will be. The Finance Committee will be evaluating the effect of these changes before the 2019 annual meeting and will propose additional changes to the dues and fee structures on the basis of that evaluation. It was recognized, at the time of the 2017 GC meeting, that we might be relying on our accumulated surpluses.

PART III: RESERVE FUNDS (ENDOWMENT)

As of June 30, 2017, ISA Reserve Funds totaled $3,336,622. (NOTE: This figure is not directly comparable to that provided last year. It no longer includes a portion of the cash on hand that was designated as a ‘rainy day fund.’) Of this, $1,112,939 was held in a managed portfolio specializing in socially responsible securities with the First Affirmative Financial Network, $1,632,597 was held in a bond portfolio managed by Charles Schwab, and $302,718 was held in CDs.

PART IV: FINANCE COMMITTEE BUSINESS

At the annual meeting in Baltimore, the Finance Committee reviewed the reports from our financial manager, David Behnke-Seper, on the performance of our portfolio of investments with the First Affirmative Financial Network. In general, the committee felt that our current investment strategy (30% securities, 70% bonds) is too conservative, especially considering that ISA typically retains a significant amount of cash outside the investment portfolio. Because securities markets have been rising for a number of years, however, it was decided to begin shifting to a more aggressive portfolio slowly by transferring the funds currently held in CDs to First Affirmative. We had expected to transfer $400,000 over the course of the year but the penalties for early withdrawal on the CDs were far greater than we had anticipated. So far, $100,000 has been transferred, the remainder will be transferred as the CDs mature.

The second major order of business for the Finance Committee followed from the changes to ISA financial policies adopted at the 2017 Governing Council meeting. All ISA reserve funds are now consolidated (i.e., we no longer have a cash account designated as the rainy day fund, another designated as the transition account, another as savings, and the brokerage accounts designated as the endowment). As part of this change, the Finance Committee is mandated to designate a portion of the
Reserve Funds as “untouchable,” meaning that it is not available to be spent except to make up for an emergency (e.g., a cancelled convention) or for a HQ transition. The Finance Committee designated $2.25 million of the reserve fund as unavailable.
ISA Finance Committee Report

This report was prepared by T. Clifton Morgan, ISA Treasurer, acting as the chair of the ISA Finance Committee (members include Mark J. Crescenzi, Wendy Wong, J.P. Singh, Courtenay Conrad, Katja Weber, and Taehee Whang, with ex-officios Mark Boyer, T.V. Paul, Brett Ashley Leeds, Patrick James, and Jennifer Fontanella). The report was submitted on February 14, 2018 for the 2018 Governing Council meeting in San Francisco, as the ISA Finance Committee Business excerpt from the larger Treasurer’s 2018 Report to the Governing Council.

At the annual meeting in Baltimore, the Finance Committee reviewed the reports from our financial manager, David Behnke-Seper, on the performance of our portfolio of investments with the First Affirmative Financial Network. In general, the committee felt that our current investment strategy (30% securities, 70% bonds) is too conservative, especially considering that ISA typically retains a significant amount of cash outside the investment portfolio. Because securities markets have been rising for a number of years, however, it was decided to begin shifting to a more aggressive portfolio slowly by transferring the funds currently held in CDs to First Affirmative. We had expected to transfer $400,000 over the course of the year but the penalties for early withdrawal on the CDs were far greater than we had anticipated. So far, $100,000 has been transferred, the remainder will be transferred as the CDs mature.

The second major order of business for the Finance Committee followed from the changes to ISA financial policies adopted at the 2017 Governing Council meeting. All ISA reserve funds are now consolidated (i.e., we no longer have a cash account designated as the rainy day fund, another designated as the transition account, another as savings, and the brokerage accounts designated as the endowment). As part of this change, the Finance Committee is mandated to designate a portion of the Reserve Funds as “untouchable,” meaning that it is not available to be spent except to make up for an emergency (e.g., a cancelled convention) or for a HQ transition. The Finance Committee designated $2.25 million of the reserve fund as unavailable.
16. REPORT ON THE ANNUAL CONFERENCE (1:15-1:30PM)

This report was prepared by Faten Ghosn and Ismene Gizelis, the Program Chairs of the 59th Annual ISA Convention, 2018. The report was submitted on January 11, 2018 for the 2018 Governing Council meeting in San Francisco.

ACTION ITEMS:

ACTION ITEM #1: CONVENTION PARTICIPATION RULES AND RANKING
The Governing Council should task the Long Range Planning Committee with considering whether any changes should be made to the participation guidelines and how ISA might incentivize sections to complete the ranking of their program items within the time limits required.

DATA ON SUBMISSION AND ACCEPTANCE
At the time of the Program’s announcement, there were 8706 unique individuals on proposals, 6506 people on the Program, and 2200 people who were wait-listed, with an overall initial rejection rate of 25.27%. Following the release of the Program, ISA headquarters and the Program Team received and processed many requests from participants asking to withdraw from the Program. As a result, the original figures associated with the Program’s release underwent changes, and the following table compiled by ISA headquarters sets forth the state of the Program as of January 1, 2018.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Types</th>
<th>Submitted</th>
<th>On Program</th>
<th>Withdrawn</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
<th>% of Non-Withdrawn</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual Papers</td>
<td>5151</td>
<td>2535</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>49.2%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Papers a</td>
<td>8513</td>
<td>5015</td>
<td>1017</td>
<td>58.9%</td>
<td>66.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panels</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>73.8%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roundtables</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>74.8%</td>
<td>77.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>8825</td>
<td>5839</td>
<td>1506</td>
<td>66.2%</td>
<td>79.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The total number of participants on program, including non-attending co-authors is 6134.

a Includes the total number of papers on program, including those submitted to panels.

b The overall number of participants includes all those placed on the Program across panels, roundtables, and individual paper proposals.

c The number of participants who withdrew from the conference includes participants placed on the Program at the time of the Program’s announcement, those who withdrew from the waiting list, and those who had been placed on the Program to fill a vacancy and subsequently withdrew from the Program.
CURRENT STATUS OF THE PROGRAM

- The PCs and SPCs have reviewed and evaluated all submissions and crafted the 1,248 panels and roundtables, which reflect the contributions from 29 Sections and 4 Caucuses as well as 25 Partner Organizations.
- 87 specialty items (committee panels, working groups, JSS, workshop grants, Flash Talk sessions, ‘Challenging Oppression Series,’ etc.) have also been placed on the program.
- Most of the vacancies in the Program that were created as a result of withdrawals and participants’ failure to register have been filled. This process is on-going, however, since we (PC/Program Team) need to wait for the new placements to be accepted by the participants before officially being placed on the Program.
- As of February 28, 2018, the number of unique individuals on the Program was 5,818 as a result of participant withdrawals from the Program. The Program Team and ISA headquarters continue to receive requests from participants asking to withdraw from the Program, and the number of unique individuals is anticipated to fluctuate through the beginning of the Annual Conference.

NEXT STEPS

- The Program Team will continue to monitor participant withdrawals and fill vacancies; this process will continue until the conference. The online Program is updated periodically to reflect relatively contemporaneous additions, and the Program Team is tracking major changes to the Program for inclusion as an addendum when the Annual Conference begins.
- The proofs of the Program have been sent to the company responsible for printing the Program.
- The Conference will take place in April 2018.

PROGRAM HIGHLIGHTS

- 3 Sapphire Series Panels, each one involving a diverse set of scholars:
  - Power and Rules in the Profession of International Studies (FA 05)
  - Diverse Approaches to Understanding Power and Rules in the International System (FB 05)
  - Formal and Informal Rules in International Politics (FC 05)

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE 2019 PROGRAM

1. In many of our communications with the SPCs, we encouraged each caucus and section to collaborate with one another by co-sponsoring panels and roundtables. Based on the 2018 program, it appears that each caucus and section seized the opportunity to co-sponsor program items, and many of the caucuses and sections were able to extend their initial program allocations through this procedure. Throughout the process, we often outlined the following guidelines governing co-sponsorships to assist the SPCs in their work: (1) panels and roundtables should have no more than three co-sponsors; (2) caucuses and sections should only co-sponsor panels if they have not already sponsored up to three panels above their allocations; and (3) each co-sponsor must rank the co-sponsored item within the
caucus or section’s allocation. However, we encountered panels and roundtables that transgressed each of these guidelines. Certain caucuses and sections exceeded these guidelines to such an extent it negatively impacted other caucus and sections, leading to a situation wherein some caucuses and sections were unable to place their full allocations onto the 2018 program. In avoiding these issues in the future, we believe that the codification of ISA’s guidelines concerning co-sponsorships would assist SPCs in avoiding certain pitfalls. In addition to providing the co-sponsorship guidelines, we recommend that SPCs be provided each caucus and section’s program allocation along with a description of the formula ISA uses to generate each allocation.

2. Alongside the issues identified in the first section, several SPCs failed to rank their sponsored panels and roundtables through ISA’s system. As a result, the default setting ranked these caucuses and sections’ program items in the order in which they were sponsored. Consequently, many co-sponsored items were ranked outside of program allocations, thereby exacerbating some of the issues identified in the first section. SPCs who complete the ranking of the program items will reduce the chance of future grievances and lessen the workload of the program team and ISA headquarters.

3. Similar to previous program teams, we encountered the following issues, which created additional work for our team and ISA headquarters. First, several conference participants exceeded ISA’s participation limits, which required our team to follow up with specific individuals to bring their participation into alignment with ISA’s guidelines. However, the likelihood of this issue occurring could be reduced if SPCs strictly adhere to ISA’s guidelines concerning conference appearances. While this change would reduce the workload, it would, more importantly, generate more space to invite to the annual conference a greater number of scholars. Second, in selecting volunteers to be appointed as chairs or discussants, SPCs should ensure that each chair and discussant meet the following three conditions: (1) the volunteer should have a paper on the program; (2) the volunteer should have four or less appearances on the program; and (3) the volunteer should not be appointed as a chair more than twice or a discussant more than twice. By adhering to these guidelines, SPCs will reduce future conflicts and grievances. We also noticed that co-authors were not given a chance to be on the volunteer list; As a result, we believe that the system should either automatically put people on a list (unless they opt out) or it should send a follow-up email that will allow people to volunteer.

4. Throughout the programming process, we advised SPCs to put together a program that reflects the great diversity (e.g., in terms of gender, geography, institutions, methodology, and substance) within our discipline, and in many ways, the 2018 program is an expression of this goal. Nevertheless, we did encounter an issue where one caucus/section weighted its sponsored items in favor of scholars from a particular region. By regularly encouraging SPCs to account for diversity in their programs, these concerns can be avoided, and a stronger program can be created. That being said, on the whole we made sure that all regions were represented across the program.

5. We echo the recommendation of previous program teams in upgrading and updating ISA’s system. In particular, the system’s performance should be improved to allow for higher
traffic on the website. In the days surrounding the proposal submission deadline, ISA’s system experienced several crashes that necessitated an extension of the deadline. In addition to the difficulties encountered by those attempting to submit proposals, the crash allowed panel proposals with four and six papers to be submitted and available for program sponsorship. Also, the crash appeared to generate duplicate accounts for several individuals, creating problems with conference appearances and paper sponsorships. Separate from the issues surrounding the system’s performance during periods of high traffic, the pending placement interface should be updated to allow program teams to click and review pending items.

**Action Item #1:**

The Governing Council should task the Long Range Planning Committee with considering whether any changes should be made to the participation guidelines and how ISA might incentivize sections to complete the ranking of their program items within the time limits required.

**COFFEE BREAK (1:30-1:45PM)**
17. Evaluation Committee for the ISA Executive Director (Executive Session, 1:45-2:15pm)

This report was prepared by Etel Solingen, acting as the chair of the ISA Executive Director Evaluation Committee (Members include: William Thompson and Mustapha Kamal Pasha). The report was submitted January 12, 2018 for the 2018 Governing Council meeting in San Francisco.

ISA tasked our committee with evaluating Executive Director (ED) Mark Boyer in accordance to a decision approved by the Governing Council at its 2015 annual meeting. The Committee discussed procedural matters at various virtual meetings and built on previously developed relevant criteria to elicit comments from Governing Council members and ISA staff. The number of responses was significant and enabled the Committee to identify a very consistent pattern praising the work of the ED across all categories of evaluation, including competence, professionalism, collegiality, and openness. Individual responses were confidential and not shared by the Committee with the ED. The full Committee then held a virtual meeting with the ED, which enabled him to update Committee members on additional associational matters. The Committee ended the meeting by expressing its gratitude to the ED for his excellent steering of association affairs over the last year. The committee is unanimous in its highly positive assessment of the ED’s performance.
18. HEADQUARTERS RENEWAL PROCESS (EXECUTIVE SESSION, 1:45-2:15PM)

Summary Report of ISA HQ (Prepared December 2017)
Mark A. Boyer, University of Connecticut

Drafted for Discussion of Possible Extension of HQ Siting at UConn from 2020 to 2025¹

PREAMBLE
ISA is a member-driven organization. And as our web-site states:

International Studies Association is one of the oldest interdisciplinary associations dedicated to understanding international, transnational and global affairs. Founded in 1959, its more than 7,000 members span the globe – comprising academics, practitioners, policy experts, private sector workers and independent researchers, among others. The Association has long served as a central hub for the exchange of ideas and for networking and programmatic initiatives among those involved in the study, teaching and practice of International Studies.

With this core mission in mind, ISA HQ exists to support its members and to facilitate the business of the organization and all of its constituent groups (sections, regions, caucuses). That work ranges across conferences, publications, communication, finance and more. Moreover, as requests for new programming have emerged, ISA HQ has had to develop new means for conducting the business of ISA.

In addition, HQ recurrently recognizes that ISA is largely a volunteer organization. This means that we endeavor to facilitate the work of our member-volunteers with what remains a lean staff for the size of our organization and its programming. We are very fortunate to have very active and involved members, which augments the HQ staff resources to assure a smoothly running organization.

The remainder of this report focuses on a variety of aspects of what we currently do and what we will need to do in the coming years.

SOME SUMMARY DATA AND TRAJECTORIES
As you can see from the three charts below, ISA continues to be a healthy organization. Membership is stable or increasingly slightly; our finances are strong; and we continue to see growth in the number of panels offered at the annual meeting. This last measure points to some potential decisions for ISA in the

¹ Based on the recommendations of the Ad Hoc Committee on ISA’s Long-Term Fiscal and Financial Strategy (Action Item #5) made to the 2017 Governing Council meeting in Baltimore (and accepted by the GC), this report lays out the objectives, accomplishments and challenges facing the UConn-based HQ team, led by Dr. Mark A. Boyer.
coming years about annual convention size, selected venues, and optimal acceptance/rejections rates for submissions to the annual meeting.

But these are good problems to have and the Long Range Planning Committee will be discussing the annual meeting issues in the coming months. Other pieces of data can be found in the Executive Director’s annual report, the report of the President, Program Chairs and throughout the GC materials.
Goals and Objectives
From the start of our time as the new headquarters, we had two broad, over-arching objectives: 1) to maintain the very positive trajectory of the Association developed by our University of Arizona predecessors and 2) make sure that the Atlanta convention in 2016 came off as seamlessly as possible. We strongly believe that we achieved the latter, but only with the careful tutelage of those members of the UAz team who stayed on as staff members under the new leadership. We learned a great deal during that first year, which made the Baltimore process almost seem routine (that is, until the travel ban was imposed!).

We continue to work on the former, which has been transformed into our own set of processes, as we will discuss at some length throughout this document. In particular, our primary goals and objectives are:

- **An Emphasis on Good Process** – during the HQ transition and since, we have found many good practices in place. But we have also found ISA’s process weak in other areas. This has led to (among other items):
  - extensive reform to the Code of Conduct;
  - re-examination of plagiarism policies and evaluation process;
  - contracting with new auditors; through that experience we have revised many of our accounting practices and the way we present our budget to the GC and our members more broadly;
  - implementation of a conference in-take process for all groups within ISA to facilitate conference support.
  - Implementation of greater financial accountability for all ISA programs, including journal subventions, grants, group conferences, etc.

- **On-Going Professional Development** – when ISA moved to UAz in 1995, ISA was about 2500 members; we are now nearly triple in size. That has led to growth in the number of staff needed
to run ISA, but it also requires a more professional and skilled staff than perhaps was required in the past. Fortunately, we have hired very well. That said, we continue to look for opportunities for staff professional growth to help us better serve our members and better manage our human and financial resources at HQ.

- **Continuing Engagement Outside North America** – Slightly under 50% of ISA’s membership is currently resident outside North America (53% in US/Canada/Mexico). Thus, ISA will continue to engage with our members around world and to reach out to new scholars in various regions. In addition to the large annual meeting, and nearly a dozen smaller meetings, we are dedicated to holding annual large, collaborative meetings in other regions of the world. 2016 saw a conference in Slovenia; 2017 in Hong Kong; 2018 is set for Quito, Ecuador, and we are currently discussing a possible 2019 meeting in Europe. These efforts should also help us serve our members who may have challenges traveling annually to the large meeting in North America. We also have two outreach efforts underway to develop one or two small conferences in Africa in the next 3-5 years.

- **On-Going In-Reach** – while ISA naturally wishes to engage those outside our membership, it is also important that we continue to understand who our current members are, what challenges they face in their professional work and how ISA can help them surmount those challenges. As result, the Executive Director and some of the staff have been attending our Region meetings on a rotating cycle and also some other meetings held by ISA constituent groups (like the Global South Caucus workshop in Cuba in July 2017). This practice will continue into the foreseeable future.

- **Enhancing Serving Members** – HQ continues to focus on ways to better serve our members. These efforts include discussions about:
  - Forums for virtual engagement throughout the year;
  - Internal HQ strategic planning for innovative changes to convention;
  - And overhaul of the ISA Professional Resource Center.

- **Financial Stability** – HQ is recurrently working to keep the long-term financial health of ISA at the center of operations and decision-making. This includes work on promoting donations to ISA from our members to augment operational funds and work toward a long-term endowment development strategy. This includes a central goal of greater financial accountability for ISA projects as mentioned above.

- **Marketing ISA** – HQ is crafting a brochure for marketing purposes to help with potential exhibitors/sponsors as well as outreach materials to attract partner organizations and new members. This will continue to fan out in multiple directions and has benefited greatly from ideas developed through staff professional development.

### A Looming Transition

Jeanne White has become an institution within ISA. Her experience in, knowledge of and contacts around the meetings industry are truly extraordinary. Everyone within ISA seems to know her and love her. It’s that simple. But HQ is fully aware that Jeanne plans to retire in the summer of 2020. From the start of UConn’s HQ leadership in 2015, Jeanne’s exit plan has been at the forefront of our planning. To summarize our transition post-Jeanne:
• We fully recognize that we cannot replace Jeanne with a single person. The array of her skills is too large and complex. As a result, we have the following underway:
  o Jen Fontanella is taking over the contracting aspects of Jeanne’s job, as it dovetails well with Jen’s financial responsibilities.
  o Donalyn Maneggia passed the certified meeting planner (CMP) exam in November 2017, so she will continue to oversee regions and sections for the short- to medium-term.
  o Kristin Nacovsky was hired about a year ago to handle sponsorship and other aspects of conference support. She has begun professional development within the meetings industry and is already bringing new ideas to HQ.
  o We anticipate one new hire in 2018 for conference support.
• We also plan to hire Jeanne back on a part-time basis post-retirement for advice, mentoring and on-going support.

MORE SPECIFIC ACCOMPLISHMENTS
• As mentioned above, the development of an in-take form for use with all conference organizers. The agreement lays out what HQ can and will do to support conference organizers and also what is expected of those organizers. In addition, it aims to make sure that contractual pieces are processed appropriately.
• Creation of the Special Projects Fund – this fund created a process for the peer review of “adhoc” requests to HQ for financial resources. The fund sets aside up to $60,000 annually for projects under $25,000. This program is now accepts applications twice a year, assuming funding remains for the second round.
• In July 2016, ISA held a Diversity Training Workshop for members of the current and incoming Executive Committee. This day-long event was extraordinarily helpful to all involved and will help set the stage for ISA’s on-going efforts to foster diversity in all forms.
• Related to the previous point, HQ carved out 10 panels for the Baltimore meeting that focused on everything from how to get engaged in ISA and a “first ISA tool-kit” to sexual harassment and ISA’s Code of Conduct and more. We anticipate that this group of panels will be an on-going feature at the annual meeting with variable topics and issues addressed. Thanks to Annick Wibben for taking the defacto lead on this important initiative for Baltimore.
• The launch with Oxford University Press as our journals publisher has gone smoothly. OUP hosted their third Editorial Summit in May 2017. OUP has also just launched SilverChair as their web support platform and our journal web-sites are all moving to that portal.
• Following GC approval of the proposal, we signed a contract extension with OUP through 2025.
• Following Atlanta 2016, we moved quickly to purchase the Compendium from Wiley. The sale was complete in July 2016, and we formally signed the new contract with Oxford University Press in January 2017. Special thanks to our new OUP partners on this venture and to Renee Marlin-Bennett for all her work to help us work through this transition. The new Oxford Research Encyclopedia of International Studies (OREIS) launched in summer 2017.
• Building Redundancy at HQ (related to staff development mentioned above) – we continue to look for ways to assure smooth operations at HQ, especially in terms of reducing reliance on any one staff member. One new approach is the explicit use of internal teams centering around
academic programming, conference planning and support, and finance. Jen Fontanella deserves enormous credit for implementing this new organizational management approach.

- We continue to work to make sure our university host knows the value of having ISA on campus. The following projects are illustrative:
  - Continued engagement of the Digital Media and Design undergraduate program for audio-video work in Baltimore. Samples of their Atlanta work are now widely available on the ISA site and on social media.
  - Contracted with the Design Center Studio (a student design center embedded within the BFA program) for the 2017 printed program cover design.
  - Honors research scholarships – Dr. Boyer used a portion of his research budget to provide small research grants (up to $500) to students in UConn’s Honors Program. Students must be pursuing a research project in international studies.
  - a U21 Research Workshop proposal (at UConn) will be moving forward with Mark Boyer as a co-PI.
- HQ organized a one-day workshop in Montreal in September 2017 focusing on Global South Taskforce reporting to the GC in April 2018.

**Potential Challenges**

- Changes to the publishing landscape – from open access to increasing plagiarism claims, we will continue to work with our publishing partners to stay apprised of new developments and their implications for ISA.
- Communications – from social media to revamping the monthly newsletter to outreach to the policy community, we have initiated a number of practices that will hopefully enhance communication with our members and those outside ISA who will find our work of interest.
- We are a volunteer organization – to re-emphasize some of the discussion from above, every year, we confront challenges related to the fact that we are dependent on the goodwill of a wide range of ISA “volunteers.” We are gratified by the number of our colleagues who wish to be involved in “doing”. But this also entails a process of “re-education” every year, as turnover means that few volunteers have done their jobs previously. Thus, we continue to look for better ways to educate our members about the roles they must play. This includes education about conflict of interest, technology, decision-making constructs at association level as well as within our constituent groups. Thus, we have created “hand-over” in some places (e.g., committee chairs and officers) and seek to continue these efforts.
- Getting people to see the “big picture” – with the number of constituent groups and the large membership, we often struggle with some members who see their “narrow” mission, but create challenges for HQ as we seek to balance demands across a large and diverse memberships. One area where this has become most controversial has been in the scheduling of the smaller conferences during the year.
- Technology overhaul – we are in the midst of a technology overhaul. It will likely be on-going for the next year in various places and forms. Jen Fontanella and Jeanne White have done an exceptional job of moving this forward.
November 30, 2017

ISA President Ashley Leeds
Professor of Political Science
Rice University
6100 Main St., P.O. Box 1892
Houston, TX 77005-1892

Dear President Leeds and Members of the ISA Governing Council

I write to communicate enthusiastic support for the extension through 2025 of UConn’s hosting of the ISA Executive Headquarters and Dr. Mark Boyer’s role as ISA’s Executive Director. Since ISA’s arrival on campus in 2015, the synergies between the Association, Dr. Boyer’s dual role as faculty and Executive Director, and the University’s Office of Global Programs have further enhanced the energy around global programming at the University of Connecticut.

By way of background, UConn Global Affairs provides university-wide leadership to build and sustain global education at the University of Connecticut www.global.uconn.edu. UConn Global services international students and scholars, nurtures strategic global partnerships, manages student, faculty, and staff mobility programs, promotes collaborative international research, develops curricula to build global competency, and delivers educational and professional services that support sustainable economic and social development. With these key institutional missions in mind, we fully recognize that ISA’s location in Storrs provides further cache for the University as a global hub of research and teaching on all things global.

As a result, when Dr. Boyer asked if UConn would be interested in extending the hosting agreement through 2025, we responded with a hearty yes. We are honored to have ISA on campus and look forward to our collaborations continuing through 2025.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

Daniel Weiner, Ph.D
Vice President for Global Affairs
Professor of Geography

398 FAIRFIELD WAY, UNIT 4152
JOIN W. ROWE BUILDING
STORRS, CT 06268-4152
PHONE 860.486.3152
FAX 860.486.2160
daniel.weiner@uconn.edu
www.global.uconn.edu

An Equal Opportunity Employer
19. PUBLICATIONS COMMITTEE REPORT (EXECUTIVE SESSION, 2:15-2:45PM)

This report was prepared by Sara McLaughlin Mitchell, acting as the chair of the ISA Publications Committee (members include James H. Lebovic, A. Cooper Drury, Wesley Widmaier, Marijke Breuning, Shannon Lindsay Blanton, Jon Pevehouse, Jacqui True and Stacie Goddard, with ex-officios Daniel Nexon, Amanda Murdie, Cameron G. Thies, Laura Neack, Debbie Lisle, Michael Colaresi, Deborah Avant, Gerald Schneider, Renée Marlin-Bennett, T.V. Paul, Brett Ashley Leeds, Patrick James, Mark A. Boyer and Jennifer Fontanella). The report was submitted March 5, 2018 for the 2018 Governing Council meeting in San Francisco.

ACTION ITEMS:

ACTION ITEM #1: PROPOSAL TO INCREASE ISA JOURNAL SUBVENTIONS

The International Studies Association supports the costs to publish seven journals (FPA, IPS, II, ISP, ISQ, ISR, JoGSS) and a research encyclopedia (OREIS) with annual subventions. The Publications Committee proposes to increase ISA journal subventions by 25% (28% for ISQ) using a phased-in procedure that would add 12.5% to ISA journal subventions in year 1 and 12.5% in year 2 (14% for ISQ each year). Increased subventions are important to 1) provide adequate financial support for editing ISA journals, 2) diversify the institutional homes for editorial proposals, and 3) compete with peer journals in political science, international relations, and other ISA disciplines.

- Proposal to Increase ISA Journal Subventions (Pages 71-75)

This report summarizes the discussions of the ISA Publications Committee in 2017 and provides information about the ISA journals based on the editors’ annual reports. Deliberations from the Committee produced recommendations for editorial teams for International Interactions and International Studies Quarterly and a proposal to increase subventions for all journals (documents provided separately).

The committee met in Baltimore on February 22, 2017. Topics of discussion included our first contract year with Oxford University Press (OUP), noting University of Connecticut’s support on ISA journal pages, and plans for the Oxford Research Encyclopedia of International Studies (OREIS, formerly the Compendium). ISA President Brett Ashley Leeds described a special project for the committee that would result in a one-day summit in July to discuss proposals from editors and committee members about broader changes in subventions or operations for the journals. This retreat was organized in response to a proposal by a group of editors for increased subventions presented at the 2016 GC meeting, which resulted in a renegotiation of the contract with Oxford University Press (approved at the 2017 GC meeting) that included increased editorial subventions.
The ISA Editorial Summit occurred on May 12, 2017 in New York. The group discussed a new document that provides information to new ISA editors during the editorial team transition process. OUP representatives provided information about manuscript workflow, keywords, pre-prints, page budgets, staff changes, understanding usage and citation/Altmetrics data, marketing strategies (e.g. OUP blog, virtual issues), a centralized ISA family site for the journals, and the results of an author survey. Editors described various activities they had undertaken internationally to reach out to non-North American authors. The Publications Committee Chair provided the group with an overview of various financial categories used by ISA journals. We discussed whether subventions were adequate to cover essential tasks for the journals and what activities were difficult to support given current budget models. Editors were asked to submit proposals to the Publications Committee prior to the July summit. The group also discussed publishing abstracts in multiple languages\(^2\), strategies to handle reviewers who fail to respond or submit reviews, and copyright issues. We also discussed the possibility of centralizing some editorial functions through OUP's virtual editorial office (VEO).

The Publications Committee received two proposals from the ISA editors for consideration prior to the San Francisco summit meeting on July 29, 2017. One proposal came from the editors of several journals (ISR, FPA, ISQ, II, FPA) and requested funds to expand JoGSS' pre-submission exchange to encourage non-North American journal submissions and to support trips to international conferences to expand the audience for ISA journals. A second proposal came from the editors of FPA and requested additional funds to support international travel and a workshop for a potential special issue. Members of the Publications Committee, ISA President Leeds, and ISA Executive Director Boyer considered these proposals at the summit in addition to broader issues related to journal financing and operations.

President Leeds opened the discussion by noting the broad challenges facing ISA with regard to publications. Income from publications makes up a large proportion of ISA's operating budget and allows ISA to provide many member services. Managing the peer review process to vet research is one of the main contributions of scholarly organizations like ISA. And yet, our current editorial model in which university based teams assume responsibility for editorial tasks for five-year terms is facing significant challenges. First, the job of editing is becoming more difficult and time consuming as the number of submissions to our journals continue to increase. Second, our association and the research covered by many of our journals is so diverse as to require a team approach to obtain the necessary editorial expertise. What this means is that it is no longer likely that our journals with larger submissions can be effectively edited by one person or even a team based at one university. Thus, the job of chief editor involves significant management expertise as well as academic and editorial expertise, and we are looking for many volunteer editors to staff a team for each journal bid. Second, the staffing and space required to handle a larger number of submissions increases the cost burden on universities. Given cuts in university budgets, many universities no longer see supporting association journals as a good investment. Thus, there is concern that it may be harder to recruit bids for editorships, particularly for our journals with larger numbers and more diverse submissions. While we received four bids for ISR in 2016, we received only one bid for II in 2017 and only one bid for ISQ in 2017, despite significant

\(^2\) Starting with the February 2018 issue, all print issues of International Studies Perspectives will include English and Spanish abstracts.
outreach aimed at identifying and recruiting potential editors. There is reason to be concerned that our current editorial model may not be sustainable.

President Leeds also noted that despite the fact that ISA has seven journals, we may not be taking advantage of economies of scale in editorial tasks to the extent we could. Similar tasks are handled by seven different editorial staffs at seven different locations, and the staff for each journal changes every five years along with the editorial change. Thus, the following questions guided the day-long discussion:

1. What do we want editors to do?
2. How much should it cost to do what we want editors to do?
3. What are the advantages and disadvantages of the current model in which editorial costs are shared between ISA and host universities?
4. How might we benefit more from economies of scale in ISA journal editing?

President Leeds specifically asked the committee to consider how the current structure for journal support influences who is able to bid for editorships and who is not and how changes in technology alter what we can do collectively.

ISA journal editors were asked to call in during the morning to answer questions from the committee about the proposals that were submitted along with broader questions being addressed at the summit. The committee asked the editors to share what they believe are the tasks most essential to being an editor. While there were some differences in responses, largely the answers clustered around the areas of selecting reviewers, making editorial decisions, and writing good feedback letters. Two other things that individual editors rated as essential tasks were recruiting for diversity and promoting what the journal publishes. The committee then asked the editors what tasks they spend significant time doing that are not essential for an editor to do and could be delegated. Here editors specified copy editing, originality/plagiarism checking, and promotion/social media. The editors also noted, though, that journals have many different needs which could make it difficult to centralize these tasks for ISA journals as a collective. There would need to be strong communication between editorial staff and centralized staff performing these tasks. The committee asked editors about the success of international recruiting trips and editors noted some success although the number of manuscripts submitted was small. We discussed issues of open access. It was also noted that many universities are unwilling to provide support for academic journals and that labor and other issues are not standard globally, limiting the potential set of editorial bids that ISA can receive. Editors described experiences with plagiarism software, large journal back-logs, and replication.

After the phone conversation with the editors, the committee considered the proposals submitted by ISA editors and brainstormed several ideas based on the morning session. While committee members were in favor of the pre-submission process, there was a general sense that we should see how well it works for JoGSS before expanding it to a broader set of journals. Committee members raised concerns about embedding this process in a larger effort to provide mentoring to ISA members and questions about where journals would find mentors for the pre-submission process. The decision was simply to provide additional overall funding to the journals, and allow editors to determine whether pre-
submission programs are a priority. Additional funding for FPA was considered as part of a broader idea to increase ISA journal subventions (see separate memo with the proposal and justification for the increase). We spent considerable time looking at the budget categories and journal budgets from the previous year. We discussed editors’ essential tasks and whether ISA subventions were adequate to do those tasks, especially in situations where universities could not provide support. We noted a very large difference across journal proposals (in the tens of thousands of dollars) which stems from variance in university support. Our proposal to increase subventions seeks to establish a minimum amount of support that an editorial team would need, even in the absence of local funding.

While some committee members expressed concern that the current editorial model restricts at least lead editors to coming from institutions that can provide editorial support and that this reduces the diversity of potential editors, others argued that it is important for universities to show they support editors with financial backing, much of which is not new expenses, but space and graduate student assignments. These committee members claimed that if a university will not make any investment to facilitate editorial activity, then perhaps it is not a smart move for a faculty member of such an institution to take on such a large task. Thus, the consensus was that ISA should provide increased subventions (as detailed in the separate report with action items), but that ISA should not fundamentally change the current editorial model of shared financial support from the home institution of the lead editor and ISA/Oxford.

The committee also discussed several ideas for centralizing editorial tasks. There was discussion of hiring a copy editor/originality checker and/or a science writer who could promote articles centrally from ISA Headquarters for all ISA journals. Before considering hiring ISA employees, however, the committee agreed to learn more about the Virtual Editorial Office (VEO) service that OUP provides including cost and scope. It may be more cost effective for some of these tasks to be handled through Oxford.

In general, the publications committee did not believe that traveling to international conferences to recruit manuscripts was an essential editorial task; the members argued that the time and funds would be better invested in other initiatives. While diversity in authorship of publications is a goal of ISA, the publications committee was skeptical that editor panels at international meetings are a cost-effective way to accomplish that. Discussion also turned to working with Oxford to increase access to ISA journals for scholars from the global south and to provide abstracts in translation, which ISP has begun doing.

The outcome of the July retreat can thus be summarized as follows: (1) The publications committee proposes increased subventions for ISA journals as detailed in the companion report. (2) The publications committee favors continuing the current editorial model of shared financial responsibility between ISA/Oxford and a rotating home institution for each journal at least for the time being. (3) The publications committee recommends further investigation of Oxford’s VEO service and other means of centralizing tasks to take advantage of economies of scale.

---

3 JoGSS began using the VEO service in late 2017 and thus will provide a pilot test for the quality of the services and whether it is cost-effective.
In the summer, the Publications Committee also considered a request from an editor to shut down new submissions during a hiatus (vacation) period. The committee deliberated via email on two proposals: 1) whether journals could create hiatus periods and 2) whether they could set a policy of not accepting new submissions during those hiatus periods. The committee voted in favor of the first proposal and noted that it would be useful for editorial proposals to include this information in the future. The committee voted against the second proposal, preferring that journals continue to accept new submissions while on hiatus. The results of the vote were communicated to ISA journal editors.

ISA editors and their staffs each year compile a very impressive set of data that provides details regarding manuscript submissions, acceptance rates, turn-around times, manuscript reviewers, diversity in authors/reviewers, and journal’s impact scores. It is truly impressive how much thought and effort the editors and staff at each journal puts into these annual reports, and they are easily found under the Publications tab on the ISA site. We urge you to take a closer look at these individual reports housed at the ISA website. Some highlights in 2017 are detailed below.

- **Contracts**: Continued success in our contracts with Oxford University Press (OUP) and Taylor and Francis, especially OUP’s launching of the website for the Oxford Research Encyclopedia of International Studies (OREIS, formerly the Compendium).
- **Virtual Reach**: Enhanced web presence for ISA journals through blog posts, podcasts, and virtual issues; increases in ISA journals’ article downloads and impact factors in 2016. Journals such as *FPA, IPS, and ISR* increased activities on Twitter and other social media outlets.
- **Submission Rates**: ISA’s journals processed over 1,800 new manuscript submissions last year, a 14% increase from 2016. Acceptance rates ranged from 8.3% to 19.5%. Several journals including *FPA and ISQ* took successful steps to handle the large back-log of accepted articles.
- **Turnaround Time**: Our target for ISA journals’ turnaround time is 75 calendar days. All journals were better than this standard in 2017 (ranging from 36 to 72 days), which makes our journals attractive to potential authors.
- **Female Participation in ISA Publications**: Women authors represent 24-42% of the authors for accepted articles in ISA journals in 2017, paralleling the rates for female submissions. Reviewer pools at our journals also show that gender participation closely parallels their manuscript submission rates. Moreover, the rates at which women and men decline to review is nearly equal.
- **Non-North American Participation in ISA Publications**: We see only slow increases in participation by scholars from outside the United States and Canada in ISA journals. Submissions by authors range from 14 to 54 distinct countries across the journals. Editors engaged in a variety of activities to increase non-North American submissions including panels and other sessions at international conferences. *ISP* began publishing article abstracts in English and Spanish in 2018 following successful meetings with Global South scholars in Cuba and Mexico. *JoGSS* implemented a new pre-submission exchange program to provide feedback to authors typically underrepresented in mainstream international relations journals.
- **Editorial Changes**: In addition to recommending new editorial teams for *International Interactions* and *International Studies Quarterly* (see separate documents), the Publications
Committee also approved a proposed editorial change for the lead editors of Foreign Policy Analysis (due to Cameron Thies becoming President-Elect for ISA) and associate editorial changes for IPS, ISQ, and OREIS.

- Financial Reporting: ISA instituted a policy of requiring editorial teams to provide a financial report each summer. The publications committee received and reviewed reports for six of the seven journals; the outgoing ISR team did not submit a financial report. The publications committee is pleased to report that the six journals are in strong financial shape.

The state of ISA Publications appears to be very solid and trending in desirable directions in several ways. The quality of our editorial teams is excellent, the relationship with our publishers is first-rate, and the management of our journals is very sound. The readership and external impact of ISA publications continues to rise markedly, as does the number of scholars seeking to publish with us. We are increasingly diverse in both gender and geographic terms, although we can and will continue to improve on these fronts.

**Action Item #1: Proposal to Increase ISA Journal Subventions**

The International Studies Association supports the costs to publish seven journals (FPA, IPS, II, ISP, ISQ, ISR, JoGSS) and a research encyclopedia (OREIS) with annual subventions that range from $30,000-$50,000. The remaining costs for journal operations are covered by host institutions. Many host institutions’ financial commitments exceed ISA subvention amounts and such high buy-in commitments for editorial proposals diminishes ISA’s ability to recruit new editorial teams. The Publications Committee proposes to increase ISA journal subventions by 25% (28% for ISQ) using a phased-in procedure that would add 12.5% to ISA journal subventions in year 1 and 12.5% in year 2. As we will make clear in our proposal, increased subventions are important to 1) provide adequate financial support for editing ISA journals, 2) diversify the institutional homes for editorial proposals, and 3) compete with peer journals in political science, international relations, and other ISA disciplines.

Our proposal begins by providing background information about ISA’s journal funding model. We present proposed financial changes in our new funding model and we provide a rationale for why additional support is warranted. We describe benefits of increased subvention levels for ISA, especially in terms of the association’s ability to recruit editorial proposals from a diverse group of scholars around the world.4

---

4 The process that produced this proposal is as follows. Several ISA journal editors submitted a proposal to the Governing Council in 2016 to increase journal subventions. The proposal did not pass, but Ashley Leeds agreed to reconsider journal funding issues during her presidential term. She asked the Publications Committee to solicit proposals from journal editors and consider these ideas along with Committee members’ ideas for financial reforms. Taking into account information from the previous editors’ proposals for increased subventions, proposals from the editors in 2016, and ideas from Publications Committee members and ISA leadership, the Publications Committee met in San Francisco in July 2017 and agreed on the approach articulated in this document.
Background: Current ISA Journal Funding Model

The current funding model for ISA journals is based on a contract negotiated with the publishers (Oxford University Press (FPA, IPS, ISP, ISQ, ISR, JoGSS, OREIS) and Taylor & Francis (II)). A portion of ISA’s proceeds from journal revenue are used for subventions to editorial teams. Table 1 provides information about current subvention levels and the number of new manuscripts each journal processed in 2016. While ISA journal subventions have increased somewhat in the past two decades, the Publications Committee feels that these amounts are not keeping pace with the inflationary costs for running journals or with peer political science and international relations journals. This is problematic given that ISA journals have experienced higher workloads through processing more new submissions in recent years.5

ISA editorial teams use subvention funds for a variety of expenses. The largest expense category relates to financial support for editors’ salaries (including fringe benefits/course buyouts), followed closely by graduate student support (either as managing editors, editorial assistants, or replicators). Moreover, personnel costs are always rising – wages and overhead expenses grow over time. It is thus important to increase subventions to journals to keep pace with the rising costs of the central expenditures of the journal.

Subventions also support production costs (copy-editing, proofreading, mailing, etc), conference travel, support for editorial board meetings, promotions and social media (e.g. receptions, special events), office space/equipment, and administrative/HR support. Non-ISA journals provide resources for other purposes such as paying reviewers for special issues, paying stipends to editorial board members, paying for replication of empirical articles, providing funds for best article awards, supporting open access costs, or funding special production expenses (e.g. color graphs). While some journal expenses could be centralized to create economies of scale (e.g. production and copy-editing), the Publications Committee feels that current subventions are not adequate to cover the essential duties that we would like editors to perform, including selecting reviewers, writing decision letters with detailed feedback for authors, and promoting the journal’s content.6

Table 1: ISA Journal Subventions and Submissions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journal</th>
<th>Current Subvention</th>
<th>Submissions 2015-2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Policy Analysis</td>
<td>$32,000</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Political Sociology</td>
<td>$32,000</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5 As noted in the 2016 proposal to the Governing Council to increase ISA journal subventions, ISA journals have experienced significant increases in manuscript submissions with most journals experiencing 50-150% growth in new submissions since 2010.

6 The Publications Committee has been in discussions with OUP to consider and evaluate possibilities for centralized provision of some editorial tasks through a virtual editorial office (VEO). We are currently collecting information about the costs of VEO services.
The Publications Committee discussed whether there is a minimum level of financial support that we could identify that would allow an editorial team to carry out essential journal duties without any home institution support. Other associations (e.g. American Political Science Association, Midwest Political Science Association, and Southern Political Science Association) select editorial teams for association journals and then negotiate an editorial budget. Conversations with editors of *AJPS, APSR, IO, JOP, JPR* and other journals revealed that these budgets can cover all journal related expenses in situations where home institutions are unable to provide financial support. The level of funding support is also much larger for these associations, with $150,000-$250,000 in annual support for a journal being typical. The ISA funding model, on the other hand, establishes a subvention level *a priori* which must be used by interested editorial teams to establish a budget. Editorial teams determine what resources are necessary to edit a particular journal and then they fill in the funding gap with financial support from their own institutions. The difference between subvention levels and journal budgets varies considerably across journal bids and across ISA journals. Some host institutions can provide more than $80,000 annually above the typical $32,000 subvention, while others are unable to match the subvention rate or provide any funds. These differences are also observed in proposals by teams that wish to edit the same ISA journal, with examples from the past five years where we see some proposals coming in with more than $40,000 in support than other proposals to edit the same journal.

The Publications Committee sees two problems with the current ISA journal funding model. First, the $32,000 subvention levels that cover most ISA journals are inadequate to pay for basic editorial duties. Imagine a basic structure where a single editor oversees a journal at her home institution, paying herself one summer month salary and hiring a PhD student as an editorial assistant for twelve months. At many institutions, $32,000 would not fully cover the costs of the graduate student salary, fringe, and tuition which would leave zero funds to support the editors’ summer pay or any other production-related or professional costs (e.g. travel to ISA). Potential editors with significant teaching loads may look to buyout courses to free up editorial time, but typical buyouts rates for classes would quickly eat up the

---

7 The top three field journals in political science handle more manuscripts than the typical ISA journal, but ISQ’s submission rates are in the ballpark of these other journals.
$32,000 subvention funds. Second, ISA journals represent the diverse research of our professional association. Low subvention levels for ISA journals privilege wealthier and American universities in editorial bids. Current journal editors have used impressive strategies to increase the reach and breadth of ISA journals, yet the institutional makeup of proposed editorial teams does not represent the diversity of ISA scholars. In soliciting bids for *ISQ* and *II* in 2017, for example, we heard from many potential editors outside the United States that they were interested in editing an ISA journal but were unable to get funding from their home institutions. Given that we do not have a process for selecting a team and then setting a journal budget, we think the next best strategy is to increase journal subventions to a level that would cover the basic costs for editing that would make bids without home institution financial support feasible.

**Proposed ISA Journal Funding Model**

Our proposed change to the ISA journal funding model is simple and involves a 25% increase in subventions implemented in a two year period. Table 2 presents information on how the subventions would change over time. Our total request for increased support is only $74,000 and close to half of that amount can be funded by the $30,000 increase in subventions that Oxford University Press is providing as part of our recent contract renegotiations. The proposed increase for *International Studies Quarterly* is larger than the increased subventions for the other journals (28%) because of the large number of manuscripts that *ISQ* processes. Because some editorial teams are able to operate at lower costs, we also propose that any unused subvention funds be utilized by ISA for special publication-related projects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Policy Analysis</td>
<td>$32,000</td>
<td>$36,000</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Political Sociology</td>
<td>$32,000</td>
<td>$36,000</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Interactions</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$36,000</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Studies Perspectives</td>
<td>$32,000</td>
<td>$36,000</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Studies Quarterly</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$57,000</td>
<td>$64,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Studies Review</td>
<td>$32,000</td>
<td>$36,000</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Global Security Studies</td>
<td>$32,000</td>
<td>$36,000</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OREIS</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

8 ISA signed a new ten year contract with OUP in 2016.
9 One recent example includes JoGSS’ pre-submission exchange program.
Total expenditures: $250,000 $293,000 $324,000

**Benefits to the International Studies Association**

This relatively small financial investment in ISA journals is important given the general proliferation of journals in ISA scholarly fields. At a time when we have more academic journals in need of a greater number of scholarly editors, universities around the world are facing reductions in budgets, reducing administrators’ willingness to finance the operations of publishing companies and professional organizations. Many universities have prohibited the use of their funds for editing journals altogether. These funding changes in universities around the globe will only make host institutional support more difficult to obtain in future editorial bids. This could create a negative feedback loop: as editorial teams are harder to find, the Association risks the quality of the journal, which makes it less attractive to publishers, further depressing journal income. Thus we feel it is important to move ISA journal subventions to a minimum level that could support an editorial team, even in the face of zero institutional support.

Second, higher subvention levels for ISA journals will help to diversify the institutional homes for ISA editorial teams. Many journals have been housed at large US research universities because financial support for editing journals has traditionally been good in these institutions. Yet funding for editorships is more limited in non-R1 institutions. Furthermore, potential editors within North American institutions often have high teaching loads and need financial support to buy out courses, raising the costs for potential bids. To attract journal editors outside of North America, we need a model for funding such that the subvention level covers the basic editorial needs of the team. As noted earlier, in soliciting bids for *II* and *ISQ* this year, we communicated with many non-North American scholars who were interested in editing these journals yet were deterred by the lack of financial support from their home institutions. Without changes to our funding models, we will continue to privilege institutions that are already privileged.

Finally, increasing ISA journal subventions will also help make our journals more competitive with peer journals. Current ISA journal subventions are well below the funding levels of peer journals. When scholars have choices about which journals to edit, the lack of funding from publishers or professional associations can push them away towards more well-funded operations. This diminishes the number of bids we can attract for ISA journals as well as the institutions that are capable of providing additional support for journal operations.
20. RECOMMENDATION ON ISQ EDITORIAL TEAM (EXECUTIVE SESSION, 2:15-2:45PM)

This memorandum was submitted February 27, 2018 for the 2018 Governing Council meeting in San Francisco.

The ISQ editorial team led by Dan Nexon will end its term on December 31, 2018. In April 2017, ISA issued a call for editorial proposals. The Executive Director, President, and Publications Committee Chair all worked to recruit potential editors for the position. As of the stated deadline of August 15, 2017, we did not receive any editorial proposals, and thus the deadline was extended by one month to September 15, 2017. During this extension, we received one proposal from Brandon Prins and Krista Wiegand of University of Tennessee-Knoxville. Publications committee chair Sara Mitchell recused herself from the deliberations due to her close professional relationship with the proposed chief editors.

The remaining members of the publications committee debated the initial proposal and sent a number of questions and requests for further clarification to Prins and Wiegand. Upon receiving and reviewing those answers, the publications committee members voted unanimously to recommend the Prins and Wiegand team as the next editors of ISQ. The publications committee was particularly impressed with the level of support provided by the University of Tennessee and the diverse editorial team assembled by the chief editors. Notably, all members of the editorial team have included letters indicating their commitment to serve for the full five year term and their acknowledgement of the workload expected of them.

The Executive Committee then reviewed the proposal and accompanying documents and requested that Prins and Wiegand revise the proposal to incorporate responses to the publications committee’s prior questions. This revised proposal is attached for Governing Council consideration.
21. RECOMMENDATION ON II EDITORIAL TEAM (EXECUTIVE SESSION, 2:15-2:45PM)

This memorandum was submitted January 9, 2018 for the 2018 Governing Council meeting in San Francisco.

SUMMARY:
The Committee has voted unanimously to recommend the proposal led by Professor Jeffrey Pickering (Kansas State University) to edit International Interactions for the 5-year term January 1, 2019 – December 31, 2023.

OVERVIEW OF THE DECISION PROCESS:
In addition to myself, voting members of the Publications Committee include Professors Marijke Breuning (U. North Texas), Shannon L. Blanton (U. Alabama-Birmingham), A. Cooper Drury (U. Missouri) Stacie E. Goddard (Wellsley U), James H. Lebovic (GWU), Jon C.W. Pevehouse (U. Wisconsin Madison), Jacqui True (Monash U.), and Wesley W. Widmaier (Griffith U.).

One proposal to edit International Interactions was received by our mid-August 2017 deadline. The proposal was circulated for comment among the membership of the full Publications committee. The full Committee includes not only the voting members, but also executive editors from each of our seven journals and the Compendium, ISA Executive Director, and the immediate past, current, and incoming ISA Presidents. Comments on the proposal were shared among these individuals until mid-September 2017. In September, final deliberations and voting took place among the voting members of the Committee alone.

Feedback from the full Committee was extremely supportive of the Kansas State bid. Committee members noted that the proposed editorial team is an impressive group of scholars with strong theoretical and technical skills. They also praised the representational diversity of the editorial group and lauded their broad coverage of important subfields and issue areas. The group was also impressed with the financial resources that Kansas State University could provide. Questions were asked about whether the proposed team would maintain the substantive focus of the current editorial team and if the Kansas State group would have a vacation policy. Professor Pickering noted that his team would maintain the substantive focus of the current II team (methodologically rigorous analyses of conflict and IPE issues) while also expanding the geographic and research foci (e.g. Global South, peacekeeping, gender and conflict, and terrorism). Pickering also noted that the proposed editorial team would take a vacation in August of each year.10

---

10 In July 2017, the Publications Committee voted on two items related to hiatus/vacation periods for ISA journals: 1) ISA journals have discretion to establish hiatus periods in which they will not accept new submissions and 2)
The next set of discussions occurred in September and involved the members of the Publications Committee. Some members had questions about the decision-making model for the journal, noting that it was perhaps more collaborative than previous teams. Others agreed that there should be a key point person (Pickering), but thought that the editorial team should be given leeway for creating its decision-making process. The substance of this discussion was conveyed to Professor Pickering per the group’s agreement.

In summary, the voting members of the Publications Committee voted unanimously to recommend the proposal led by Professor Jeffrey Pickering (Kansas State University) to edit *International Interactions* for the 5-year term, January 1, 2019 – December 31, 2023.

---

OUP will shut off new submissions in Scholar One in these hiatus time periods. The committee voted in favor of motion 1 but not in favor of motion 2. This information was conveyed to Professor Pickering and his editorial team.
22. REPORT AND DISCUSSION ON CONFERENCE LOGISTICS
(EXECUTIVE SESSION, 2:45-3:15PM)

ANNUAL CONFERENCES UNDER CONTRACT:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Start/End</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>April 4</td>
<td>April 7</td>
<td>San Francisco Hilton &amp; Parc 55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>March 27</td>
<td>March 30</td>
<td>Toronto Sheraton and Hilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>March 25</td>
<td>March 28</td>
<td>Honolulu, Hilton Hawaii Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>April 7</td>
<td>April 10</td>
<td>Las Vegas, The Rio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>March 30</td>
<td>April 2</td>
<td>Nashville, Gaylord Opryland Resort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023</td>
<td>March 15</td>
<td>March 18</td>
<td>Montreal, Fairmont, Sheraton and Marriott Chateau Champlain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2024</td>
<td>April 3</td>
<td>April 6</td>
<td>San Francisco Hilton &amp; Parc 55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCES:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Start/End</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>July 25</td>
<td>July 27</td>
<td>Quito, Joint conference with FLACSO-Ecuador</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>June</td>
<td></td>
<td>Belgrade, Joint conference with CEEISA (Tentative)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ghana (Small workshop – Tentative)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ACTION ITEM #1: LOGISTICAL CONCERNS ABOUT CURRENT ISA CONVENTION SITING POLICY

These materials will be delivered in a separate email, as they will be discussed in Executive Session and should be treated confidentially.

COFFEE BREAK (3:15-3:30PM)
This report was prepared by Layna Mosley, acting as the chair of the ISA Professional Rights and Responsibilities Committee (members include Edward Mansfield, Natalie Florea Hudson, Rorden Wilkinson, David Hornsby, with ex-officio Mark Boyer). The report was submitted December 12, 2017 for the 2018 Governing Council meeting in San Francisco.

**Action Items:**

**Action Item #1: Code of Conduct Revisions: Complaint Procedure**
Our committee strongly supports revisions to the ISA’s Code of Conduct, as a means of improving the mechanism by which complaints related to Code violations are received and adjudicated.

- Code of Conduct Revisions: Complaints Procedure (Pages 83-84)
- Appendix A: Code of Conduct Revisions (Pages 85-90)

At the 2017 ISA Governing Council meeting, the Governing Council approved several changes to ISA’s Code of Conduct, as suggested by the Professional Rights and Responsibilities Committee. Since then, the Professional Rights and Responsibilities committee has discussed additional changes to the Code. We recommended many changes – some large and some small – to the Executive Committee for its November 2017 meeting. Our recommendations stem from our use of the Code during the last year, as well as from conversations with the Executive Director and the President.

Over the past two years, we have had several complaints filed with ISA under the Code of Conduct. As we worked through this process last year, we discovered several disjunctions in the process that we have worked to remove in the following revisions to the Code of Conduct. The most significant one, we think, focuses on clarifying the role of the Executive Committee as the body that refers the complaint to a committee and then acts, under the revised language, as an appeal body. In the current process, the Executive Committee is essentially redundant to the reviewing committee in the process, as the Executive Committee does its own review after the designated committee review. Thus, the revised process specifically designates the Executive Committee as the referring body and the appellate body.

Based on feedback from the Executive Committee, we have revised our set of recommended changes. We look forward to the Governing Council’s discussion of our proposed Code of Conduct revisions at its 2018 San Francisco meeting.

**1. Code of Conduct Revisions: Complaints Procedure**
Our committee strongly supports revisions to the ISA’s Code of Conduct, as a means of improving the mechanism by which complaints related to Code violations are received and adjudicated.
The proposed revisions seek to clarify the process by which complaints are adjudicated: in ordinary circumstances, complaints are referred to the PRR Committee; the PRR collects evidence and evaluates the claim; and the PRR makes a determination and recommends, where appropriate, a sanction. The ISA’s Executive Director communicates the Committee’s findings to the complainant and respondent. The respondent has the right to appeal, within a specified time frame, the determination and/or sanction to ISA’s Executive Committee. The proposed revisions also specify some sanctions that are available to the investigating body (typically PRR), and it offers the alternative of mediation, conducted by a professional mediator, should all parties to the dispute agree to a mediation procedure.

We also agree that the Code of Conduct should be further revised to employ non-gendered language. Our committee’s view is that this sort of revision should be done by ISA Headquarters, and should be done for all of ISA’s documentation. This will ensure consistency of language across documentation.

2. Complaints Received

During the last year, ISA Headquarters received, and referred to our committee, three formal complaints. These complaints, which were received in late February and early March. The complaints involved the same set of individuals, and all three focused (at least in part) on behavior during the annual meeting (February 2017, Baltimore).

The committee began its consideration of these complaints almost immediately. We gathered information on these complaints, discussed whether the Committee (and the ISA generally) had jurisdiction regarding some of the issues raised in the complaints, and deliberated the merits of the complaints. As the current Code of Conduct specifics, the committee also forwarded the materials related to the complaints to the Executive Committee. The Executive Committee and PRR completed their deliberations, and shared their determinations with the complainants and respondents, in early June.

3. Issues for the Future

We anticipate that further changes to the Code of Conduct may be necessary, as new substantive issues arise, and as the PRR Committee and the Association gain further experience with applying the Code.

The PRR committee also intends to examine the issue of personal relationships, in the context of conflicts of interest, as well as in the more general context of appropriate professional interactions. The end result may be a suggested “relationships policy” for the association.
APPENDIX A: CODE OF CONDUCT REVISIONS

Note: This document proposes various revisions to the current code, as suggested by the PRR committee in October 2017, and further amended in December 2017, following feedback from the ExComm. One suggestion received was to replace current language with gender neutral language throughout the document. PRR is very supportive of this, but suggests that this be done Association-wide, by HQ, for all documents. This will allow for consistency across the ISA’s language.

PREFACE

The purpose of this document is to provide an authoritative statement regarding the expectations for professional conduct for all who participate in ISA meetings and conventions, and it will be especially useful for those who are new to the profession and/or the ISA. The code of conduct is born out of a natural outcome of the ISA’s commitment to maintaining and promoting a professional environment at its meetings and other organized activities, and it is guided by the conviction that the advancement of knowledge flourishes most readily in an atmosphere of constructive debate in which all members treat one another with dignity and respect.

The International Studies Association (ISA) brings together professionals from a variety of backgrounds and from a large number of locations around the globe. We share an interest in the various aspects of international studies broadly conceived, but we may differ in the conventions of professional interaction and our cultural traditions. This diversity brings with it the potential for fruitful dialogue about research and policy, but also the possibility of disagreements among members. This code of conduct is designed to ensure that all are treated with dignity and respect; and that sensitivity and consideration guide our interactions while, at the same time, not limiting the substance or arena of our debate.

CODE OF CONDUCT

1. This code of conduct refers to relations between ISA members and other participants and their interactions in the course of ISA activities.
   a) ISA activities include the ISA’s annual conventions, international conventions, regional meetings, pre- or post-conference workshops, and editing of the Association’s journals.
   b) Some matters of professional ethics are under the purview of specific committees and will be addressed elsewhere. Examples are plagiarism and academic freedom.

2. ISA Office Holders, from the President and Executive Director to members of the Governing Council and Editors of ISA journals, have a special responsibility to uphold and observe the Code of Conduct, promoting in the Association’s activities a professional environment characterized by constructive debate and the treatment of all members and participants with dignity and respect.

3. The ISA recognizes that there is a distinction between victimization through bullying and/or harassment and legitimate, justifiable, and appropriate constructive criticism. Nothing in this document should be construed as a limitation on the ability of members and participants to constructively evaluate and critique one another’s work.

4. The ISA recognizes its duty to ensure that members and participants are not bullied and/or harassed. It further recognizes that this duty is of wider application and includes all members and participants, regardless of status (full, postgraduate, or retired) or the period of time.
   a) Bullying may be characterized as
i) Offensive, insulting, intimidating, or malicious behavior targeted at another person or persons;

ii) An abuse or misuse of power intended to undermine, humiliate, denigrate, or injure the person or persons toward whom such behavior is targeted.

b) Harassment may be defined as, but is not limited to:

i) Unwanted conduct affecting the dignity of men and women or individuals. It may be related to age, gender, gender identity, sexual orientation, race, disability, religion, nationality, citizenship or any personal characteristic of the individual, and may be persistent or isolated. The key is that the actions or comments are experienced as demeaning and unacceptable by the recipient.

5) The ISA recognizes that members and participants who feel that they have been victims of bullying and/or harassment as defined in this code of conduct are entitled to pursue their case in a safe and non-threatening environment.

6) The ISA is committed to ensuring that complaints brought under this procedure shall not lead to the victimization or harassment of any individual.

a) The ISA is conscious of the need to avoid escalating disputes when seeking to resolve cases of an alleged breach of this policy.

b) The procedures for addressing grievances (detailed below) aim to de-escalate any disputes and resolve allegations through consultation, whenever possible. At the same time, ISA recognizes that punitive measures may be required to address some violations.

c) ISA also is committed to ensuring that those who print complaints under this Code are not subject to retaliation by respondents or third parties.

7) The ISA ensures that procedures are in place to address allegations of bullying and/or harassment. Such procedures shall provide for:

a) Timely handling of such allegations;

b) Fair and impartial handling of such allegations; and

c) Fair, impartial, and sensitive treatment of all parties affected by such allegations.

ADDRESSING GRIEVANCES

1) An individual who considers that he or she is a victim of a breach of this code (Complainant) should, if practicable, seek to resolve the matter informally with the person against whom the allegation is made (Respondent). If this is unsuccessful or inappropriate to the situation, then the Complainant may seek redress through the procedures outlined under 2 and/or 3.

2) Formal Complaint

a) If an informal procedure fails to resolve the matter, the complaint is not resolved informally, or in cases where the nature of the allegations renders informal procedure inappropriate, the complainant may bring a formal complaint under this policy.

b) A written complaint shall be signed by the Complainant and should include the following information:

i) The name of the Respondent;

ii) The nature of the conduct about which a complaint is made, including, where possible, dates and times;

iii) The names of any people who may have witnessed the conduct; and

iv) Any action that has already been taken to resolve the matter.
A formal complaint should be made in writing to any member of the ISA Executive Committee. The Executive Committee member who received the complaint will forward the complaint to the Executive Director for initial review to determine if the complaint falls under the ISA Code of Conduct (i.e., the issue occurred in the context of ISA activities). If the Executive Director is the potential Respondent, the sitting President will make this assessment. Once that determination is made, the Executive Director or sitting President will share a copy of the complaint with the Respondent.

d) Once that determination is made, the Executive Director or the sitting President will share a copy of the complaint with the Respondent.

i) If the Complainant expresses concerns that the sharing of a full complaint may lead to retaliation from the Respondent, the Executive Director or sitting President may opt to instead summarize the complaint, perhaps even omitting the identity of the Complainant.

ii) The default practice, however, is to share the complaint with the Respondent.

A written complaint shall be signed by the Complainant and should include the following information:

- The name of the Respondent;
- The nature of the conduct about which a complaint is made, including, where possible, dates and times;
- The names of any people who may have witnessed the conduct; and
- Any action that has already been taken (either under II. above or otherwise) to resolve the matter.

e) The Complainant may request, prior to a full investigation of the complaint, that the mediation procedure described below (Section 3) be used.

f) The ISA President will initiate an investigation of the complaint, which will proceed as follows:

This committee will typically be the standing Committee on Professional Rights and Responsibilities.

i) This investigation will be undertaken by a committee appointed with at least two-thirds agreement of the ISA Executive Committee;

ii) This committee will, in most instances, be the standing Committee on Professional Rights and Responsibilities, but from considering the complaint, the ISA Executive Committee, in consultation with the Executive Committee, may also refer the matter to a different committee or constitute an ad hoc committee.

The latter actions require approval (two-thirds supermajority) from the Executive Committee.

g) The investigating committee may ask the parties and any witnesses (whether or not identified by either party) to present evidence within a reasonable period of time of their request. All evidence will be given in writing (including e-mail). Individuals may also be called to present an oral statement or to provide documentation. Those who provide evidence should be reminded at the outset that it will be used in order to resolve the matter.

h) The investigating committee will evaluate the evidence using the following criteria:

i) The allegations involve inappropriate conduct as defined in this Code of Conduct;

ii) The evidence suggests the alleged behavior did indeed violate professional norms of dignity and respect;

iii) The committee may further determine whether the alleged behavior appears to constitute an isolated incident or a pattern of behavior that has consequences for the ability of the ISA to maintain and promote a professional environment in which all members and participants treat one another with dignity and respect;
The investigating committee (typically the PRRC) will prepare a report for the ISA Executive Committee. The ISA Executive Committee will review the evidence, summarize the committee’s deliberations, render a judgment regarding the occurrence of Code of Conduct violations, and shall recommend a resolution of the matter. Resolution may include:

• i) Recommend that on the basis of the evidence that the complaint be dismissed;

• ii) Make recommendations for informally resolving the matter (without necessarily attributing blame or responsibility). The objective will be to (re-) establish a professional and respectful working relationship between the parties. The committee may use mediation services, as appropriate and as available, to achieve this end;

• iii) Decide that there is a prima facie case and make recommendations to the ISA Executive Committee Director and sitting President for the resolution of the matter.

• iv) The recommendations suggested under h.ii may include, but are not limited to:

   1. A formal private letter of reprimand.

   2. A public letter of censure; and. This letter will be made public after the time frame for appeal has passed.

   3. A suspension of membership of the Respondent for a specified period of time. Such a suspension would suspend access to ISA-related funding, and to participation in ISA meetings.

   4. A ban from the right to publish in ISA-administered journals.

• v) The recommendations will have an explicit foundation in the evidentiary findings of the committee;

• vi) The Respondent’s failure to cooperate with the committee may constitute grounds for disciplinary action by the committee.

b) The Executive Committee shall determine the resolution of the matter.

The ISA Executive Director shall communicate the resolution of the matter to both the Complainant and the Respondent. The resolution of the matter, as well as the original complaint, will be held at the ISA Headquarters. Should a Respondent be subject to a future complaint, the Executive Director will share this information with the adjudicating committee.

k) The ISA Executive Director will report annually on the use of the Code of Conduct process. The report should not name the individuals involved or describe specific allegations. Rather it should summarize the process, in terms of the number of complaints filed; the number of cases referred to committee (and to which committee); the number of complaints upheld and their resolution (censure, membership restrictions or other penalties).

3) Mediation

a) If, as in Section 2 above, the Executive Director or Sitting President has determined that the complaint falls under the ISA Code of Conduct, the Respondent may request that his/her complaint first be addressed via Mediation. The following should occur in When such a request is received, the Executive Director or sitting President will ask whether the Complainant is amendable to mediation situation. If both parties agree to mediation, the ISA will engage the services of a professional mediator.

b) The mediation process will typically involve the following steps, although the exact structure of the process is left to the professional mediator, perhaps in consultation with the Executive Director or the sitting President. The mediator is asked to keep detailed records of all communication; these records will be placed on file at ISA Headquarters.
• i) Request an explanation from the Complainant of the nature of the complaint and grievance, as well as a description of any informal efforts at resolution that have taken place. This may be done by e-mail or telephone. Both the Complainant and the ISA President will keep records of these communications.

• ii) Contact the Respondent, outline the nature of the complaint, and obtain that person’s response to the complaint. As in 2.iv above, the complaint typically should be shared in full with the Respondent.

• iii) Appoint a mediator to try to resolve the conflict. This will ordinarily involve consultation with both the Complainant and the Respondent. In addition, the President may consult with the Executive Committee in his or her efforts to identify a suitable mediator. The President may appoint him or herself but is under no obligation to do so.

• iv) The mediator will contact both the Complainant and the Respondent. If appropriate and feasible, arrange a joint meeting with the parties to discuss the case.

• v) The mediator will make recommendations to the parties for resolving the matter, without necessarily attributing. Depending on the circumstances of the case, the recommendation may include an attribution of blame or responsibility.

• vi) The objective will be to (re-) establish a professional and respectful working relationship between the parties.

• vii) The mediator will prepare a brief written report for the Executive Director or sitting President. This report shall summarize the efforts and the resolution of the dispute. Alternatively, the report may summarize the efforts and report that a resolution has not been achieved and is unlikely occur.

• viii) The report will remain confidential. However, the mediator may share this report with the parties to the complaint, if desired by these parties.

• 4 An appeal may be made regarding the outcome of the investigation, either by the complainant or by the Respondent, using the following procedures:
  a) Any appeal should be made in writing to the ISA Executive Committee.
  b) An appeal can be made only on grounds of procedural irregularity or where the outcome of the investigation is seen to be manifestly unreasonable.
  c) The appeal must be made within a reasonable period of time—three months of the communication of the decision.
  d) The Executive Committee will:
     i) Review the appeal, its decision regarding the resolution of the matter, and the report by the investigating committee. Draft, and draft a response to the appeal. This response will evaluate whether the appeal has merit. If the Executive Committee determines the appeal has merit it may: propose to
        (1) Send the matter back to the investigating committee;
        (2) Constitute a new investigating committee;
        (3) Dismiss the matter; and
(4) Suggest an alternative strategy for resolving the matter.

ii) Forward this response and all documentation to the Governing Council for a final determination.

e) The Governing Council will
   iii) Review the Executive Committee’s response to the appeal and all documentation.
   iv) Decide the course of action to be followed by voting on the proposal put forward by the Executive Committee.

5) **Recordkeeping:** the functioning of this Code, and of the complaints process detailed above, requires the keeping of records regarding previous complaints and the resolution of those complaints. As such, records of all complaints received, and of the disposition of those complaints, are to be kept at ISA Headquarters. When a new complaint is filed, the Executive Director (or, where appropriate, the President) will check these records, and will provide information about past complaints to the PRR Committee or other investigating body. As with all information provided in the complaints process, such information is to be treated confidentially by members of the PRR Committee or other investigating body.

iv) **Additional Provisions:**

b) A party or witness acting under any stage of this procedure who knowingly makes a statement that is untrue, malicious, frivolous, or in bad faith may be subject to the disciplinary powers detailed under 2. The investigating committee should investigate any such action and make recommendations as part of its report.

c) At all stages of this procedure, the Complainant, the Respondent, or a witness in the procedure may be accompanied by a colleague.

d) All information gathered under this procedure will be treated in confidence, while recognizing that some information may be shared among those involved within the confines of the investigation as part of the evidentiary process. This Code also acknowledges that, when the investigating body finds the Complainant’s code to have merit, the Complainant may wish to share the judgement with a limited set of individuals, such as their department chair. Complainants who wish to do so are asked to consult the ISA Executive Director or sitting President prior to disseminating such information.

1. This Code of Conduct and its procedures for resolving grievances is not intended to and shall not be a substitute for the rights of any of the parties to seek legal redress.

Any legal action on the part of the Complainant will be exclusively a matter between the Complainant, the Respondent and the authorities in the location where the incident occurred. The ISA will not be a party to such legal action, nor will it accept any financial responsibility for such action.
24. **LONG RANGE PLANNING COMMITTEE REPORT (4:00-4:15PM)**

This report was prepared by Jennifer Sterling-Folker, acting as the chair of the ISA Long Range Planning Committee. Members include Patrick Thaddeus Jackson, Deborah Larson, Pascal Vennesson, Carolyn Shaw, Michelle Scobie, Matthew Hoffmann, Raul Pacheco-Vega, and Adrienne L. Roberts, with ex-officios T.V. Paul, Brett Ashley Leeds, Patrick James, Mark Boyer and Jennifer Fontanella. The final report was submitted December 20, 2017 for the 2018 Governing Council meeting in San Francisco.

**ACTION ITEMS:**

**ACTION ITEM #1: PROPOSAL FOR A NON-ENGLISH BOOK AWARD**

Proposal for the creation of a Non-English Book Award 4-year pilot program with specific languages rotating on a pre-determined basis and with language selection based on the most widely used non-English languages spoken among ISA members.

- Proposal for a non-English Book Award (Pages 92-94)

The ISA Long-Range Planning Committee (LRPC) met at Baltimore ISA Annual Convention in February 2017 and subsequently held several exchanges by email. The LRPC discussed a wide range of topics and ultimately focused on two – the development of a Non-English Book Award (discussed by the prior LRPC) and ideas about a broader societal engagement for ISA. These discussions resulted in one proposal that the LRPC is recommending to the Governing Council. The following report includes very brief overviews of both discussions, followed by a proposal to establish a Non-English Book Award, followed by a fuller account of our discussion regarding broader social engagement.

**NON-ENGLISH BOOK AWARD DISCUSSION**

The Governing Council referred the idea of a non-English Book Award to the LRPC in 2016. The LRPC was asked to explore whether other academic organizations offer book awards for scholarship in different languages, how their process is structured, and how this might be applied by ISA. Building on the data collected by the prior LRPC chair and committee members, the current LRPC committee considered how to develop a structure and process for a non-English book award committee within ISA. Considerable committee discussion ensued over the committee’s structure, how to identify appropriate languages for the award and whether further data collection was needed prior to the initiation of a Non-English Book Award. Ultimately the majority of the LRPC chose to propose a pilot awards structure and process to be initiated immediately, but with a four-year sunset date at which time the language selection and committee structure would be reassessed and require re-approval from the Governing Council.
**Broader Social Engagement Discussion**

The LRPC discussed a subcommittee-generated proposal to encourage broader ISA social engagement. This proposal grew out of ISA Baltimore committee discussions about whether ISA should do more to encourage and protect the free exchange of ideas and the pursuit of knowledge from external interference. The subcommittee proposed a number of ideas that would strengthen ISA’s process for taking public positions on issues that are of broad concern to all ISA members as scholars. Several committee members raised concerns about the specifics of these proposals and ultimately agreed to table them for further discussion.

**Proposal for a Non-English Book Award**

We recommend the following action item:

The Governing Council approves the creation of two annual Non-English Book Awards with specific languages rotating on a pre-determined basis and with language selection based on the most widely used non-English languages spoken among ISA members. We recommend this be a pilot program for a 4 year period, at which time the Governing Council would assess it for possible revisions and renewal. Data collected by ISA headquarters on membership languages during the four years would assist the assessment and potential renewal process.

Each year the incoming President would form two non-English book award committees comprised of 2-4 scholars fluent in one of the two languages designated for that year. Each committee would operate as any other ISA book award committee with ISA headquarters support. Given that the languages would rotate annually, membership on the committee would be a one-year appointment. The committee reports would be presented annually to the Governing Council. As we propose to create two awards each year selected from the 8 different languages most widely used by ISA members, the rotation of languages would follow a 4 year cycle (please see below for our rationale).

**Design**

Two annual non-English book award committees would be formed each year by the incoming President and comprised of 2-4 scholars fluent in one of the two languages for that year. Given that languages are selected on the presumption that a sizeable portion of the ISA membership speaks that particular non-English language, there should be enough members willing and able to serve on the committees for that year. The committees would operate as any other ISA book award committee. This would be a one-year appointment for each language committee’s members since the composition of the committee would change annually with the next languages in the rotation.

Publishers could nominate books but authors could also self-nominate their own books. Nominations would be limited to books published in the period since the last time a prize was given in that particular language. For the first four rounds of awards beginning in 2019, book nominations would be limited to books published in the four years just prior to the award year.
The standard ISA book award amount is $500 and a commemorative plaque. In keeping with this standard, the committee recommends the same amount for each of the languages awarded every year, for a total of $1000 annually for the two language awards plus a plaque for each recipient.

**LANGUAGE SELECTION & ROTATION RATIONALE**

Ideally, the non-English languages to rotate would be selected based on the primary languages spoken by members and the languages most widely used among members. Unfortunately ISA does not currently collect information on languages when a member joins, only their nationality, and it utilizes generic category totals for each country’s membership numbers in order to protect member identities.

Relying on this data for award language selection presents problems. An ISA member’s nationality may not indicate which language they write or publish in, particularly in countries with more than one official or de facto language. Some languages such as Chinese and Hindi have multiple dialects. And the current ISA numerical membership ranges for each country are quite wide (ie: 50-100; 100-1,000), with no indication of the actual variance within each category.

To overcome some of these issues, the LRPC researched the official or de facto majority language of each country for which we have ISA members. SEE ATTACHED DATA SHEET. We then added the upper membership totals for countries which had the same languages. For countries that had more than 1 official language (Canada for example), we counted those countries in the relevant non-English language totals. Based on this data, the most widely spoken non-English languages among our membership are:

- French (1215 possible members across 7 countries)
- German (1200 possible members across 4 countries)
- Portuguese (1055 possible members across 3 countries)
- Turkish (1015 possible members across 2 countries)
- Hindi (1000 possible members across 1 country)
- Japanese (1000 possible members across 1 country)
- Spanish (310 possible members across 12 countries)
- Chinese (255 members across 5 countries),

These membership/language totals are followed by Arabic (195 possible members across 12 countries), Italian (150 possible members across 2 countries), Dutch (105 possible members across 2 countries), and Russian (60 possible members across 3 countries). Based on this data, and the desire to be as inclusive as is reasonably possible with these awards, the LRPC proposes that book awards be given on a rotating basis in the 8 most-widely spoken languages among ISA members listed above: French, German, Portuguese, Turkish, Hindi, Japanese, Spanish and Chinese.

Additionally, the LRPC proposes that each year there be a book award given in two separate languages. The rationale for this is that a book award for 1 language each year would mean an 8 year rotation, which is too long a time period for non-English speakers to wait before they can nominate their book. By awarding in two languages each year, the rotation of languages is cut from an 8 year cycle to a 4 year cycle. This cycle is also more beneficial for faculty who are facing tenure and promotion pressures. With this in mind, we propose the following initial rotation:
2019: French; Chinese
2020: German; Hindi
2021: Portuguese; Japanese
2022: Turkish; Spanish;

Given the language rotation schedule of every four years, eligible books would have to be published in the four year period since the last time an award was given for that language. For the first four rounds of awards beginning in 2019, books would be nominated from the four years prior to the award year.

The committee decided not to include any languages in the rotation which had less than 250 members. Relatively low membership numbers for a given language means there would be fewer books nominated and fewer members able to serve on the language decision committee that year. For many languages this makes logistical sense, for example Serbian which has only 25 possible ISA members. This decision may be more questionable for countries that were closer to the mark, such as China (which is just over it at 255) or Arabic (which is under it by 55 possible members).

RE-ASSESSMENT & DATA COLLECTION
The LRPC recommends that the proposed committee structure, language selections and language rotations be approved for a four year period. At that time the Governing Council would reassess it for revisions and potential renewal. If this pilot program is renewed, the LRPC recommends that the Governing Council establish periodic evaluations of it thereafter to ensure that the awards reflect ISA membership demographics. We recommend that ISA headquarters immediately add a question to membership forms and/or renewals about a member’s primary language. This data could then be used by the Governing Council in four years to determine if the languages selected are reflective of membership demographics and whether adjustments need to be made to these awards and the committee structure.

SUPPORT BY ISA HQ
ISA headquarters would assist the Non-English Book Award committee, as it does for other ISA award committees, in acquiring copies of the books and coordinating the prize checks and plaques once the committees made final decisions. It would also collect additional information on membership languages to assist the Governing Council in making any changes to the language selection or committee structure.

ADDENDUM
An alternative model for a rotating non-English book award might have been to rely on the regional sections within ISA to nominate and judge non-English books. We rejected this option because the language selection issues seemed relatively insurmountable given that multiple languages are often spoken within a region or across different regions. While there is an attraction to relying on ISA regional sections to assist the nominating/decision process, the LRPC felt that the logistical problems were more difficult with this model and chose instead to proposed a Presidential selection process which we felt was more amenable to structural and procedural solutions.
BROADER SOCIAL ENGAGEMENT DISCUSSION

The LRPC discussed a subcommittee-generated proposal to encourage broader ISA social engagement. This proposal grew out of ISA Baltimore committee discussions about whether ISA should do more to encourage and protect the free exchange of ideas and the pursuit of knowledge from external interference. In particular, the subcommittee focused on policy stances as a consequence of academic freedom restrictions and whether ISA needed to do more on this front.

After consulting with the Academic Freedom Committee (AFC), the LRPC subcommittee proposed a number of ideas that would strengthen ISA’s process for taking public positions on issues that are of broad concern to all ISA members as scholars. These proposals included the further delineation of the AFC’s mandate, the hiring of an ISA HQ staff member to assist the AFC in the investigative collection of data, requiring that the ISA President be the sole signatory on ISA policy statements, and directing ISA HQ to develop a media strategy for publicizing and distributing policy statements in order to better inform ISA members of the ISA rules and initiatives in these matters. The rationale for these proposals was to strengthen the AFC’s capacity to investigate cases and to strengthen the impact of the ISA’s statements in general (since they would be issued from a single, highest ISA authority).

Several concerns were raised in subsequent discussions of these proposals. The first involved whether the goal was to clarify the work in which the AFC was already engaged or to expand the AFC’s mandate and scope to include proactive investigation of cases. A second was whether additional ISA headquarter staff were needed to support the AFC’s work either as it currently stands or with an expanded mandate. A third was whether it was appropriate or desirable to have the ISA President be a single signatory on ISA policy statements.

While there was general agreement within the committee that the wording of the AFC mandate could be minimally updated to better reflect what the committee does at present (for example, adding the phrase “restrictions on travel for scholarly purposes”), ultimately the LRPC decided to table these proposals for further discussion. There remains disagreement within the committee over whether expanding the AFC’s mandate is appropriate and in what direction it should do so. These disagreements are compounded in the absence of additional information from and greater participation by the AFC. For these reasons, the LRPC decided to hold off on making any proposals on this issue at this time.
25. **Ad Hoc Committee on Virtual Engagement Report (4:00-4:15PM)**

This report was prepared by J. Andrew Grant, chair of the ISA Ad Hoc Committee on Virtual Engagement (members include Amanda Murdie, Cullen Hendrix, Sebastian E. Bitar, Laura Sjoberg, Patrick Thaddeus Jackson, and Carmela Lutmar, with ex-officios T.V. Paul, Brett Ashley Leeds, Patrick James, and Mark Boyer). The report was submitted March 9, 2018 for the 2018 Governing Council meeting in San Francisco.

**Action Items:**

**Action Item #1: Online Programming**
The Professional Development Committee should consider developing online programming as follow-ups to in-person events, or as stand-alone content.
- Mentoring, Professional Development, and Online Colloquia (Pages 96-97)

**Overview and Objectives**
The Ad Hoc Committee on Virtual Engagement has been tasked with investigating ways in which the International Studies Association can improve its overall services to members and impact on the discipline through investment in resources for virtual engagement. Technology now makes it possible for ISA members across the globe to interact between annual meetings. This committee was tasked with thinking about what programs might best harness this technology to advance professional development, teaching, research, and outreach for ISA members. To that end, the Ad Hoc Committee on Virtual Engagement met at the Baltimore ISA Annual Convention in February 2017 and subsequently held several exchanges via email, Skype, and telephone.

**A: Mentoring, Professional Development, and Online Colloquia**
Our committee concludes that the most valuable area for investment is in programs for ISA members, and particularly programs that focus on mentoring, professional development, and discussion of research. Although the annual ISA conference serves as a focal point for the scholarly activities, meetings, and side-meetings (both formal and informal) for ISA members, there has been growing interest in avoiding the loss of momentum associated with such one-year intervals by introducing online or virtual colloquia between meetings. Some ISA Sections have experimented with online workshops. The International Political Economy Society (IPES) has organized online workshops. Perhaps the most developed example of virtual colloquia/workshops are the regular sessions run (since at least 2013) by the Conflict Consortium (CC) Virtual Workshop. It seems that most of the CC’s virtual colloquia comprise five participants and run approximately 90 minutes in length (the CC’s use of the term workshop refers to having one’s paper “workshopped”) and take place via Google Hangout (see for example
More recently, (roughly two years ago), the Peace Science Society established an Online Peace Science Colloquium (see for example [http://pssonlinecolloquia.wixsite.com/opsc](http://pssonlinecolloquia.wixsite.com/opsc)). The sample OPSC seems to be approximately 66 minutes in length. And, the OPSC has its own YouTube channel ([https://www.youtube.com/channel/UC8Aq87nwrKS1kcM2MhB_7Q](https://www.youtube.com/channel/UC8Aq87nwrKS1kcM2MhB_7Q)). These research workshops are likely best organized at the Section level within ISA.

One area that we recommend that ISA HQ facilitate virtual discussion, however, is in follow-ups to the Junior Scholar Symposium (JSS). The JSS brings together four junior scholars working on similar research topics with a senior scholar for discussion of the four research projects at the ISA Annual Meeting. We suggest that the group meet again virtually four to six months after the meeting to discuss new drafts of the work based on the initial meeting discussion. JSS meetings provide not only opportunities for discussion of research, but for broader professional mentoring, and maintaining those connections between annual meetings is important. This virtual follow-up model could also be adopted by some of our many workshops on pedagogy, methodology, etc, at the annual meeting and at regional meetings.

It is possible that groups within ISA (for example, sections, caucuses, or committees) might want to arrange other virtual sessions on professional development topics. We can imagine “live” – or “open mentorship” virtual sessions similar to TalkSpace (which is an online therapy service) – or the video AMA model – which could feature one or more mentors who would make themselves available for an hour or two per semester and respond to either “live” questions or “pre-submitted” questions (or a combination thereof). Topics might include things like balancing work-life commitments; when and how to say “no” to service requests; how to access and cultivate scholarly networks; pre-tenure and post-tenure challenges; teaching and scholarship outside of the North American / European system and traditions; graduate supervision best-practices; or job search advice. Members might also share experiences and insights on curriculum reform, teaching methods, pedagogical approaches, and the like.

Alternatively, similar topics could be covered in a series of mentoring videos. Scholars could be recorded giving advice on selected topics. Perhaps ISA HQ could organize a time and place at an annual meeting where scholars could come in and record short messages and pieces of advice for graduate students and early career faculty.

We suggest that the Professional Development Committee be tasked with considering these possibilities further.

**Action Item #1:**

The Professional Development Committee should consider developing online programming as follow-ups to in-person events, or as stand-alone content.

---

11 Will Moore appears in many of the Conflict Consortium (CC) video clips. Given his influence as a mentor and collaborator, we would like to suggest a trigger warning in case readers wish to review some of these video clips.
B. Teaching Resources:

Another area in which ISA might be able to use the expertise of members to serve other members is in providing teaching resources. A video-clip or podcast on an issue that has become topical might be quite valuable to our members. We envision something akin to a “primer” on North Korean nuclear weapons, conflict in Syria, or Brexit negotiations (for example) by an ISA member with expertise in the topic. These could be used outside of class in a “flipped” classroom model or played in class. The challenge would be the difficulties involved in the production of these videos/podcasts.

Another option would be to link scholars (cohorts and mentor-mentees) for “global classrooms” where two classes in different places have joint sessions. Basic / free online tools like Zoom and Google Chats work well. Virtual chat rooms are a related possibility, and so are Google Hangouts and GoToMeeting (though a fee must be paid to use the latter).

C: Outreach and Dissemination of Work of ISA Scholarship to the Broader Public

The committee also considered how ISA might use virtual engagement to disseminate the scholarship of ISA members to the broader public (i.e., non-academic audiences). We concluded that this should not be the first priority of ISA virtual engagement since the IR blogosphere is already fairly crowded and the technological quality (and hence resources) required for outward facing video production and webinars would be high.

Based on the past experience of some committee members with various online/virtual outlets, we observe that academics, generally speaking, are not particularly skilled at producing engaging blogs, podcasts, videos, etc, without some level of training or coaching. Although the technology to produce blogs, podcasts, and the like is more accessible to academics nowadays, this gap persists. Specifically, having access to the technology in question does not mean that the content is curated and it cannot guarantee a steady stream of interesting and compelling material. Furthermore, there is still a need to be able to translate academic knowledge into a type of material that has appeal beyond academia, and in stylistic terms, the material should be in a striking format – other than a PDF rendering of a journal article or book page. For instance, the Monkey Cage addresses the above shortcomings by employing professional editors from the Washington Post – and the difference is discernable. We should also keep in mind that video, as a medium, is even less forgiving than text-based (blogs) or audio (podcasts) – further reinforcing the level of professionalism and style required for future endeavors. For instance, without a studio and/or professional film and lighting crew, videos (even ones uploaded to YouTube\footnote{There is an “International Studies Association” video on YouTube, but it seems to belong to an undergraduate student club that goes by the same name at the Santa Barbara City College.}; see Amitav Acharya’s 2014 ISA Presidential address – \url{https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=mufOrKg9WVo} – which he uploaded to his own YouTube channel) would look less like a “TED-talk” and more like a “Bloggingheads” setup. Such an outcome might be fine – expectations would have to be managed, though.
Some paper prize winners could participate in an open Q&A online session or a Twitter session on the paper in question. In terms of format, it might begin with a brief interview about the paper / project, and then use that material as the basis for either video-taped interview clips or “digital shorts” that might push the content. These digital shorts are easily tweetable. Although another option is to ask paper award winners to engage in “TED-style” video talks instead, we have to keep in mind the earlier concerns about discussing one’s work in an accessible and interesting style.

Another possibility would be a regular podcast featuring interviews with IR scholars on timely issues, historical events of contemporary relevance, and emerging trends in international politics. It would not be too difficult to locate ISA members willing to be interviewed and someone to “host” the podcasts. RINGR is a software that turns a telephone call into a reasonable facsimile of a broadcast-quality signal for a podcast.

ISA could make a scheduled list of talks and/or call for presenters every time an urgent matter arises. However, by the time the call for participation goes out to ISA members and volunteers are selected, video tapings are scheduled, etc, the window of relevance and timeliness may have closed. Additionally, even well-established think-tanks and research institutes wrestle with dissemination challenges and seek to direct traffic to their video clips and other media, commentary, reports, etc.

In sum, we do not recommend investing heavily in online outreach at this time. It might be something to revisit once some other video-based programs are well developed and ISA has more experience with video production.

**D: Enhanced Annual ISA Meetings**

Motivated in part by the concern about a “travel ban” and by ISA’s desire to bring innovative formats to our annual meeting, the Program Team set aside a series of panels for the San Francisco meeting for virtual engagement. Following the San Francisco call for papers, the VE Committee solicited submissions for “virtual engagement” paper presentations, panels, and roundtables. We received a total of 190 VE submissions, although many misunderstood the call and simply requested Power Point capabilities. The VE Committee reviewed the submissions and identified a draft “long-list” of submissions that were placed on 20 panel submissions (some panels had 1-2 VE-related presentations; others had up to 5 VE-related presentations). The degree of innovation and actual virtual engagement were prominent criteria as part of our review. The VE Committee also aimed to be not only as inclusive as possible, but also incorporate diversity considerations among the VE submissions (gender, approach, geographical location, etc). The panel submissions were then further reduced to 16 VE submissions / panels (some VE panels were consolidated), which were passed along to the Program Team for their review and addition to the Program. From this group of 16, the Program Team placed 12 panels on the SF conference program. Out of the 85 individuals who were on the 12 selected VE panels/roundtables, 68 registered by the time of the registration deadline.

In the run-up to the conference, however, most of the panels that had been scheduled to include virtual engagement will no longer include that component. Six of the twelve panels have informed us either that the panelists who had intended to participate remotely will be at the meeting in person, or else the
remote participants will not be available after all. Of the remaining six panels, only three confirmed their intentions to use live streaming and provided the required information for the AV team to make the connections before our final deadline of March 9, 2018, despite repeated requests. As a result, only three of the twelve panels originally intended for virtual engagement will take advantage of the technology. We also note that the expense for virtual engagement panels is quite high; about 10% of the technical cost of the entire San Francisco convention.

Given the low demand and high cost, we recommend that for Toronto, virtual engagement panels return to being an option under the Innovative Panel program. Participants are welcome to propose panels using live streaming, and they will be evaluated by the Program Team as part of the Innovative Panel program.

**Conclusions:**

We believe there are important opportunities going forward for ISA to provide increased benefit to members through virtual engagement. We encourage sections, caucuses, and committees to propose ways they might use virtual engagement to provide professional development opportunities and support research and teaching. We also encourage ISA HQ to continue to investigate and invest in technologies that make such activities easier. In the long run, ISA might also engage in producing more outward facing content, but we believe content targeted to members should be the higher priority. Finally, we believe there should continue to be opportunities for virtual engagement at the annual meetings through the Innovative Panel program.
26. ISA TASK FORCE ON THE GLOBAL SOUTH – RESOLUTIONS (4:15-4:45PM)

The resolutions presented below result from the work of the ISA Global South Task Force over the past year and are put forth for the approval of the 2018 ISA Governing Council.

ACTION ITEMS:

**ACTION ITEM #1: PROPOSAL TO CREATE PERMANENT STANDING COMMITTEE ON THE STATUS OF ENGAGEMENT WITH THE GLOBAL SOUTH**
Create a permanent standing Committee on the Status of Engagement with the Global South to be executed in line with the parameters stipulated in Article XV of the ISA Constitution.

- Resolution #1 (Pages 103-104)

**ACTION ITEM #2: PROPOSAL TO AMEND THE TRAVEL GRANT GUIDELINES**
Amend the current ISA Convention and Conferences Travel Grant Awarding/Eligibility Guidelines to include general norms and concrete selection criteria, in order to improve on the transparency and efficiency of the travel grant selection process.

- Resolution #2 (Pages 104-105)

**ACTION ITEM #3: PROPOSAL TO ESTABLISH AN EMERGING GLOBAL SOUTH SCHOLAR WORKSHOP**
Establish an Emerging Global South Scholar Workshop for every annual ISA convention to promote and support junior Global South scholarship and networking. This workshop would provide a forum for discussing research; writing academic journal articles; publication strategies; and networking skills and career development. This would be organized by the GSCIS and, implies a new budget line item of $2,500 per year.

- Resolution #3 (Pages 105-106)

**ACTION ITEM #4: PROPOSAL TO REVISE ISA’S RESEARCH WORKSHOP GRANT GUIDELINES**
ISA’s guidelines for its Research and Workshop Grants be revised to include specific provisions geared toward Global South scholars.

- Resolution #4 (Page 106)

**ACTION ITEM #5: PROPOSAL TO INSTITUTE SYSTEM FOR ANNUAL TRACKING OF GLOBAL SOUTH DATA**
Annual data tracking of Global South data, including publication submissions/responses/acceptances, conference participation, governance participation, and travel grant awards.

- Resolution #5 (Pages 106-107)
**ACTION ITEM #6: PROPOSAL TO ESTABLISH FUNDING STRUCTURES GEARED TOWARD GLOBAL SOUTH MEMBERS**

Establish fundraising and funding structures geared towards Global South members’ advancement within the ISA.

- Resolution #6 (Pages 107-108)

---

**BACKGROUND:**

The Global South Task Force (GSTF) was convened by past ISA President T.V. Paul (2016-17), under Article VIII.2.H of the International Studies Association (ISA) constitution, to “propose programs and policies designed to advance the best interests of the association.” Despite the ISA’s global nature and purpose,13 the majority of the association’s current membership, conference participation and publications rely heavily on Global North contributions (only about 10% of present ISA members are from the Global South). In an effort to make ISA a more inclusive and globally representative academic body, the Association’s leadership felt that an examination into the issues facing Global South (GS) scholars of international studies disciplines was warranted.

At its meeting in Atlanta in March 2016, the Governing Council (GC) of ISA unanimously approved the creation of a presidential Task Force on the Global South, in collaboration with the Global South Caucus (GSCIS), to complement and expand on the work of the GSCIS. At its meeting in Baltimore in February 2017, the GC approved the members of the GSTF; the issues for its consideration; proposed tasks; and scheduled timeframes (see Appendices 1 and 2).

Over the past year, the GSTF has worked through its three subcommittees on gathering and analyzing information. The GSTF used the following sources: internal ISA data and reports; insights gained from internal ISA stakeholders; two reports of the Global South Dialogues held in 2016 and 2017; notes on best practices gleaned from wider consultations with similar internationally-oriented professional academic associations; and, survey (administered in English, Spanish and French) results obtained from 358 current and potential ISA members in GS regions (see complete details in the appendices of full GSTF report available on ISA website). From these inputs, each sub-committee produced a report and a

---

13 According to the ISA website, [www.isanet.org](http://www.isanet.org), the ISA purpose is to promote international understanding and support the following goals:

- Provide opportunities for communications among educators, researchers, and practitioners in order to continually share intellectual interests and meet the challenges of a changing global environment
- Develop contacts among specialists from all parts of the world in order to facilitate scientific and cultural change
- Provide channels of communication between academics and policy makers to promote a successful link between the production of knowledge and its utilization
- Improve the teaching and dissemination of ideas, concepts, methods, and information in the field of International Studies
- Publication of knowledge through its six journals, compendium, and other publications
follow-up meeting was held in Montreal, Canada from September 15-16, 2017 with the following participants:

GSTF Co-Chairs: Navnita Chadha Behera (Delhi University) and Kristina Hinds (University of the West Indies)

- Subcommittee 2: Coordinator: Jayati Srivastava (Jawaharlal Nehru University, New Delhi) *Specific Regional/Country Challenges and Contributions for ISA Participation.*
- Subcommittee 3: Coordinator: Amitav Acharya (American University) - *Long-range Issues: Scholarship, Scholarly Engagement and Mutual Understanding of Scholars from Global South and Global North.*
- Ex-Officio Members: Past/present Presidents, T.V. Paul (McGill University), Ashley Leeds (Rice University), Patrick James (University of Southern California) and; ISA Executive Director, Mark Boyer and staff members, Jennifer Fontanella, and Lembe Tiky.
- Rapporteurs of Final Report: T.V. Paul (McGill University) and Nanette Svenson (Tulane University)

The Montreal meeting produced an outline for the GSTF’s Final Report and a series of proposals on the following issues: membership; travel grants; conferences/workshops/events; scholarship and publishing; data tracking; and funding (endowments, donations and grants). The resolutions are presented for consideration below and are based on a combination of the GSTF subcommittee reports and the Montreal meeting discussions. These represent the policy recommendations for ISA on these issues.

**Action Item #1:**

Create a permanent standing Committee on the Status of Engagement with the Global South to be executed in line with the parameters stipulated in Article XV of the ISA Constitution.

- **a)** The mission of this committee will be to pursue objectives designed to increase the participation, status and visibility of GS scholars in ISA, working jointly with the GSCIS, the Global Development section and pertinent other ISA sub-groups.
- **b)** Seven committee members, nominated by the ISA president-elect, will serve two-year, staggered terms. The first term for the Chair and two of the other four members will extend a third year to promote institutionalization and allow for subsequent staggering of terms.
- **c)** The chairs of the GSCIS and Global Development Section shall be ex-officio members of this committee. The committee members will contribute to the implementation and oversight of the other resolutions presented here.
- **d)** The responsibilities of the committee will include continual review of the status of Global South scholars in ISA regarding membership, participation and publications, along with preparation of recommendations to the ISA Governing Council, President, Executive Director and the HQ on ways to track and improve the status and visibility of GS scholars in the profession.
The Committee shall help identify sources for the proposed Global South Scholars fund (See Resolution 6).

**Justification:** As noted in the background section above, ISA Global South Dialogue reports, and the rationale for forming the GSTF, ISA is a predominantly Global North oriented organization and stands to gain by adopting a broader and consistent outreach strategy to fulfil its mandate of “developing contacts among specialists from all parts of the world in order to facilitate scientific and cultural change.” Thus, the GSTF believes that creation of this committee is warranted as a means of: (1) continuing to focus the ISA’s attention on the GS scholars’ issues referred to here and in the GSTF final report; and (2) working towards making ISA a truly global academic body.

**ACTION ITEM #2:**
Amend the current ISA Convention and Conferences Travel Grant Awarding/Eligibility Guidelines as follows:

Travel grants are intended to supplement other sources of funding for individuals attending the convention/conference. They are not meant to cover all the expenses involved. Due to limited resources and large numbers of requests, awards made by the Association almost always are for less than the total cost of program participation.

a) Travel grants are only provided to individuals who are on the program for the convention/conference, however, please be aware that you will need to apply for a travel grant before you are notified of your acceptance to the program. Typically, the application deadline is prior to an applicant’s acceptance to the preliminary program; this is done so that notifications of acceptance to the program and notifications about grants can proceed quickly in order to allow potential participants time to assess whether or not they can fulfill their obligations to the program by coming to the convention/conference and presenting their work.

b) Final decisions regarding requests for funding are made by the executive office of ISA, acting under guidelines approved by the GC of the Association and based on information provided by the Program Chair.

c) You need to be a member of ISA at the time of the convention or conference to be awarded a travel grant.

d) Key principles guiding priority consideration for financial support include:

i. Must be on the program for the annual meeting;

ii. Support for junior scholars and senior graduate students;

iii. Support for scholars from the Global South;

iv. First-time attendee; (i.e., aimed at recruiting new scholars to ISA);

v. Accepted for inclusion one of the ISA specialized programs, such as the Junior Scholar Symposium, Pay-It-Forward and Emerging Global South Scholars Workshop (subject to GC approval)

---

14 See the ISA website, www.isanet.org, About Us – Purpose.
vi. Support for applicants who have not received funding from ISA during the past two years (except for those falling under the above-mentioned category – see 2.d.v).

e) Following on is the more directly operational consideration for award selection: Candidates’ degree of need, to be determined by ISA HQ’s estimates for total cost of transport involved for conference attendance.

f) The Executive Director shall attempt to offer amounts for grant awards at different allocation levels as follows: Up to $500; Up to $1,000; Up to $2,000.
   
i. Larger grants (Up to $2,000) should be used to encourage the participation of scholars from Least Developed countries (LDCs) as defined by the UN (See UN definition: https://www.un.org/development/desa/dpad/wp-content/uploads/sites/45/publication/ldc_list.pdf). However, larger grants are not reserved only for applicants coming from LDCs.
   
ii. Since there is wide variation in the applicant pool each year, these figures provide very broad guidance only. The numbers below reflect what the allocation might look like based on the current budget of $225,000:
   
iii. Up to $500 (more than 300 awards based on current budget)
   
iv. Up to $1,000 (about 40 awards based on current budget)
   
v. Up to $2,000 (about ten awards based on current budget)

Rationale: By including general norms and concrete selection criteria, as per sections 2.d and 2.e preceding, the GSTF seeks to improve on the transparency and efficiency of the travel grant selection process. By including the provision of a small number of larger awards, the guidelines aim to increase feasibility of conference attendance for ISA members from the GS with demonstrated need, on account of travelling greater distances and facing severe financial and other structural constraints (understanding that the exact allocation is determined significantly by the size and composition of the applicant pool each year). As noted above (see 2.f.i), special emphasis should be placed on identifying and encouraging participation of scholars from LDCs.

ACTION ITEM #3: Establish an annual Emerging Global South Scholar Workshop that would rotate between the annual ISA convention and at other co-sponsored/partnered ISA conferences in different regions on an alternate year basis. Designed broadly along the lines of ISA’s ‘Pay-it-Forward’ program and, to promote
and support junior Global South scholarship and networking, this workshop would provide a forum for discussing research; writing academic journal articles; publication strategies such as proposal writing for books; and networking skills and career development for early/mid-career scholars from the Global South. The Committee on the Status of Engagement with the Global South, subject to the GC’s approval will be given the mandate for organizing such workshops and, this implies a new budget line item of $2,500 per year.  

Justification: Consistent access to financial and technical support for developing professional skills in academic publishing, teaching and research methods tends to be limited in many GS academic institutions. Institutionalizing such a forum at the ISA’s Annual Convention and, at other co-sponsored/partnered ISA conferences in different regions, would provide sustained professional support to a particularly underserved segment of the ISA. Facilitators of these workshops should be drawn from North and South, should reflect the ISA’s emphasis on diversity and should have scholarly experience and in-depth understanding of academic/research environments in the GS locations.

ACTION ITEM #4:
ISA’s guidelines for its Research and Workshop Grants be revised to include a specific provision: “Submission of proposals led by and/or comprising of Global South scholars are specially encouraged.” The ISA’s “Workshop Proposal Evaluation Scheme” should also be amended, under the section entitled “Contribution to ISA’s mission (10 percent)” to include weightage for “projects led by and/or comprising of Global South scholars and, those having a good mix of Global South and Global North participants.” (See: https://www.isanet.org/Help/Knowledge-Base/ID/75/WorkshopProposal-Evaluation-Scheme)

Justification: ISA workshops offer an excellent platform with great potential for fostering scholarly engagement and collaborative work between scholars of Global North and Global South. However, currently few workshop proposals come from GS scholars. There is a need to rectify this situation. The suggested changes will help to send a clear and promising signal to GS scholars to apply for these grants. Further, according extra weightage to those proposals that help to create and sustain such networks and research partnerships between scholars from the Global South and the Global North will help to achieve the aforementioned objective.

ACTION ITEM #5:
Institute a system for annual data tracking of the following:

- a) The number of GS scholar publication submissions/responses/acceptances and the number of GS peer reviewers/editors by ISA journal; and
- b) Figures on GS scholars’ ISA conference attendance; ISA governance participation; and receipt of ISA travel grant awards. This data should capture information for the GS in general and by region.

15 The figure of $2,500 per year is the estimate obtained from ISA headquarters for allocations for similar events in the ISA annual conference programming.
i. These figures are to be included in the Executive Director’s Annual Report as a means of archiving and tracking historical data.

ii. The Committee on the Status of Engagement with the Global South (subject to the approval of the Governing Council) may work out the feasibility, purview and modalities of this exercise with the Publications Committee and the ISA Headquarters.

**Note:** While acknowledging the deep pluralities and diversities that characterise debates on defining ‘Global South, for the purposes of data collection, the GSTF suggests using the parameters of ‘developing economies’ and ‘economies in transition’ as specified by the United Nations. ([Please see: http://www.un.org/en/development/desa/policy/wesp/wesp_current/2014wesp_country_classification.pdf](http://www.un.org/en/development/desa/policy/wesp/wesp_current/2014wesp_country_classification.pdf)). The current institutional location of scholars/ISA members may be used for this purpose.

**Justification:** Tracking data will be vital for monitoring GS scholars’ publication and participation trends over time and can be used by ISA to design strategies for addressing some of the gaps in the involvement and representation of GS participants in its activities.

**Action Item #6:**

Establish **fundraising and funding structures** geared towards Global South members’ advancement within the ISA. Two different, albeit parallel, measures may be taken in this regard.

a) A Global South Fund to which ISA members can make donations. The option for members to donate to this fund should be facilitated via the ISA members’ portal (for example: when members join ISA, renew ISA membership, or register for ISA conferences/conventions). The current provision may be revised to specify the purpose or program for which donations are being sought along with an additional note on tax exemptions, if any, on such donations. As a first effort toward this, ISA could establish a specific donation category for GS travel grants; its specialized mentoring programs including Junior Scholar Symposium, Pay-it-Forward and Emerging Global South Scholars Workshop (subject to GC approval); and Research and Workshop Grants among others.

b) Establish a Global South Endowment with a corpus fund to allow for ongoing and sustainable funding for Global South involvement in the ISA. This is a longer-term strategy that would require that adequate funding be sourced. The Committee on the Status of Engagement with the Global South (subject to the approval of the GC) may be asked to explore avenues for generating corpus grants for the specific purpose of setting up this endowment. If ISA decides to establish a larger endowment for **all** of its programs at a later stage, then the GS fund may be incorporated within this broader program provided that a stipulated portion is explicitly allocated for the GS initiatives.

**Justification:** Additional funding is required for the promotion of GS related activity within ISA, particularly as GS scholars often must travel greater distances to participate; typically have access to fewer funding sources in their home countries; and may face other structural barriers to participation in ISA activities. Establishing sustainable fund-raising designated for promoting GS involvement in the
association will help the ISA cover some of the associated costs and will ensure that resources are dedicated specifically to GS oriented initiatives.

**Advisory:** The Task Force calls upon all components of ISA, governing bodies, president, incoming president, program chairs, journal editors, section, caucus, and region governing bodies to consider initiatives on GS participation and representation as presented in the full GSTF Report along with the three subcommittee reports attached in its appendices. This is available on the ISA website.
27. Region, Section, and Caucus Business (4:45-5:00pm)

The item is set aside for the Governing Council members to raise any matters related to section, caucus or region business.

General Reports and Issues

The annual reports of the sections and regions can be accessed at:
28. OLD BUSINESS (4:45-5:00PM)
PROPOSAL FOR ASIA-PACIFIC REGION EXPANSION

To: Governing Council, International Studies Association
From: Asia-Pacific Region Executive, International Studies Association

On behalf of the Asia-Pacific region of the International Studies Association (ISA), I would like to formally propose the following:

PROPOSAL
To expand the scope of the ISA Asia-Pacific region to include South Asia (Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Bhutan, India, Maldives, Pakistan, Nepal, Sri Lanka).

RATIONALE
Currently, the Asia-Pacific region does not include South Asia. This proposal will allow ISA members from South Asian member states to participate in (and potentially receive travel grants to attend) ISA Asia-Pacific regional conferences, annual meetings and to serve as officers in the executive council.

Sincerely,

Giorgio Shani
President, Asia-Pacific Region
ISA

Note: ISA Headquarters has verified the signatories of the petition. Of the 318 signatories, 260 are currently ISA members. Of those 260 signatories, 112 (43%) reside in areas that are currently part of the Asia-Pacific region, and 37 (14%) reside in areas that are proposed to be added to the Asia-Pacific region.
30. ADJOURNMENT (5:00PM)

NOTE: The President’s reception for the Governing Council is scheduled for Tuesday, April 3rd from 6:30 to 8:00 PM in 3-1984 Imperial Suite, Hilton San Francisco Union Square.