

The 2011 Annual Meeting Panel Allocations

Robert J-P. Hauck, *Deputy Director, APSA*

The process by which panels are allocated among program committee divisions and related groups may appear to be arcane. It needn't be. In the late fall of the year preceding the next Annual Meeting, each division or group organizer receives a panel allocation and a detailed explanation of how the size of the allocation was determined. The following paragraphs detail the process by which the 2011 panel allocations were determined.

The 2011 allocations were the result of a multi-step process and distribution formula that was last revised by the APSA Council in 2008. At that time, the Council capped the potential growth of the official program at 736 panels. The first step in the 2011 allocation process involved determining the number of panels that would be distributed to the 51 divisions of the official program.

STEP ONE: DETERMINING THE NUMBER OF PROGRAM COMMITTEE PANELS

The calculation began with the 693 panels distributed to the program committee in 2010. According to Council guidelines, the total official program size in a particular year is based on the number of program committee panels organized in the previous year adjusted by the percent increase or decrease in APSA's individual professional membership in the subsequent year.

From September 2009 to September 2010, APSA individual professional membership remained stable. The 2011 program committee, therefore, would again organize 693 panels. To account for rounding in the formula and the addition of a new division, the total number of panels distributed among divisions had to be increased to 695, still well under the 736 panel cap.

STEP TWO: DETERMINING THE NUMBER OF PROGRAM CO-CHAIRS' PANELS

Space permitting, the program committee co-chairs are allocated a number of panels equal to 5% of the total number of panels organized by the program committee divisions. For 2011, the program co-chairs received 35 panels. The program co-chairs use these panels to build the theme for the

2011 program and shape the Annual Meeting by distributing extra sessions to program divisions proposing special sessions related to the meeting theme, or for other purposes such as "Hyde Park" sessions.

Adding the co-chairs' panels to the program committee's total allotment increased the size of the 2011 official program to 730 panels.

STEP THREE: DETERMINING THE NUMBER OF RELATED GROUP PANELS

Related groups are an integral part of the Annual Meeting. The number of panels available to related groups, according to Council guidelines, may equal no more than 20% of the total official program. The size of the related group program is calculated by measuring related group panel attendance as a percentage of total attendance in the previous year. Related group participation equaled 13% of total attendance in 2010. Thus, 95 panels were set aside for related groups in 2011.

The actual number of panels organized by related groups, however, is also a function of demand. Each related group wishing to participate in the Annual Meeting receives at least one panel; additional panels are allocated to specific groups based on their attendance in the previous year, using the same allocation formula as is applied to division allocations.

With the addition of 95 related group panels, the size of the 2011 Annual Meeting increased to 825 panels.

STEP FOUR: DETERMINING THE NUMBER OF APSA-ORGANIZED PANELS

Some of the association's standing and ad hoc committees also organize panels at the Annual Meeting. The total number of possible panels is capped at 2% of the number of official program panels. In 2011, 15 APSA-organized panels were allocated.

STEP FIVE: DETERMINING TOTAL MEETING SIZE

By the standard formula, the program co-chairs, program committee divisions, related groups, and APSA committees could together organize 840 panels.

In addition to the panels and roundtable sessions, the meeting will include between four to six poster sessions, potentially offering 695 presentations, as well as approximately 210 business meetings, receptions, and other gatherings. The 2011 meeting, therefore, will be a daunting affair consisting of over 1,000 sessions of various sorts.

STEP SIX: ALLOCATING PANELS AMONG THE PROGRAM COMMITTEE DIVISIONS AND AMONG RELATED GROUPS

As a result of new rules adopted by the Council, 90% of the 695 program panels set aside for the 51 divisions and all of 95 related group panels are distributed to 60 or so related groups using an algorithm. In one sentence, a base number of panels are assigned to each division (three panels) and related groups (one panel), and the remaining panels are distributed based on the percentage of panel attendance the division or related group had at the last Annual Meeting.

In somewhat greater detail, raw attendance data are collected each year. Several adjustments are then made to the raw count. Roundtable attendance is capped at 70 to lessen the impact of non-paper panels. Panel and roundtable attendance are then adjusted for time of day and day of week by using multiple classification analysis to calculate how much attendance at different times and days differed from the grand mean and then adding or subtracting those amounts.

Mean attendance per panel is then calculated using the adjusted figures. Attendance at co-sponsored panels is divided between the sponsors, and the panel itself is weighted as 0.5 for each in the calculation of the mean. The mean adjusted attendance for each division or related group is then multiplied by the annual base allocation for the program committee and related groups, resulting in a total adjusted attendance figure for each division or related group. The use of a base-approved number of panels controls for any distortion that might otherwise arise if a division or related group did not offer all of its panels or received a one-time only additional allocation.

The resulting total adjusted attendance figure for each division and related group are summed to obtain a meeting total, and

a percentage is calculated from this total for each division and related group. The allocation is then made by assigning each division of the program committee a base number of three panels, and apportioning the remaining panels on the basis of the percentage figure. Related group allocations are made by assigning each group a base of one panel and apportioning the remaining panels proportionate to attendance at their panels the previous year.

Beginning with the 2010 meeting, accord-

ing to Council policy, no related group's allocation will exceed the median allocation of official program divisions. This means that in 2011, no related group's allocation can exceed 12 panels.

The last step is a relatively new step for program divisions. In 2008, the Council ended the bonuses distributed to divisions associated with targeted fields of interest. Instead, 10% of panels available to the program committee are distributed to divisions adjusted by their acceptance rates. Divisions

with acceptance rates below the mean acceptance rate (15% in 2011) share in the additional panels in proportion to their distance from the mean.

In the end, the multi-step process was designed and applied to guarantee a fair distribution of a limited resource. Periodic adjustments have been and will continue to be made to the process to preserve fairness and adapt to changing conditions. ■

Nominations and Expressions of Interest Sought for Editor of *American Political Science Review*

In June 2012, the UCLA editorial team at the *American Political Science Review* will complete its current term. President Carole Pateman has named an APSR search committee to help identify a successor or successors to be presented for Council approval in August 2011.

The members of the search committee are: John Aldrich, Duke University; Charles Beitz, Princeton University; Janet M. Box-Steffensmeier, Ohio State University; Valerie Bunce, Cornell University; Pradeep Chhibber, University of California, Berkeley; Neta Crawford, Boston University; Gary Goertz, University of Arizona; Gary Segura, Stanford University; and Joan Tronto, University of Minnesota, chair.

The *Review* is the centerpiece of the association's publications. Its contents represent the best work in political science to political

scientists in the United States and abroad, other social scientists, and interested parties in foundations, government, and the private sector.

The search committee invites nominations and proposals for an editor or group of editors to lead the *Review*. The new editor or editors will be charged with maintaining the centrality of the *Review* to the profession and upholding the standards of excellence cultivated by *Review* editors since 1906. The search committee seeks an editor or editorial team that has a commitment to publishing articles that represent the methodological and substantive diversity of the discipline, including qualitative and multi-method research. Any proposal should include ideas for maintaining the high standards of the journal and increasing the diversity of articles that are published.

Typically, the cost of running the journal

is shared by the editor(s)' home institution and the APSA. Nominators and potential editors should consider this situation in making nominations and proposals to the committee. The association is especially open to proposals that include innovative individual and institutional collaborations, and it welcomes preliminary discussions with candidates about how such proposals might be structured and funded.

Nominations and expressions of interest, accompanied by a resume(s), should be sent to APSA Executive Director Michael Brintnall. The committee will begin to review received nominations and proposals on February 16, 2011. The committee may review proposals submitted after the deadline. Proposals submitted on or before the deadline will certainly receive full consideration. ■