

Ad Hoc Committee on Climate at American Society of Criminology Meetings Report to the American Society of Criminology Executive Board

April 2022

The Ad Hoc Committee on Climate at American Society of Criminology Meetings was appointed by ASC President Sally Simpson and the ASC Executive Board in February 2020. The committee was co-chaired by Vanessa Panfil, Jennifer Cobbina-Dungy, and Karen Heimer. Other committee members were Victoria Kurdyla (student member in 2020), Sadé Lindsay (student member in 2020), OJ Mitchell (ASC Board representative), Anthony Peguero (ASC Board representative), Zach Rowan, Jeremy Staff, Maria Vélez, and Emily Wright (ASC Board representative). The Ad Hoc Committee also had an advisory committee whose members were Rod Brunson, Claire Renzetti, and Nancy Rodriguez.

The ASC Executive Board's charge to the committee was as follows:

“This ad hoc committee will assess the issue of climate at ASC Meetings and sponsored events. Climate may be understood to include participant experiences with and perceptions of barriers to inclusiveness, mutual respect and civility in the conference environment. The committee will be particularly attentive to issues experienced by women, scholars of color, LGBTQ+ scholars and student members. The ad hoc committee will assess barriers to inclusivity at ASC meetings and sponsored events, and will propose steps to enhance inclusivity, respect and civility at future meetings and events.”

The committee commenced virtual meetings during the spring of 2020. The extensive, data-driven work of the committee proceeded as follows: The committee gathered information from other professional organizations of academic social scientists, focusing on the policies and initiatives being proposed and implemented by other academic professional organizations to increase inclusivity and address the impact of imbalances in power and privilege. The committee also gathered data from the ASC membership by designing and conducting 16 virtual focus groups of ASC annual meeting attendees who may be more likely to experience barriers to inclusivity, including scholars of color, women, LGBTQ+ scholars, scholars with disabilities, and students. The opportunity to participate in the focus groups was offered to the ASC membership via email communication. There were 56 focus group participants. This information was supplemented with 25 in-depth interviews and statements from several others who could not participate in the focus groups. All information collected was analyzed thoroughly and is summarized in this report. The committee used our analyses of the data from other organizations, focus groups, and interviews to generate a detailed series of action items, which are embedded within this report. The report concludes with a statement about the future.

We include an executive summary of our committee report, which presents a set of recommendations for improving climate at ASC meetings and events. These recommendations synthesize many of the action items contained within the body of the report.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Ad Hoc Committee on Climate at American Society of Criminology Meetings

The committee work included two major data gathering activities. The results of these activities are summarized here, followed by a series of recommendations for change.

First, the committee selected a set of national professional organizations and examined their policies and procedures to promote diversity, equity, and inclusion at their meetings. We found that ASC is out of step compared to many other professional organizations; all of the other organizations studied have specific practices and policies in place to promote diversity and inclusion at national meetings. Moreover, we found that most of the other organizations have policies, committees, and activities designed to promote diversity, inclusion, and freedom from harassment that extend beyond the national meeting setting and apply to organizational functioning more generally. Our review reveals the following: 1) most of the other professional organizations employ a trained professional staff member who specializes in and is devoted to a focus on diversity, inclusion, and harassment; 2) all of the organizations have websites that include clear, accessible, and easy to locate statements and/or policies regarding diversity and inclusion; 3) many have commissioned official task force reports regarding diversity, equity, and inclusion, assisted by staff support; 4) most have several standing committees addressing concerns of conduct regarding DEI and harassment ; 5) all post a code of conduct at meetings on their website, including an anti-harassment policy; and 6) many include some mechanism to assist persons experiencing harassment or unwanted behavior at meetings, in the form of an ombudsperson or the organization's trained DEI specialists.

The second data gathering activity of the committee, the collection and analysis of data from focus groups and interviews with ASC meeting attendees, produced the following themes:

1. *Inclusion through representation*

With an increasing number of women, people of color, LGBTQ+ people, younger people, students, and international individuals, seeing diversity in leadership positions within ASC, leadership positions with ASC Divisions, and in other major roles, such as journal editors, helped participants feel like they had a place at the ASC meetings.

2. *Inclusion through ASC Divisions*

Divisions were said to be particularly beneficial because 1) one's work was recognized and appreciated within the division, 2) people saw others who looked like them and may

share their experiences and values, and 3) they provided an avenue for students to get involved, hold office, and serve on committees.

3. *Inclusion through mentoring and networking*

Formal and informal mentoring programs through Divisions and other member-created associations helped orient students and early career scholars to the ASC meetings and facilitated networking and additional career-related opportunities.

4. *Exclusion based on type of research or institution*

Many felt that certain kinds of scholarship, institutional homes, and service were devalued in the organization, making them feel less welcomed at meetings and producing further inequality in the discipline. There were complaints that the discipline preferred quantitative versus qualitative approaches, being male and American, and deemed critical approaches to be “fringe.” Respondents saw this as resulting in ill-fitting program placement, poor attendance for panels, and low engagement with the work. Another common theme was the lack of diversity in high-visibility sessions on the ASC program (e.g. Presidential plenaries), election slates of officers, award recipients, and program and other committee representation.

5. *Exclusion experienced by women*

Displays of disrespect were a common theme evident in conversations at the meetings and during panels. This included addressing women by their first names while using titles and honorifics for men. During panel sessions, participants reported being asked to relinquish their time to the other presenters, being “mansplained” about their own presentations or areas of expertise, or having queries directed to male coauthors rather than the lead (female) author.

6. *Exclusion experienced by people of color*

Many felt that scholars of color were often siloed at ASC meetings, leading to feelings of alienation. Some experienced exclusionary practices like being mistaken for hotel staff and being addressed by their first name instead of Dr. or Professor as others. While Divisions such as the DPCC led many to feel included, others were well aware that scholars of color continued to remain excluded from serving on major panels and events.

7. *Exclusion experienced by LGBTQ participants*

Feelings of exclusion were often linked to the topical areas they study not being taken seriously or being respected in the field, with its spillover to personal identity. Opportunities and visibility that did arise for LGBTQ participants at the meetings are because they—as individuals and as a collective—organized their own opportunities, such as panels and creating a Division.

8. *Exclusion experienced by trans and non-binary participants*

Trans and non-binary respondents felt frustrated by certain conventions within the discipline, such as measuring “gender” as sex assigned at birth and the “lack of thought about the existence of trans people or non-binary people.” Some articulated that other researchers viewed trans individuals as “an anomaly, as this weird specimen to be poked and prodded at,” which could have harmful consequences for transgender people.

9. *Exclusion experienced by students*

Students perceived an assumption that all students had less knowledge or experience than attendees with terminal degrees or in faculty positions. This was frustrating to the students who had returned to academia after being a practitioner or who had extensive teaching experience. Other students reported feeling “invisible” and “not good enough.” There was acknowledgement that structural issues such as racism, sexism, ageism, and heterosexism may negatively affect students most strongly, given institutional power structures.

10. *Exclusion experienced by international students and scholars*

Feelings of isolation and lack of mentorship at the ASC meeting may be exacerbated for scholars and students traveling internationally. Logistical barriers mentioned included high costs and difficulties of international travel and the fact that the meeting is in English. People for whom English is their second language encountered microaggressions from other participants (e.g., being asked about their accent).

11. *Exclusion experienced by participants with disabilities*

Exclusionary experiences of people with disabilities were extensive, including issues with physical mobility (i.e. crowded events may not allow ease of access), offsite events (i.e. transit options at the hotel may not be available to people using wheelchairs; lack of accessible ramps or restrooms), hearing impairment (i.e. difficulty obtaining microphones for large rooms; lack of ASL interpreter and captioning), and visual impairment (i.e. inaccessible program app), all of which may prevent or restrict participation.

12. *Exclusion experienced by formerly incarcerated people*

The discipline often studies justice-involved people, which can lead to feelings of “otherness” and of being an “outsider.” Some presenters at ASC refer to formerly incarcerated people using microaggressions and dehumanizing language. People who are formerly system-involved may feel that they lack the necessary scholarly social and cultural capital resulting in them being stereotyped and subject to prejudice.

13. *Exclusion based on sexual harassment*

Most of the focus groups generated comments about an unacceptably high level of sexual harassment at meetings, suggesting considerable consensus about this issue. In particular, some respondents reported being touched inappropriately, in both sexual and non-sexual ways. People of all genders reported witnessing sexual harassment and unwelcomed behavior directed at colleagues, students, and others, including unwanted physical contact. This was reported to sometimes but not always be linked with alcohol use (see below). Respondents made clear that harassment makes the individuals experiencing it feel unsafe and unwelcome at meetings; they also made it clear that harassment also makes witnesses and others hearing of the harassment feel unsafe and unwelcome, regardless of gender.

14. *Exclusion based on logistical concerns*

Our focus groups and interviews produced three major logistical concerns: accessibility (especially for individuals with various mobility concerns due to age, pregnancy, disability, child strollers, or temporary injuries), cost (i.e. membership fee, registration

fee, traveling to major/large cities that often require flights, transportation from airport to hotel, multiple meals out at restaurants, a hotel room to be shared because of high cost, lack of free breakfast or a fridge, lack of Wi-Fi), and size of meetings (i.e. the meeting's large size makes it "impersonal" and "way too overwhelming and not very welcoming").

15. Exclusion based on alcohol

The excessive consumption of alcohol during the meetings was identified as problematic. Participants often linked sexualized harassment and unwelcomed touching to intoxication of the perpetrator, whether at an event in the ASC hotel or an ASC-sponsored event offsite. A few participants reported witnessing physical violence or aggression from drunk ASC attendees.

16. Necessary action by ASC leadership

Focus group and interview respondents were fairly critical of the ASC's specific efforts to increase inclusivity—namely, they didn't think there was much outreach, nor concrete actions beyond allowing Divisions. Critiques included those provided in various sections above, such as a lack of inclusive programming at the annual meeting and a lack of clear policies and actions from ASC that demonstrate valuing diversity, equity, and inclusion. There were some pointed critiques about which groups tend to stay in power, the unwillingness to relinquish power, and the replication of structural privilege in ASC leadership historically and thus the replication of the status quo.

The time for change is now; ASC meeting attendees are yearning for more intentional actions by ASC leadership to support diversity and inclusion at the annual meetings and in the discipline. These general findings led the committee to propose a set of broad recommendations that link to action items embedded in our detailed report that follows. The overarching, broad recommendations that we propose are as follows:

Recommendations

1. Hire a DEI specialist to help ASC meet the current expectations of professional organizations, including the following:
 - a. Addressing issues of diversity, inclusion, and harassment and informing the development of policies and programs.
 - b. Providing confidential discussion and guidance at annual meetings regarding options for addressing instances of harassment and unwanted or unwelcoming behavior.
 - c. Creating a statement focused specifically on diversity and inclusion that is easily accessible directly from the ASC homepage, comparable to those seen on the homepages of other professional organizations of social scientists.
 - d. Guiding the ASC in the development of mechanisms proven to increase participation of historically excluded racial/ethnic minority groups.
 - e. Developing anti-harassment policy and the mechanism for enforcing it that is easily accessible directly from the ASC homepage.

2. Develop and institute an anti-harassment policy—encompassing sexual, gender, and racial harassment—and set of practices whereby conference attendees can report sexual and other forms of harassment to an ombudsperson or DEI specialist at the annual meeting. This policy and set of practices should include a mechanism for investigation and sanctions (especially for repeated offenses), such as barring harassers from participating in the conference, holding membership, receiving awards, etc.
 - a. Ensure these procedures are easily accessible via the ASC website, the conference app, the conference program, and on signage at the meeting. The policy should include clear information on how to report violations.
 - b. Encourage bystander intervention and reporting as an ethical obligation of membership.
 - c. Train Division chairs on the new processes.
 - d. Offer a pre-conference harassment training workshop for attendees; this could be offered by the DEI specialist.

3. Institutionalize opportunities to increase participation and access to the meetings from underrepresented groups through ASC sponsored activities, like formal mentorship of graduate students, early career scholars, and underrepresented scholars through travel grants and waivers. Certain grants and waivers could also be available to all participants.
 - a. Create additional opportunities where students can apply for travel stipends and reduced-cost or free conference registrations.
 - b. Encourage Divisions to offer competitive travel grants to international students and scholars; ASC could also provide several competitive travel grants of this nature.
 - c. Investigate hybrid presentation options for international scholars and students to present their work and participate in the conference if they cannot travel to the U.S. This option may also be helpful to facilitate the participation of various groups including students, parents, people with disabilities, and system-involved people. The hybrid option for those not attending in person may be associated with reduced registration fees.
 - d. Consider increasing funding to be able to offer more fellowships through the Ruth D. Peterson Fellowship for Racial and Ethnic Diversity and support more mentees through the associated mentoring program.
 - e. Encourage Divisions to implement formal mentoring programs based on the template of already-existing successful mentorship programs. These can include formal mentoring programs for students that pair them with more experienced students and faculty, that include mentorship prior to the meeting as well as during the meeting, thereby helping students to navigate the conference, feel integrated, and become more connected. This may be particularly important for students who are not at the large criminology/criminal justice programs.

4. Set a long-term commitment to racial and ethnic diversity (and acknowledgement of how the discipline has been complicit in white supremacy) with a series of plenaries, panels, training sessions, etc. to combat issues of racism and white supremacy.
 - a. Provide training, perhaps as a pre-meeting workshop, about anti-racism and anti-racist scholarship.
 - b. Continue attempts to diversify the ASC Executive Board and other positions of influence in the organization, as well as diversifying the content of the program and the pool of nominees and recipients of major awards.
 - c. Make transparent the processes by which people are nominated to run for office and invited to serve on standing and ad hoc committees. Consider allowing those interested in serving the ASC to self-nominate for committees and the voting slate. At present, Divisions can suggest committee members to the President-elect, but there appears to be no mechanism for members outside of Divisions to volunteer for ASC committees.

5. Improve the physical accessibility and social components of ASC meetings and sponsored events.
 - a. Provide ASL interpreters, closed captioning, and microphones.
 - b. All offsite functions should be held at locations that are ADA compliant.
 - c. Designate a quiet room, a room with seating intended for conversations, and all-gender restrooms at every ASC conference.
 - d. Hire a consultant with expertise in accessibility to attend the ASC 2022 meeting to evaluate accessibility and make a list of other areas for improvement.
 - e. Provide more options for socialization and networking that are alcohol-free.

Part I. Review of Statements, Policies, and Procedures Used in Other Professional Organizations to Promote DEI and Welcoming Behavior at Meetings

The committee selected a set of national professional organizations and gathered information from the websites of these organizations, as well as through some communications with professional staff of the organizations. The group of organizations that we studied were as follows: American Economic Association (AEA), American Political Science Association (APSA), American Psychological Association (APA), American Sociological Association (ASA), American Educational Research Association (AERA), and the Population Association of America (PAA). We selected these organizations because they represent cognate social science fields and yet cover content distinct from criminology. These organizations vary greatly in size, and most have much larger memberships than ASC. Yet, these are the other organizations of social scientists to which many of our members have ties, and we believed they represented good candidates for gathering information that would be informative to ASC.

We found at the outset that many of the organizations have general policies and activities surrounding diversity, inclusion, and harassment rather than having policies that apply only to behavior at meetings. As a result, we first considered the general statements and activities of the organizations and then turned to focus on policies, procedures, and resources addressing inclusion and anti-harassment specific to professional meetings. We determined that the broader context was important information for the ASC Executive Board, and is important for contextualizing specific policies, procedures, and resources specific to meetings. Please see **Appendix A** for detailed information and links to specific information. **Table 1** includes summary information about what is available at each organization that we studied. Below, we discuss highlights from our review of each of the following:

- Statements about diversity, inclusion, and harassment, including definition
- Task forces regarding diversity, inclusion, or harassment
- Standing committees pertaining to diversity, inclusion, or harassment
- Code of conduct at meetings, reporting procedures, and sanctions for violation
- Trained professional staff devoted to a focus on diversity, inclusion, and harassment

We report some highlighted findings below and offer recommendations for ASC to consider.

A. Trained professional staff devoted to a focus on diversity, inclusion and harassment

Most of the organizations reviewed employ a professional staff person specializing in diversity, equity, and inclusion. (See Table 1.) The larger organizations often have multiple staff; the smaller have fewer or one staff person. This staff person provides many benefits to the organizations that we reviewed. The position offers organizations expertise and education about DEI issues, Title IX, ADA, harassment complaints, etc. The DEI staff person also can address issues as they arise at meetings, with discretion and protecting anonymity (e.g., ASA's alternative to an ombudsperson at meetings). The DEI staff help to prepare materials that focus on diversity, inclusion, and harassment that are distributed by the organizations, and advise on

best ways to present the information on websites. Moreover, the DEI staff person serves as a resource to members, sections/divisions, and the organization's leadership for promoting DEI in the organization generally and for helping to respond to issues when they arise. Our view is that the employment of a DEI specialist by ASC will be instrumental for helping the organization to address the issues raised in this report.

Action Item: Hire a DEI specialist to help address current issues of diversity, inclusion, and harassment and to inform the development of policies and programs.

B. Statements about diversity, inclusion, and harassment

Most of the websites of professional organizations that we examined include clear, accessible, and easy to locate language regarding DEI and harassment. (See Appendix A.) This information often featured prominently on the organization's homepages, such as in a tab at the top of the page or in a location that was otherwise easy to locate on the homepage. In short, many of the organizations have entire areas of their websites devoted to DEI. See, for example, the homepages of the American Economic Association (<https://www.aeaweb.org/>), American Sociological Association (<https://www.asanet.org/>), and American Political Science Association (<https://www.apsanet.org/>).

The American Economic Association, a large and well-funded organization, devotes a major portion of its website, prominently displayed on its homepage (<https://www.aeaweb.org/>), to *Best Practices for Economists: Building a More Diverse, Inclusive, and Productive Profession*. The materials posted under their "view best practices" link/button are impressive (<https://www.aeaweb.org/resources/best-practices>). Clearly, the AEA has devoted significant resources to develop an extensive set of materials. These materials now are publicly available and can be instructive to study if ASC were to decide to build a section of its webpage devoted to diversity and inclusion. We also can learn from the materials posted on the other organizations' websites, as well.

In terms of a succinct yet comprehensive statement about the importance of diversity and inclusion, the American Sociological Association (ASA) includes the following statement on their website (<https://www.asanet.org/about/governance-and-leadership/diversity-statement>):

The American Sociological Association is committed to recruiting, investing in, and empowering a diverse membership with an equitable and welcoming environment for all. This includes people of various cultures, ages, races, ethnicities, sexual orientations, gender identities, socioeconomic statuses, religions, physical or mental abilities, and political affiliations, as well as first generation students and faculty members. This also includes people from all employment statuses and types of employment. As a national association, we place value on dismantling power inequalities. We engage and respect diverse experiences through all our programmatic activities and in the business of the Association.

Our committee notes that the ASC does not currently have a statement on diversity and inclusion that is easily accessible on the website. The ASC Code of Conduct does include embedded references to the importance of DEI. Our review showed that most of the other organizations that we studied had well-developed statements or entire sections of websites specifically devoted to DEI. Moreover, the ASC Code of Ethics document is extremely difficult to locate. Currently to access it, one must navigate as follows: From the homepage, go to “About ASC,” from there go to “Core Documents” and then select “Code of Ethics” (https://asc41.com/wp-content/uploads/Core_Documents/ASC_Code_of_Ethics.pdf). Our committee concurred that unless one is very familiar with the website of ASC, the code is difficult to locate.

While our committee is charged with focusing on diversity, inclusion, and harassment at ASC meetings, we note that most other organizations embed their efforts to address problems at meetings within a broader context of a statement on DEI in the organization. As such, we offer a recommendation that goes beyond the scope of our charge but seems critical for creating a broader context for shaping policy and practices at meetings.

Action Item: Consider creating a “best practices for building a more diverse and inclusive profession” area of the ASC website, that is clearly visible on the homepage.

Action Item: Create a statement focused specifically on diversity and inclusion that is easily accessible directly from the ASC homepage.

C. Task force reports pertaining to DEI and harassment

Many professional organizations have commissioned task force reports regarding diversity, equity, and inclusion over the past ten to fifteen years. A review of the many task forces that have been sponsored is beyond our scope. However, we offer an example here that focuses on the national meetings. In 2005, the American Psychological Association created the APA Presidential Task Force on Enhancing Diversity, which was charged with increasing APA’s welcomeness to diverse groups at the conference and for developing models for reconciling differences between diverse groups (<https://www.apa.org/pi/oema/resources/taskforce-report.pdf>.) This report largely evaluated the history of APA and how it has (or has not) addressed inclusiveness and diversity, highlighted some specific problems at the conference, and made a list of priorities over time with associated cost. For instance, members of the task force documented that at the conference programs sponsored by or informed by marginalized groups are often scheduled opposite one another, scheduled opposite some other major APA event, or scheduled the last day of conference precluding access to the programming meant to promote inclusiveness. We note that focus group participants experienced similar scheduling conflicts regarding these types of programming at the ASC annual meeting as well.

D. Standing committees pertaining to DEI and harassment

Ethics Committees: Every organization studied has a standing committee on professional ethics, as does ASC. The charge to several of these ethics committees includes addressing concerns of conduct with regard to DEI and harassment. As such, we include a very brief (and incomplete) discussion of the scope and powers of standing ethics committees.

Most of the ethics committees that we examined have a broader charge than that of the ASC Ethics Committee. Some allow for the ethics committee to investigate and sanction unprofessional behavior (including harassment), which is the case for the American Psychological Association and the American Economic Association. Others appear to hear complaints and grievances, such as the American Political Science Association (see <https://www.apsanet.org/portals/54/Files/Publications/APSAEthicsGuide2012.pdf>).

The American Sociological Association's Committee on Professional Ethics (COPE) appears to have a more limited scope than these organizations, with a charge as follows (<https://www.asanet.org/about/governance-and-leadership/ethics>):

The Committee on Professional Ethics is responsible for promoting ethical conduct by sociologists through educational activities for members. It also navigates complaints of violations of the Code of Ethics as per policies and procedures adopted by Council, makes recommendations for proposed changes to the Code of Ethics, and addresses other matters as requested from time to time by Council. However, ASA also has other policies and committees that operate alongside the ethics committee, including an [anti-harassment policy](#), [ethics disclosure policies](#), an [awards revocation policy](#), and a [policy on removal from leadership positions](#) (<https://www.asanet.org/about/governance-and-leadership/ethics/association-ethics-policies>).

When comparing the scope statements of the various ethics committees, we found that ASC's Ethics Committee seems to have the most limited scope, with the following committee (see charge (<https://asc41.com/about-asc/committees/committee-charges-reporting-schedules/>):

The Ethics Committee serves to educate members with respect to ethical expectations, general principals, and standards as detailed in the society's Code of Ethics. Such education, among others, may be accomplished by placing articles in the Society newsletters and on the Society website, organizing conference session and workshops, and advertising the Annual Meeting Code of Conduct. The Chair of this Committee shall serve as the Chair of the Program Committee Ethics Area. In that capacity, they will be responsible to organize sessions and possible workshops at the Annual Meetings that deal with ethics-related issues.

Other standing committees pertaining to DEI and harassment: Most of the professional organizations that we examined each have several committees that address issues of diversity, inclusion, and harassment. (See Table 1.) These committees are often focused on issues in the organization more generally and thus speak to broader organizational and professional context, although at times, they explicitly address activities and behaviors at professional meetings. The organizations' websites clearly state the role and charges of these committees. (In some cases, the names and contact information of members or staff liaisons for committee are listed.)

The listing of committees and links can be found in Appendix A, along with links to information on each committee. As such, we do not review these committees here but note the range of committee foci: status of race and ethnic minorities in the profession; status of LGBTQ+ people; status of women; status of persons with disabilities; sexual harassment.

These various committees are important to fostering an inclusive climate at professional meetings because they bring issues of concern to leadership. These committees also are instrumental in creating and offering services, workshops, and webinars around DEI issues to the larger membership. Currently, these activities in ASC operate within the Divisions, which may result in less access to all members.

Action Item: Consider broadening ASC’s committees focused on diversity and inclusion and/or clarify the scope and increase resources available to the Committee on Diversity and Inclusion to support their activities.

E. Code of Conduct at Meetings

The other organizations that we examined all post a code of conduct either in general, and/or specific to professional meetings on their websites (see Table 1). Several of the organizations clearly state the types of behavior that are expected and/or will not be tolerated at meetings. Most of the codes note that attendees are representing their field at the meetings, that expectations of professionals in the field hold for behavior at meetings, and refer to their broader codes of conduct in the profession. Some codes of conduct pertaining to meetings clearly define the audience -- attendees, caterers, book sellers, staff, etc. Some note expected behavior for those who witness harassment. We offer summaries and links to examples of codes of conduct specific to professional meetings, below. (See Appendix A for details and additional links.)

Population Association of America, <https://www.populationassociation.org/paa-2021/paa2021-reg-info/anti-harassment-policy>, which includes a statement about the purpose of professional meetings, focus on creating diversity in the scientific workforce, explicit statements about the costs of harassment, and a statement that PAA considers harassment to be a serious form of professional misconduct. It defines harassment clearly with examples. It then lists expected behaviors, including calls to members to be proactive bystanders and to alert security personnel or law enforcement in the case of imminent physical danger.

American Political Science Association, <https://connect.apsanet.org/apsa2020/code-of-conduct/>, which includes (a) a statement of the anti-harassment policy for annual meeting attendees, (b) a specific list of behaviors that are expected of attendees, including being proactive in mitigating harm and alerting conference or security personnel in the case of imminent physical danger, (c) a thorough description of unacceptable behaviors (see listing) and (d) a discussion of sanctions for violation.

American Sociological Association, <https://www.asanet.org/2019-asa-annual-meeting-anti-harassment-policy>, which similarly includes a statement of the problem of harassment, statement of expected behaviors at meetings/ancillary events including a call to intervene to mitigate harm or alert security in the case of imminent physical danger, a detailed definition of unacceptable behaviors, and reporting mechanisms (i.e., to the executive director with contact provided or the director of meeting services with contact provided).

The above are excellent examples of anti-harassment policies that are easily accessible to membership on the organizations' websites. They contain many overlapping elements and could guide ASC's development of a similar policy. The other organizations (e.g., AEA, APA, AERA) include specific reference to professional meetings in their extensive sections of websites devoted to DEI and harassment, as noted and linked in Appendix A. ASC currently does not have an anti-harassment policy pertaining to meetings.

All of the other organizations have clear and confidential reporting mechanisms that are transparently conveyed to the membership. (See Table 1.) ASC stands alone by not having a clear and publicized process for reporting complaints. This lack of a clear reporting process is highlighted in the discussion of findings from our focus groups and interviews. Appendix A contains detailed information and links to material on the range of reporting procedures within the other organizations. Several organizations that we examined offer access to an ombudsperson at the national meetings in discreet locations (e.g., APSA, AERA). Ombudspersons are not mandatory reporters, discussions are confidential, and ombudspersons typically listen, record, and advise about options. An alternative used by the American Sociological Association is to have trained staff present at the meetings to assist, advise and discuss confidentially (i.e., DEI officer); ASA also allows for formal reporting to their Committee on Professional Ethics (COPE). The Population Association of America directs persons to report to Title IX officers at the offender's university.

All organizations except PAA and ASC appear to allow for sanctions of some form (see Table 1 and Appendix A). These sanctions are very diverse and not always clear, ranging from reprimand, to withdrawal of awards, to withdrawal of membership; the latter, however, seems only possible in the largest organizations after formal processing (AEA, AERA, APA).

Action Item: Develop an anti-harassment policy and a mechanism for enforcing the policy, including sanctions. Post the policy prominently on the ASC website. The policy should include clear information on how to report violations. Consider including encouragement of bystander intervention and reporting as an ethical obligation of membership.

Action Item: Conduct further fact-finding with other professional organizations to learn more about the committees and processes used to investigate and respond to reports of misconduct, as well as possible sanctions for determined misconduct. Consider developing an investigation process and potential for sanctions within the ASC.

Action Item: Offer the services of an ombudsperson (or DEI officer) at annual meetings to offer confidential discussion and guidance regarding options for addressing instances of harassment and unwanted or unwelcoming behavior.

Table 1. Summary of DEI and or Harrassment in Organizations and at Annual Meetings

Organization	DEI and/or Harrassment in Organization			DEI and/or Harrassment at Annual Meeting		
	<i>Ethics Code on Website</i>	<i>Standing Committee(s)</i>	<i>Paid DEI Staff Person</i>	<i>Clear DEI/Harass Policy</i>	<i>Procedures for Reporting</i>	<i>Possible Sanctions Listed</i>
AEA	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes, Ombuds	Yes
AERA	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes, Ombuds	Yes
APA	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
APSA	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes, Ombuds	Yes
ASC	Yes	Yes	No	No#	Not documented	No
ASA	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
PAA	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes, Title IX	No

Notes. IX=Encourage report to IX officer; Ombuds=Report to Ombudsperson
 ## Embedded in Code of Conduct statement but more geneal and less well-developed than any other.
 Note: Ombudspersons are not mandatory reporters. They typically listen, record, and advise about options.

Part II. Findings from Focus Groups and Interviews of ASC Annual Meeting Attendees

A. FOCUS GROUP AND INTERVIEW METHODS

In summer 2020, the focus groups subcommittee conducted 16 focus groups with various groups of ASC attendees. The focus group procedures were based on the charge to the committee, which was:

This committee will assess the issue of climate at ASC Meetings and Sponsored Events. Climate may be understood to include participant experiences with and perceptions of barriers to inclusiveness, mutual respect and civility in the conference environment. The committee will be particularly attentive to issues experienced by women, scholars of color, LGBTQ+ scholars and student members. The ad hoc committee will work to assess barriers to inclusivity at ASC meetings and sponsored events, and will propose steps to enhance inclusivity, respect and civility at future meetings and events.

Our subcommittee expanded our scope to include additional groups that we perceived to have unique insights about barriers to inclusivity at ASC meetings and sponsored events. Two of our focus groups were with Division Chairs, as they may be in a position to address particular issues related to participants’ experiences at the ASC meeting. The other 14 focus groups were comprised of: Women (3 groups); African Americans (2 groups); Asians and Asian Americans (1 group); Latina/o/x individuals (1 group); international students and scholars (1 group); LGBQ individuals (1 group); trans and non-binary people (1 group); students (2 groups); people with disabilities (1 group); and “other/general” participants (1 group). We also intended to have a group for individuals who were formerly system involved and a group for staff (such as directors or advisors), but these were not held due to participant cancellation/low attendance.

In order to generate participants, we sent an invitation to the ASC membership in August 2020 inviting individuals who had attended ASC meetings to sign up for pre-scheduled focus groups throughout late summer. We encouraged forwarding to various listservs to maximize participant diversity. The sign-up Google form also included demographic questions that participants could opt out of. We collected email addresses to provide participants with zoom links to their scheduled focus group. Potential participants could provide their availability for multiple focus groups, although after distributing participants across groups, only a few individuals were sent links for more than one focus group. Perhaps because of the timing (summer, nearing the beginning of fall semester 2020 during a global pandemic and historical moment also characterized by civil unrest and several natural disasters), we had considerable attrition between the focus group sign-up and actual focus group participation. There were 56 participants in these focus groups. We are unable to connect specific demographic information to those who actually participated in focus groups; however, we note that nothing should be assumed about the overall demographics of a particular group beyond its major organizing characteristic. More specifically, although some groups held constant one characteristic (like race or gender), there was variation across all other social characteristics within each group. This means that the majority of groups had considerable in-group diversity and were made up of people of various genders, sexual orientations, races/ethnicities, career stages, and so forth.

In fall 2020, one-on-one interviews were conducted with 25 individuals who could not attend the focus groups for logistical reasons (e.g., time zones, prior commitments) or who did not want to share their experiences in a group interview setting. This phase of data collection was conducted by a group of doctoral students supervised by committee co-chair Jennifer Cobbina-Dungy. Our subcommittee also reviewed detailed written comments from two individuals who were unable to be interviewed. These additional interviews and responses bolstered representation from all groups of interest to the focus groups subcommittee.

Our focus group interview instrument was drawn from the elements provided in our charge, such as asking participants about the ways they felt included and/or excluded at the meetings; respected and/or disrespected; barriers to inclusivity; instances of exclusion or harassment experienced by groups we focused on; sexual harassment; ASC climate change over time; and recommendations they had for making the meetings more inclusive, respectful, and civil, both for people in their identity group and for all attendees. These questions were modified somewhat for the Division Chairs focus groups, and additional questions were asked in the one-on-one interviews related to these themes.

All focus groups and interviews were audio recorded and then transcribed. During the focus groups, we asked participants to change their zoom screen name to display a pseudonym and their pronouns so that we would be able to refer to each other appropriately and respectfully during the focus group and in the report. Focus groups and interview transcripts were coded for themes, which generated the illustrative quotes presented here. Whenever feasible, the finding or specific quote is attributed to its origin, whether from a specific focus group, the one-on-one interviews, or the detailed comments. Attribution appears as a very short descriptor of the group in parentheses following the information, such as: “quote” (Interviews) or *finding* (Women 2).

B. FINDINGS

Inclusion through representation

A key theme throughout the focus group and interview findings was ASC's changing demographics over time and the positive implications respondents felt these had. Many focus groups and interviews noted the increases in women, people of color, LGBTQ+ people, younger people, students, and international scholars and students, among others. One interview participant commented, "representation matters, we know this." Indeed, seeing diversity in leadership positions within ASC, leadership positions with ASC Divisions, and in other major roles such as journal editors helped participants feel like they had a place at the ASC meetings.

Further, a majority of focus groups discussed the fact that the perception of ASC as comprised primarily of older, white male scholars is damaging to the organization, its members, and meeting attendees. Importantly, improving diversity over time has allowed more voices to be heard (Division Chairs 2), partly by acknowledging the range of identities, perspectives, and approaches to studying issues of crime and justice (Division Chairs 1). One respondent noted that "it's important to our students coming up that they see people that look like them in positions of leadership in the academy and in publishing in [highly-ranked journals] and having positions on [the ASC Executive Board], making decisions. And being a voice" (Interviews).

Along these lines, there was encouragement for ASC leadership to "make a strong effort to include a broad range of people" on committees (General), as well as to make procedures related to voting, serving on committees, or even working one's way up to administration more transparent to members such that more members could participate (Women 2). This is related to the ASC annual meeting climate because the President, Program Co-Chairs, and Executive Committee are responsible for many of the decisions related to the meeting's theme, featured programming, speakers, and so forth. Broadly, a diverse leadership slate helps set the tone for a diverse group of people to feel welcomed at the meetings. One interviewee remarked, "seeing leaders represented, who fit my identities, makes me feel more included and I would imagine other people like me would feel that way." Below, we discuss issues of exclusion when the ASC annual meeting program does not reflect diverse voices and the leadership slate is homogeneous.

Action Item: Make transparent the processes by which people are nominated to run for office and invited to serve on standing and ad hoc committees. Consider allowing those interested in serving the ASC to self-nominate for committees and the voting slate. At present, Divisions can suggest committee members to the President-elect, but there appears to be no mechanism for members outside of Divisions to volunteer for ASC committees.

Inclusion through ASC Divisions

A primary way that our respondents felt included was through their involvement in ASC's Divisions. Divisions specifically mentioned included the Division on People of Color and Crime, the Division on Women and Crime, the Division on Queer Criminology, the Division on Convict Criminology, the Division on International Criminology, the Division on Critical Criminology

and Social Justice, and the Division of Victimology. It is likely not a coincidence that many of these Divisions provide intentional support to the same folks who may experience exclusion in the discipline. For example, respondents noted that “I wouldn’t say I felt like I had a home [at ASC] until my involvement with DPCC” (African American 2), “I think I get the most respect and recognition ... in the Divisions” (Women 3), the experience of being among fellow Division members is “sustaining” (Interviews), and that Divisions “just felt like a decent, safe intellectually stimulating, ethical place to be” (Interviews). These feelings were related not just to substantive concerns, but to identity-based considerations as well, with many participants noting that they joined Divisions to be able to meet and talk with people who look like them and may share their experiences and values. Take this example from the Trans/Non-binary focus group:

You have a place to go where you know that there will be people who look like you, and panels to go where you’re going to hear research that’s relevant to you and to the research that you do (if you do that research); and that attendees there will be welcoming.

Divisions also provided an avenue for students to get involved, hold office, and serve on committees (Interviews), which is not always available to them within the larger ASC organizational framework. Their mentoring and networking components were also valued, as discussed below.

Admittedly, ASC’s Divisions are not perfect, with focus group participants noting that the issues in ASC more broadly are replicated in the Divisions (Women 2), that Divisions can contribute to certain voices and ideas—such as critical ones—being siloed from the mainstream (General), that Division participation can be seen as “self-segregation” (Disabilities), and there can be rifts within otherwise “welcoming” Divisions about whose voices matter (LGBQ). Further, respondents did not want the issue of inclusion to be seen as settled from the ASC organizational leadership:

I sometimes wonder [whether] ASC leadership feels that since we have these Divisions and they’re sponsoring these panels, we’ve done all we need to do, you know, on race, and people of color and issues of gender and gender identity. And so, sometimes the Divisions can be the best thing in terms of inclusiveness, but also can be the excuse for not doing more in general. (Women 2)

A clarifying point made was that the creation of Divisions and other subdivisions are perhaps reflective of ASC’s growing size and shifting demographics, but not necessarily a shift toward the meetings and ASC becoming more welcoming. For example, one participant asserted, “I think in some ways we probably have the same exclusive practices that we did 15 years ago, but we just have a bigger membership now” (Asian). One Division Chair noted that “we’ve sometimes had a tendency to sort of like compartmentalize, which Divisions are ... almost like assigned the responsibility for certain problems ... it shouldn’t be like the DWC worries about gender and the DPCC worries about race [while other Divisions and leadership do not]” and furthermore that diversity, equity, and inclusion should be ASC-wide values and considered under the purview of all areas of ASC to help solve problems (Division Chairs 1).

Action Item: Continue to support the development of Divisions at ASC but offer support, particularly for DEI initiatives, within Divisions to facilitate inclusion.

Action Item: Ask each Division to articulate their efforts to facilitate DEI and reduce harassment as part of their yearly reports to the ASC Executive Board.

Inclusion through mentorship and networking

Whether it was through Divisions, events, or networks within ASC, formal and informal mentoring helped respondents feel included and valued. Participants noted the benefits of formal mentoring programs through Divisions (Students 2) and other member-created Associations, which help orient students and early career scholars generally but especially if they are also contending with other concerns related to career development or transition, such as being a first generation student or professor (Latina/o/x) or an international student or faculty member (Asian). The Ruth D. Peterson Fellowship for Racial and Ethnic Diversity was mentioned specifically as a positive program that is critical for the success of students and scholars of color (Latina/o/x). The willingness of more senior students and scholars willing to network was also regarded very positively (Students 1), with some noting that this made the difference between staying in ASC and moving on to other professional organizations (General).

Action Item: Consider increasing funding to be able to offer more fellowships through the Ruth D. Peterson Fellowship for Racial and Ethnic Diversity and support more mentees through the associated mentoring program, currently directed by Professor Peterson.

Action Item: Encourage Divisions to implement formal mentoring programs based on the template of already-existing successful mentorship programs.

Exclusion based on type of work or institution and disrespect

The words elitist/elitism made many appearances in participants' responses, as well as a general description of a sense of exclusion based on their identities. Participants stated that they felt that certain kinds of scholarship, institutional homes, and service were devalued in the organization, making them feel less welcomed at meetings. Specific issues noted relevant to fit and placement on the ASC meeting program included: a disciplinary "preference for quantitative" versus qualitative approaches (Women 3), especially valuing "fancy stats" and "sophisticated designs," according to Interview participants; being "very male, very American" focused (International); and "critical approaches feel sort of 'fringe' at ASC" (General); all of which can result in ill-fitting placement for any work deemed "fringe" and thus poor attendance for panels and low engagement with the work (Comment). Importantly, these issues are then replicated in the "gold standard journals" of the field regarding what is seen as "legitimate" or "good research," with one focus group participant stating that "ASC is the driver" of this (LGBQ). Similarly, an interviewee suggested that the goal of the ASC meeting was to "share research, but only specific types of research." In this way, the ASC meeting replicates the "inclusion ailments" of the discipline (African American 1), "exhibits what happens in the discipline" (Women 1), and "functions to reproduce inequality" (Asian). One respondent remarked, "unless we actually have ... effort to try to create those balances of power and voice within the field, then you're going to

just continue to have power imbalances evidenced in the experiences at ASC [meetings]” (African American 1).

Multiple respondents used the phrase “old boys’ club” to refer to who they perceived to be selected for committees, selected for the election slate of officers, and more likely to win lifetime achievement awards (the latter of which is absolutely undeniable based on a review of the winners of the ASC’s lifetime achievement awards).

These issues were most evident in who gets selected for high-visibility sessions on the ASC program, such as the ASC Presidential Panels and other featured events, with focus group participants and interviewees consistently lamenting the lack of diversity, such that scholars selected are often from high-ranking research institutions, senior scholars, male, and white, and that they are “the same people” asked over and over (Division Chairs 1). Some of these decisions are fully within the ASC leadership’s control—as they design these sessions directly—and should be attended to: “that lack of representation ... whether it’s conscious or not, you kind of get a sense [that] some people’s work is more important than others” (Interviews).

There was also the devaluation that respondents felt based on their identities, whether as women, people of color, LGBTQ+ people, international students and scholars, students, people with disabilities, or formerly-incarcerated people. These concerns and others are discussed in later sections of this report.

Respondents also perceived disrespect regarding their institutions, with them reporting others’ lack of willingness to engage with them if they are coming from a teaching university (Asian) or community college (African American 2), or from non-academic jobs or non-profit organizations (Women 1). This manifests in a relative lack of panels on pedagogy (African American 2) and a relative lack of receptivity to discussing scholarship’s connections with activism, equity, or social justice (General).

Action Item: To facilitate diverse featured sessions, ASC Presidents should utilize the Diversity and Inclusion Annual Meeting Planning Guide created by the Committee on Diversity and Inclusion.

Action Item: Convene an ad hoc committee to suggest mechanisms for ASC to cultivate a climate of mutual respect among meeting participants.

Exclusion experienced by women

Displays of disrespect were evident in conversations at the meetings and during panels. Common themes included male scholars not looking women in the eyes but making eye contact with other men (Women 2), addressing women by their first names while using honorifics and titles for men (African American 1), or being hugged or touched without their consent by male peers who have not considered the implication of their behavior, even if they are otherwise progressive (Interviews). Issues of being disregarded were especially problematic for younger women scholars and women students, who were not approached, “turned away,” or “dismissed” because

of ageist and sexist assumptions that “you must not be that important” (Students 2); similarly, young-looking women were assumed to be students (Women 1).

These displays of disrespect continue in the panel sessions at the ASC meeting. Women reported, “I’ve been on presentations where I’ve just been outright dismissed by male panelists or males in the audience,” such as being asked to relinquish her time to the other presenters (Women 2) or not being given the same amount of time as other presenters, with no extra time or apologies offered (Interviews). One woman powerfully asked, “why would I even bother to be at the conference when I don’t have to be, if the entire time I’m literally being looked over or looked past?” (Women 2). Women reported being “mansplained” about their own presentations or areas of expertise (Interviews). There were also inaccurate assumptions made about who had ownership of the presentation, with queries being directed to male coauthors, causing this respondent to wonder if she should modify her own comportment:

I think the number of times that I’ve presented a paper and had always senior white males direct questions to my male second author who is sitting in the audience ... that’s happened to me three or four times. And, you know, you go back to your room and I have great male co-authors and they say, “gee, what a jerk,” and most of them have learned just to say, “hey there, she’s the presenter—”, and they’ve learned how to deal with it. I have good allies around me but, good grief, right? I mean, it’s just such a violation and then you think well, did I come off too passive, or did I come off like the person who didn’t run the analysis, or did I kind of ... it sort of makes you have these questions about yourself that that are unpleasant. (Women 1)

This issue can be complicated by perceptions of the research women were presenting on. Research on women and gender was devalued, as well as specifically feminist research (Women 3), with one woman saying she has frequently heard “the gender harassment of belittling” women presenters’ research topics during the poster session (Interviews). Because of misogyny and anti-feminist cultural attitudes, men may erroneously feel that they cannot conduct this type of research; one male interviewee said of feminist criminology, “as a cis-white male I didn’t have a place in that community, in that body of research” (Interviews).

Furthermore, the aforementioned “Old boys’ club” at ASC has meant that “There didn’t seem to be any room for anyone else to shine, except maybe the students of the big dogs,” as “inclusivity was never the game they were playing” (Comment); another observed, “it’s like these guys sit there waiting for you to come and start groveling over them” (Interviews). A related perspective was that “If you’re not doing work that aligns directly with theirs and want to collaborate with them—and by collaborate, I mean do the work for them and publish with them—or you are not, kind of, all ‘fangirl’ over that then the reception is chilly” (Interviews). One woman went so far as to say that “even though there’s been women in roles of leadership in that Division, those women are often, in my opinion, treated like the help” (Interviews), but women in other Divisions with high proportions of women members highlighted efforts “to mentor that next generation and try and deal with some of the [lack of] inclusiveness” (Women 3). While there is a “greater acceptance” and growing likelihood of women holding leadership roles in ASC, they too are typically from top-ranked programs (Women 3).

Sexist assumptions related to personal/private matters were also evident. When speaking with women, other attendees felt entitled to give them romantic advice and family planning advice—such as about who to marry and have children with, or to not have children (Interviews), or made heteronormative assumptions that women attendees are married to men (LGBQ). Regarding being pregnant at the ASC Annual Meeting, one respondent reflected: “I was reluctant to share that I was pregnant in general, but especially at the meeting. This relates to what I think is the overall problematic messaging around motherhood and academia and sexism rampant in the field” (Comment), such as beliefs that a woman’s career essentially ends when she has children (Interviews).

The issue of disparate treatment of women was something that respondents wanted more accountability and intentionality from ASC leadership, especially since the issue had been brought to their attention via various mechanisms: “after a certain point, like, many avenues have come back to ASC and told them: ‘there’s an issue with inclusivity’; ‘there’s an issue with the disparate treatment of women.’ Like, at a certain point, asking the question again, actually *that* reveals something, that says something, right? The fact that you even have to ask it” (African American 1). Even among women who felt they had been treated with respect, they heard from women colleagues who felt they had not been (International). Some male respondents had been asked to stand next to or escort women colleagues or students because they felt unsafe (International); the feeling of unsafety is likely highly gendered, and will be revisited in the Sexual Harassment section.

Action Item: Recommendations related to reducing disrespect during panels were to have panel Chairs email participants ahead of time to communicate expectations clearly and to actually cut off speakers who go over time.

Action Items relevant to sexual harassment and gendered exclusion can be found below.

Exclusion experienced by people of color

Exclusion experienced by students and scholars of color at the ASC annual meetings is perpetuated in part by broader issues within the discipline. For example, many criminologists have built their careers and profited from research on young Black men (Students 1), mainstream criminological work contributes to criminalization of people of color and is resistant to anti-racist critique (Trans/Non-binary), and goals such as prison abolition or police defunding may not be compatible with the ways many criminologists pursue their work (African American 2). One participant called racism at the ASC conference “the elephant in the room” (African American 1), because it is allowed to continue with seemingly little intervention. An oft-mentioned example was the way race and crime are discussed at the meetings, “where too many times I’ve heard presentations where things that were certainly racist and offensive were said just as if it was like: ‘It’s raining outside’ ... just said so matter-of-factly” (African American 1). Some participants felt that this created pressure for scholars of color to challenge the comments made, but this could put “a target on your back”; participants wanted allies to speak up and challenge racist comments made: “As a Black woman, that is very disheartening ... [and] puts a sour taste in my mouth about the field, the conference and whatever panel I’m on, just having people in the room stay silent” (African American 1).

Another common critique we heard was that scholars of color—particularly Black scholars—felt siloed at the ASC meeting. When stepping out of spaces like DPCC events or other inclusive groups, “it’s actually quite jarring ... the lack of diversity at the [ASC] meeting, as far as people of color,” which respondents thought was partly driven by broader forces of exclusivity relating to the meeting itself and who can attend (Division Chairs 1), including economic marginality (African American 1). Because of the necessity of networking with other Black scholars, respondents in various focus groups and interviews felt like they had to choose between an event specifically intended for scholars of color and other events that might also provide them opportunities, which felt exclusionary to them because non-Black people rarely have to make this choice. Furthermore, there was a perception that DPCC does not get “the same type of respect and/or resources as some of the other divisions in ASC,” and that because so many other spaces “are still driven by whiteness” and “because knowing that ASC is an isolating experience for people of color means that DPCC for example, *should* have more resources to make sure that that’s not happening” (African American 1). Participants identified the DPCC as “inclusive” and “a safe space” (Interviews), where one respondent mentioned being able to “formally create a space” that not only celebrated Blackness, but that was “purposefully inclusive” and “very purposefully amplifying a lot of voices and talents in the area” (Interviews). Participants wanted more recognition for DPCC’s important work and diverse panels (Women 2). When Divisions are not intentionally inclusive it can feel “alienating” (African American 1), especially when scholars of color are told by white scholars that in incidents of racism they “didn’t think it was racism” (Women 2) or “didn’t see any racism ... so it wasn’t there” (African American 1). Additionally, there is a lack of a transparent process to evaluate these incidents (African American 1), including at the meetings.

Racist stereotypes and language foster an “exclusionary tenor and undertone to things” that “can be very nuanced and very subtle,” such as a senior white scholar acting dismissively (African American 1) or the work of Black scholars being discounted or even unacknowledged (African American 2). One participant mentioned a range of exclusionary experiences, such as being mistaken for hotel staff and being addressed by first name instead of Dr. or Professor as others were (African American 1). One way to combat a number of issues discussed was to actively cultivate the participation of Black scholars and other scholars of color on major panels and events; focus group and interview participants wanted to hear Black voices and perspectives, and for Black scholars to be treated as the experts they are (African American 2). A participant explained, “if ASC fails to acknowledge that [the expertise and work of Black scholars] going forward, I think that’s a very clear message to the many Black scholars that are doing the work about what you really think about their place in the world, and their place in particular in this organization” (African American 2) and thus at the ASC annual meeting. Several participants were very disappointed in the ASC’s actions, as one respondent asserted, “It just seems to me that the overall picture of who comprises ASC as an organization does not necessarily promote or highlight scholars of color” (African American 2). Likewise, another believed: “I think when it comes to race, ASC doesn’t care. And I don’t know if it’s because they don’t realize they don’t care? Or because they truly just don’t care. But it is not a space, in my opinion, for people of color and especially for women of color” (Women 2). Participants wondered if the ASC had formal mechanisms for people of color to “acquire prestige” and “be in the rooms where powerful decisions are made” (LGBQ).

Asian and Asian American scholars similarly felt excluded by the discipline such that they created their own panels to be inclusive. They also have created Associations within the ASC, because they did not feel like they had opportunities to collaborate: “I have been feeling like I’m falling behind because I’m not included ... I just feel like an outsider” (Asian). In contrast, one interviewee reflected that “when you see yourself being represented in the panels ... I felt very welcomed in that way. Included” (Interviews). Asian and Asian American participants noted issues with regard to the experiences of international students and scholars, which are discussed in that section below.

A lack of representation for Latina/o/x scholars also meant that they were not sure who to network with or how to “find their niche” in terms of connecting with other Latina/o/x scholars. For example, one Latina graduate student said, “I feel welcomed, overall,” but specified not having found “a safe space” for Latinas in the discipline (Latina/o/x). Further, the “huge, huge conference” with its own “culture” makes this more challenging to navigate. A more senior scholar noted, “if a student were to come up to me and saying she’s first generation Latinx student ... besides me providing her my own advice ... there’s only a handful of people I would point her out to, largely due to the under representation. It’s well known” (Latina/o/x). Another participant summarized the issue as such:

One of the things that I can tell you is that there’s—as a Latino—there’s so few of us at the meetings ... many of my friends of color are predominantly people who end up having to kind of clique up, and kind of hang out together. ... I don’t know if that’s because there’s a sense of marginalization or exclusion from the outside, or whether or not that’s a representation of the fact that we just want to be near those who are kind of like ourselves. Like, where we have a shared common language and a common culture ... I don’t know how much that is a self-selection versus the feeling of exclusion. I can tell you that me being the person that I am, I don’t feel comfortable going up to a group of older White scholars ... I don’t feel like I belong there. (Disabilities)

Scholars wanted more “transparency” regarding which “opportunities ... are being developed” that are more inclusive and welcoming, as the organization’s shifting demographics mean “there’s going to be definitely a gap in what ASC is able to do” (Latina/o/x).

Action Item: Investigate mechanisms proven to increase participation of historically excluded racial/ethnic minority groups; hiring a DEI specialist would be helpful in this endeavor.

Action Item: Provide training, perhaps as a pre-meeting workshop, about anti-racism and anti-racist scholarship. Consider requiring this training. Make a recorded version of the training available to all attendees.

Action Item: Set a long-term commitment to racial and ethnic diversity (and acknowledgement of how the discipline has been complicit in white supremacy) with a series of plenaries, panels, training sessions, etc. to combat issues of racism and white supremacy. One of these plenaries should be comprised of Division Chairs discussing how they are combatting racism and white supremacy within their Divisions.

Action Item: Set behavioral standards that specify what microaggressions are and how to avoid them at the meeting and in presentations.

Action Item: Continue attempts to diversify the ASC Executive Board and other positions of influence in the organization, as well as diversifying the pool of nominees and recipients of major awards.

Exclusion experienced by LGBTQ participants

Because LGBTQ attendees may be an “invisible” minority and they may not be out as lesbian, gay, bisexual, or queer while at the ASC meeting, it was uncommon for LGBTQ respondents to report feeling personally disrespected or excluded from participation at the meetings. Rather, they might have actually been intentionally mentored by more senior faculty hoping to help them find their fit (LGBTQ). However, several participants in the LGBTQ focus group discussed “how totally exhausting the assumption of straightness is,” in that they were frequently assumed to be heterosexual and had to determine whether and how to address that in interpersonal interactions to save themselves awkward or unsettling encounters. One concern was for these interactions to devolve into sexual harassment; this issue is returned to in the section dedicated to experiences of sexual harassment.

Feelings of exclusion were more often linked to the topical areas they study not being taken seriously or being respected in the field, with its spillover to personal identity. The confluence of queer-themed research and LGBTQ identity meant that LGBTQ participants felt marginalized:

I would hope to see, kind of, more people and people who are not queer, people who don't care about queer research, saying, “This is okay and this is important.” I love that DQC [Division on Queer Criminology] is, kind of, coming to the forefront here and that queer people are getting their voices in ASC, but I think that in order for that to have longevity, in order for that to kind of fit into the main narrative if that's what we want, people who are not queer have to kind of embrace it alongside us and make sure that their colleagues and students feel they can be successful by studying what they want, and looking how they want, and existing as they are. (LGBTQ)

That is, respondents were very enthusiastic about the Division on Queer Criminology that was in the works at the time (now a Division), and the legitimacy that it would help bring, but wanted to see acceptance on a broad scale and more vocal allies. On a related note, an interviewee made clear that the opportunities for and visibility of LGBTQ students and scholars at ASC meetings are because they—as individuals and as a collective—organized their own opportunities, such as panels and the Division. In other focus groups (e.g., Latina/o/x), respondents noted that the increasing visibility of queer scholars in the discipline was a positive shift forward.

Action Item: Sponsor a workshop on how to discuss LGBTQ+ people in research and teaching. Make a recorded version of the workshop available to all attendees.

Action Item: Attempt to integrate voices of queer criminologists into ASC-sponsored sessions; consult with leadership of the Division on Queer Criminology to accomplish this.

Exclusion experienced by trans and non-binary participants

While the experiences of transgender and non-binary attendees at ASC in some ways mirror LGBQ experiences, there are important differences that our committee believed necessitated a separate focus group, and our supposition was correct. For example, a respondent in this focus group stated, “It’s hard to point to a specific thing that feels actively disrespectful, but I think that there is something about not being seen or not being acknowledged that, again, isn’t quite disrespect but isn’t inclusivity [either].” Certain conventions in our discipline—such as measuring “gender” as sex assigned at birth and the “lack of thought about the existence of trans people or non-binary people within the main amount of research that I’ve seen [presented at ASC]” were frustrating for trans and non-binary respondents. There was also discussion in both the Trans/Non-binary and LGBQ focus groups about recent published criminological work that employed transphobic assumptions and made them feel unsafe and unvalued in certain spaces at the ASC Annual Meeting. On this note, a respondent in the LGBQ focus group explained that some researchers view trans individuals as “other” and as “an anomaly, as this weird specimen to be poked and prodded at,” which could have real-life harmful consequences for transgender people. Because “there’s a lot of people that still don’t know how to properly talk about these topics or study these topics or address these topics,” seeing research presented at the ASC can feel “very othering” and “very awkward and uncomfortable.” On the subject of correcting misinformation in the context of invisibility, a respondent explained:

If you’re sitting in the audience of a panel and have something to point out about inclusion of queer or trans people, or misrepresentation, or misuse of terminology, or whatever—it is hard to, sort of, take up the space to call that out or make a correction with any confidence that that’s going to be heard or respected. (Trans/Non-binary)

One respondent in the focus group recalled an evening when, upon using the bathroom in the hotel lobby—an otherwise completely empty bathroom at 1am upon returning from an outing with other queer and trans scholars—“a female custodial staff member ... immediately just started yelling for security.” One recommendation was for ASC to implement all-gender bathrooms for the duration of the conference. Indeed, there is “a question of safety in coming out as a trans person, probably more specifically, as a trans woman, in a conservative field like criminology” (Trans/Non-binary). Respondents were also in favor of putting pronouns on nametags as a required and standard piece of information so that the practice was routine and normalized, while being able to facilitate inclusion and avoid misgendering of ASC attendees. If optional or only used by certain people assumed to “need” it, this intended advancement can backfire: “when you’re trying to make something more inclusive, you run the risk of bringing to the forefront the lack of inclusivity that exists” (Trans/Non-binary), thus this suggestion for *everyone* to have pronouns on nametags.

Action Item: Add a drop-down menu of pronouns that ASC attendees must select at registration, and then put those pronouns on individuals’ nametags.

Action Item: Designate several bathrooms at the conference as all-gender restrooms (ASA has published some guidance on doing so).

Exclusion experienced by students

Overall, there was an expectation and assumption that all students had less knowledge or experience than attendees with terminal degrees or in faculty positions. This was especially frustrating to the students who had returned to academia after being a practitioner (Comment) or who had been teaching as an adjunct for years (Students 2). Many were often met with “oh, but you are just a grad student” in multiple arenas at the ASC meeting, ranging from their own presentations to not being regarded as a potential consumer at the book exhibit (Students 2). One respondent evocatively described being a student at the meeting as essentially a “master status”:

As I am sure others have said, in my opinion, your status as graduate student is one that strongly relates to exclusion and disrespect. ... Being viewed as ‘student’ seems to be an overarching identity clouding out all relevant other identities. (Comment)

Relatedly, this respondent had considered no longer attending ASC; other students reported feeling “invisible” and “not good enough” to the point that one respondent stopped attending the annual meeting after realizing that “I’ve never felt welcome at ASC” (African American 2). Students had to contend with “those messages that you get, especially as a graduate student, on: how to behave; what to look like; what to say; what to study ... what they should be doing in order to fit the bounds of a ‘good researcher,’ or someone who can succeed, or what you should do in order to get people to come to your presentation and care about your work ... There is a strong ‘This is what you should be doing’” (LGBQ). Indeed, students who explained how they didn’t fit the mold because of their particular intersecting identities or their work foci felt that they were “not well received” except by others who shared their inclusive values (Students 1). One respondent boldly stated that the “hierarchy of value or social status” at the ASC meeting does not benefit students (Women 1).

Students mentioned avoiding events because they were unsure how to network or were wary of “cliquish” environments (Students 2), and the expectation to reach out to senior colleagues for networking and collaboration can make students feel vulnerable (Interviews). These attempts were not always successful; respondents told stories of attempting to network unsuccessfully with more senior scholars and not being given “the time of day” and being “totally brushed off” until they became faculty members (Women 2). A first generation student used somewhat dire language to describe the adjustment process to networking expectations: “I don’t know how to navigate these things, so I would have to just get out of my way and kind of trial and error, and see if I swim or drown kind of thing,” adding, “I’ve been welcomed, but I just haven’t found my support system in that” (Latina/o/x).

One participant described experiencing “chaperoning,” in that senior white male professors could help students adjust to a new environment and feel safe by facilitating networking and other opportunities, but it entailed gatekeeping as well; it was valuable but also “comes at a pretty high cost, which is the reproduction of established thresholds of acceptability” (LGBQ). Responding to this concept in real time during the focus group, another participant responded, “I would have loved to have, early on as a grad student, and [as an] assistant professor, actual chaperoning, like: ‘these are safe people,’ ‘these are safe areas’ ... ‘this is a safe reception’ or ‘this is a safe person

to have a drink with.” Participants wanted specific guidance from mentors in determining safe spaces. When asked to elaborate on “safe,” these were folks who weren’t going to “do bodily or psychic harm to you, with micro or macro aggressions” nor make heterosexist assumptions; and who could see students for “who [they] are” (LGBQ). The value of informed mentoring in helping guide students and early career faculty was made abundantly clear.

In some ways, respondents felt that graduate students had been left behind by the ASC as a professional organization, which was evidenced throughout the meeting: “While everybody says that students are the most important part of what we’re doing, I don’t necessarily see that coming through in how the society presents itself or behaves” (Women 1). A related complaint was that, because student members cannot vote, they are “just not treated as equal members of a Division,” which was “horrifying” for equity reasons but also considering ongoing efforts where “we have worked tirelessly to be inclusive of graduate students in our Division” (Division Chairs 1). Some senior scholars were observed to encroach into graduate students’ presentation times, an issue of blatant disrespect (Disabilities).

There was acknowledgement that structural issues such as racism, sexism, ageism, and heterosexism may negatively affect students most strongly, as they lack institutional power and often are only starting to develop particular forms of social and cultural capital through their interactions at the ASC meeting. Exclusionary practices—such as casual racism and sexism—“can be felt more strongly by students, and they can feel more vulnerable,” and someone being told that they don’t belong “can just be particularly damaging to students” (Division Chairs 1). Power differentials related to graduate students was of concern (Women 2), as students are also more susceptible to power differentials that affect harassment (Trans/Non-binary). Distressingly, a student explained, “I don’t expect to be respected, and I don’t expect that they’re [ASC leadership] looking out for my best interest, or my safety, quite frankly” (Students 1).

There were many ideas to help bolster the success of graduate students, such as more clearly communicating opportunities to support graduate students (Latina/o/x), a formal socialization or mentoring program for graduate students (Asian), mentoring on how to best handle presentation Q&A (African American 2), mentoring or at a minimum, an orientation for first-time attendees, because otherwise it’s very overwhelming (International). Being “grad student poor” and/or having a limited amount of institutional funding for conferences “definitely serves as a barrier to inclusivity because people who want to go, who need to go who would really thrive in these networking environments, theoretically, you can’t even afford to get there” (African American 1). A more in-depth discussion of cost as prohibitive is provided below when discussing logistical barriers. There are also several issues pertaining specifically to international students, discussed in the section on international students and scholars.

Finally, ASC was advised that if barriers to inclusivity were not addressed, the organization may continue to lose student members, early career members, and younger members:

[About] graduate students, I am a millennial, and I know especially with Gen-Z, [this] is coming up in younger millennials, they know. They understand power dynamics. They understand intersectionality. They know LGBTQ & trans issues, Black issues, immigrant issues. They know what’s happening. And I think it’s going to be, it’s at the ASC’s best interest to figure out what’s wrong because [otherwise, ASC is] not going to keep

propagating, it's not going to keep working. It's barely working for my generation now.
(Students 1)

Action Item: Implement formal mentoring programs for students that pair them with more experienced students and faculty, that can include mentorship prior to the meeting as well as during the meeting, which could help with navigating the conference, feeling integrated, and networking. These programs should have specific guidelines based on successful existing mentoring programs.

Action Item: Revisit the policies by which students are barred from serving on ASC committees and voting; at a minimum, make the reasons transparent why dues-paying student members cannot engage in these activities.

Action Item: If students continue to be excluded from voting and serving on committees, waive all student membership fees in the organization.

Action Item: Create additional opportunities where students can apply for travel stipends and reduced-cost or free conference registrations.

Action Item: Reach out to doctoral programs to better connect student attendees of ASC to the organization's members and norms, perhaps via designated ambassadors.

Action Item: Consult the Association of Doctoral Programs in Criminology and Criminal Justice as a resource to improve the experience of students at the ASC conference.

Exclusion experienced by international students and scholars

Feelings of isolation and lack of mentorship at the ASC meeting may be exacerbated for scholars and students a long way from their literal homes, traveling internationally, and now at the ASC meeting (Asian). Logistical barriers mentioned included the cost of international travel (Interviews), the "hassle" of getting a visa and/or potential mistreatment at a U.S. airport (International), and the fact that the entire ASC Annual Meeting is in English (Interviews). People for whom English is their second language encountered microaggressions, such as being asked about their accent or pronunciation (Latina/o/x), or being interrupted, passed over, or having their sentences finished while they paused to find the right wording (Division Chairs 1). Importantly, some international scholars reported having many interactions where people were generous, intentional, and welcoming (International), but "having everything in English can be challenging, especially for nonnative English speakers" (Interviews). Clearly, there are varied concerns depending on where an international scholar is coming from—for example, respondents noted differences in experience between international attendees originating from an English-speaking country, European but non-English speaking countries, countries where English is not a primary language, and/or countries in the Global South.

There was a perception that conducting international work could be seen as "out of place" or without "merit" (Interviews), especially as some ASC attendees strongly believe that ASC should be focused on American and Canadian criminology (Comment), which can prevent

students especially from getting the mentorship they need (Division Chairs 2). The Division on International Criminology was seen as a positive force for support and inclusion, and for a push to recognize this work as valuable and relevant (Comment). Similarly, certain groups have emerged, such as the Korean Association, which aims to aid international students and scholars through both scholarly guidance and emotional support, to counteract concerns such as not feeling included in the discipline (Asian).

Action Item: Encourage Divisions to offer competitive travel grants to international students and scholars; ASC could also provide several competitive travel grants of this nature.

Action Item: Investigate hybrid presentation options for international scholars and students to present their work and participate in the conference if they cannot travel to the U.S.

Exclusion experienced by participants with disabilities

Although our committee was not tasked with determining barriers to inclusion for people with disabilities, our committee determined that this was an important issue to pursue; indeed, our results regarding exclusionary experiences of people with disabilities were extensive, and originated across focus groups. First are issues with physical mobility, as the hotel hallways are often narrow and maze-like; elevators are not always centrally located, making it difficult to get to the next event or presentation in only 10-15 minutes; crowded events may not allow ease of access or room to maneuver a wheelchair, walker, or cane; and so many activities are focused on standing for extended periods of time (Disabilities). In addition, meeting rooms may have cords strewn about the floor (Latina/o/x).

Offsite events can be particularly challenging regarding physical accessibility, as they may be a 10-15 minute walk from the conference hotel (Disabilities), there may not be transit options at the hotel for people using wheelchairs (Asian), and may not have accessible ramps or accessible restrooms (Disabilities). These may very well prevent participation in offsite events, as one disabled person explained, “all the times that people say ‘oh we’re going to walk over to this activity or this event’ but it’s 10 blocks from the hotel and I’m like, ‘well, I can’t walk 10 blocks. I’ll see you later.’” Some Divisions were seen to make more of an effort than others to host offsite events at accessible locations (Trans/Non-binary) or to problem solve, such as taking requests for reserved seating prior to the event for those who needed it (Division Chairs 1).

Regarding attendees who are deaf or hard of hearing, respondents noted the difficulty of obtaining microphones for large rooms (Women 1), the lack of ASL interpreters (Students 1), and the lack of captioning (Students 2). Regarding visual impairments, the design of the conference—a focus on slides, handouts, and posters, for example, even down to the inaccessible program app—can discourage participation from the visually impaired (Disabilities). For those with “invisible” disabilities, including many forms of neurodivergence such as autism or sensory processing disorders, the fact that the conference is incredibly loud, overstimulating, and may involve being incidentally touched is stress-inducing and required respondents to initiate their own solutions such as noise-canceling headphones or outright avoidance (Disabilities), especially because the ASC meeting has no quiet rooms (Asian). People may opt to not disclose their disability because of negative social consequences they have experienced: “once I come out

to people about the fact that I have that disability, instantaneously it starts to kind of create that power differential for neurotypicals” (Disabilities).

Respondents were also critical of what they perceived to be ASC’s unwillingness to provide accommodations or improve accessibility, with one person saying that the response to their concerns around accessibility was “Oh we don’t have these accommodations; we can’t do that, we can’t do that ... so I definitely think that ... disabled persons are very much a missed population at ASC. And that’s just [me] outside looking in, right?” (African American 1). A sentiment from a disabled respondent was that “There has never been any effort to make the [ASC] conference accessible in any way. Universal design is definitely not something the conference worries about.” Take this reflection from another disabled respondent about coping with barriers to accommodations:

It’s strange that ASC finally is doing this ... I don’t know what the right word would be, because for a long time, I’ve thought that it was just my obligation to kind of like adapt myself around what other people have had to do. And I think that it’s probably cost me professionally, because I don’t have the ability to interact—like there’s a more limited scope of opportunity than there would be available to other people who are there. And I don’t know how I manage ... competing concerns that I need the self-care, and I need to be able to do those things for myself, but at the same time, I should be entitled to have those same opportunities as other people, because unless I take advantage of those opportunities, I don’t know that there will ever be another person like me who’s sitting at a table to be able to advocate for people like me. (Disabilities)

There was a lack of knowledge—even among Division Chairs—about the process of requesting accommodations for the ASC meetings (Division Chairs 1). Other respondents said of the inability to request accommodations, “I am imagining that’s probably a big problem” (Asian) and “It doesn’t seem there is a lot around ability that happens at ASC. That seems pretty massive” (African American 1).

Importantly, a disabled respondent indicated that “you don’t see a lot of physically disabled people at ASC,” and our committee would like to note that this lack of participation is perhaps because the ASC annual meeting is indeed not very accessible and may improve with intentional steps to correct this.

Action Item: To better serve deaf and hard of hearing meeting participants, ASC should provide a space to report that an attendee requires an interpreter, and the ASC should hire and make these interpreters available. At any planned addresses, closed captioning should be available. Microphones should be more widely available, especially for large rooms.

Action Item: ASC should facilitate spaces being more easily navigable, especially when crowds are anticipated (e.g., signage or markers providing room for enough space to maneuver through).

Action Item: All locations for offsite functions should be ADA compliant.

Action Item: Investigate the feasibility of increasing the amount of time between sessions.

Action Item: Implement a designated “quiet room” (SSSP has done so).

Action Item: To identify any additional accessibility concerns, hire a consultant with expertise in accessibility to attend the ASC 2022 meeting to evaluate accessibility and make a list of other areas for improvement. This consultant could also generate ideas to facilitate accessibility for the visually impaired.

Exclusion experienced by formerly-incarcerated people

One overarching issue related to the exclusion of formerly-incarcerated people, or other folks with prior criminal legal system involvement, is the fact that our discipline often studies people with these experiences, leading to feelings of “otherness” and of being an “outsider” (LGBQ). An issue raised was that the way presenters at ASC often refer to formerly-incarcerated people can include microaggressions (Division Chairs 1) and dehumanizing language (Trans/Non-binary). People who are formerly system-involved may feel that they lack the necessary scholarly social and cultural capital resulting in them being judged harshly and being stereotyped; although shifting norms and values may have enabled greater understanding at ASC and in society more generally, formerly-incarcerated people may be made to feel that their experiences are not valid (compared to the research being presented), calling up “the question of who is the knower or truth teller” (Division Chairs 2). Furthermore, criminal records or conditions post-release may prevent people from travelling domestically to attend the meeting or may make the meeting cost prohibitive for someone, and thus may directly impact their participation (Division Chairs 1).

The creation of the Division on Convict Criminology was regarded as a positive development that may help provide support to academics with prior system involvement. While this Division was viewed favorably by our respondents, there was some concern that the Division’s members may be “shunned” or “demeaned” (Women 3) and that convict criminologists are treated “as second class citizens at ASC. They are not showcased, headlined, or promoted” (Comment).

Action Item: Implement several scholarships or funding mechanisms to support formerly incarcerated and/or system-involved scholars’ and students’ participation in the meetings.

Action Item: Gather information on best practices with regard to language—such as person-first language and identity-first language versus outdated and offensive terms—and make guidelines widely available to ASC attendees and the membership.

Exclusion related to intersectional identities

The sections above have demonstrated that while exclusionary experiences can differ across identity groups, they can also vary within identity groups in light of other identities. The term *intersectionality* was used in various focus groups to describe this dynamic. A description is illustrative:

I think that intersectionality idea/reality is also, is really, really, really, really important. Because just thinking about your last question and then this question, you know I was at

one point in all four of those categories [identity groups mentioned in a question], now I'm in three of those categories. And so, you know, can't divide myself, and so my experience is all of those three things at once. (African American 1)

When other respondents talked about this idea of “not being able to divide” themselves, it similarly manifested in practical choices about what to participate in:

As a person of color, African American, intersectionality is real. And so, having to make choices about: “Do I go to the queer thing or do I go to the ‘brown people’ thing?” Or, seeing somebody on stage who represents one part of me but not the other part of me ... it feels like a barrier that there's not more acknowledgement of the fact that there's cross-cutting identities of people who are in the field and of the research they do. (LGBQ)

The Divisions were seen as a place that intersectionality could be better embraced (African American 1), where, as a matter of example, it would be preferable “if the queer division was explicitly grappling with issues of race; if the race division was explicitly grappling with issues of queerness” (LGBQ). “The intersectionality problem” makes it “difficult for folks who have multiple, overlapping, marginalized identities,” because subdivisions can marginalize other identities, such as women's subdivisions really being focused on white women (Asian). However, respondents insisted that an understanding of intersectionality could meaningfully inform the Annual Meeting: “I definitely think that there are opportunities that ASC can promote counter-voices much more, and that is inclusive of intersectional voices, or people who have multiple identities” (African American 1).

Action Item: Encourage Divisions to co-sponsor panels and sessions where their members' contributions are blended.

Action Item: Issue strategic invitations for Presidential sessions, keynotes, etc. such that these sessions are highly diverse *and* bring new voices to the fore, including the voices of those working in the community.

Exclusion based on sexual harassment

Unfortunately, sexual and gender harassment have been recognized as pervasive in many occupations. Our focus groups and interviews specifically included questions about sexual harassment, and generated detailed discussions about incidents of sexual harassment, how participants coped with sexual harassment, and what they perceived as inattention to the issue. While some individual participants were not aware of any sexual harassment incidents, in nearly every focus group and a majority of the interviews, participants discussed either hearing about or actually experiencing sexual harassment at the ASC meetings or its sponsored events, such as offsite socials or the Friday night dance. One participant summarized, “It's a problem everywhere and it's a problem at ASC” (Asian).

Sexual harassment took many forms. These included inappropriate interactions, such as attendees receiving unsolicited photos on Airdrop (African American 2), being subjected to “inappropriate conversations” (Trans/Non-binary), being harassed with “very vulgar language”

(Interviews) or repeated requests for dates (LGBQ), being asked for illicit photos (Disabilities), and assuming that they too will want to sexualize and objectify women based on their sexual identity (LGBQ). Some of these inappropriate behaviors entailed power differentials, such as faculty asking doctoral students to accompany them to their hotel rooms (Students 2), a dinner invitation under false pretenses—ostensibly to talk about a research project or a job but which ends up being an intended date (Interviews), offers of quid pro quo opportunities in exchange for sexual acts (Interviews), and senior faculty becoming upset when junior faculty or graduate students refused sex with them (Interviews). Some actions felt threatening to participants, such as someone standing or sitting too close to them (Students 2) or leering at them (Division Chairs 1). There was also a range of unwelcome touching, including touching the lower back (African American 2), hair touching (Women 1), forced hugs (Women 1), leg touching (Disabilities), groping (Trans/Non-binary), and even rape and sexual assault (Interviews).

Some of the incidents where participants described sexual harassment were related to specific dynamics of the ASC conference events. For example, some participants found the dance “deeply problematic” (Women 1), where harassers could normalize their bad behavior and engage in it more anonymously than in other settings at the ASC meeting (Disabilities), at an event that’s loud and where people are drinking. One participant described intervening with a young woman who was being “manhandled” (treated roughly) at the dance (Women 1). Another described being asked to stand next to a friend at the poster session, where the presenters are expected to stand in the same place for the duration of the event, and someone can camp out at their poster and hit on them if no “witness” is present (LGBQ). As mentioned in a section above, a common theme was that alcohol exacerbated the issue, and excessive alcohol usage was driven by “the whole party atmosphere ... we have created, but certainly the ASC has supported that” (General).

Participants employed a range of strategies to avoid being sexually harassed, to neutralize sexual harassment, or to cope with sexual harassment. These include using “the buddy system” to avoid predatory people (Students 1), with a male participant saying he makes sure that female graduate students have a “buddy system” so that “they’re not placing themselves at risk where they don’t have a lifeline [to] back out of a situation” (General). Participants intentionally avoided gatherings with a lot of alcohol (Disabilities), spent much of their free time “hiding in my hotel room” (Women 2), spent private time only with fellow students or friends (Students 2), and avoided particular people who were known to be abusers (Asian).

A primary, problematic, multi-pronged theme that is fully within the control of ASC leadership is particularly salient: that repeat abusers face no consequences, as there is no mechanism to enforce any consequences or sanctions. We encountered many references to known predators at the ASC meetings. Participants used phrases such as “an underground knowledge of who to stay away from after dark” (Students 1), “a fairly well-known criminology scholar ... who’s been doing this for longer than I’ve been alive” (African American 1), “we know who these sexual predators are ... we’ve known forever who they are” (Women 2), and this description:

Well it’s kind of almost the story of ASC because—and it’s like the worst kept secret in the world—because some of these people have a historic reputation of doing it, yet there seems to be a certain degree of impunity about this. And it’s befuddling to me and I’m

literally left kind of speechless about it because it makes me question how serious we are about any of the things that we espouse. (Disabilities)

One issue may be reporting, but our participants did not know the mechanism or contact person to report sexually abusive behavior to. They said they had been informed to notify the Title 9 office at the harasser's home institution, even if it happened at ASC, away from their campus (Division Chairs 1). One participant stated, "I think that there is the policy of expected behavior, but there's nothing that says, 'If you do this, this is what's going to happen. And here's the procedure that we have put in place'" (Division Chairs 1). Indeed, something that happened in several focus groups—regardless of who was facilitating—was that a member of our subcommittee stated that we actually did not know the process to report sexual harassment, and a different member of the subcommittee said there is no formal process. This was buttressed by senior colleagues taking part in focus groups. We heard over and over again that the ASC needs to have a clear process by which conference attendees can report sexually abusive behavior committed by other conference attendees. Take this appeal:

[I recommend] having a clear policy for how to report instances of sexual harassment. Hopefully that actually works, but it could also signal to particularly the people who are more likely to be victims of sexual harassment that the [ASC] takes it seriously. Right, so that is not going to prevent it from ever happening again, but at least it sort of tells us that ASC cares and does not approve of that behavior. So, it's not like I think some of those symbolic things could be pure virtue signaling, but can also go a step beyond that. (Division Chairs 1)

These systems need to be clear, with a mechanism for investigation and sanctions, as this participant suggests:

But one of the bigger problems is even in the best written policies, it's so challenging for people to behave in such a way that it rises to a policy violation. That it's largely window dressing in my opinion. So just wanted to say that because if we were to do the same thing, we'd look like we were doing something but it doesn't really stop it. What's going to stop it is calling out the people who we know have done it, who are continuing to do it, and to ban them from the association, but that again would take courage. (Women 2)

Beyond not having a formal mechanism to report and investigate harassment, participants suggested that sexually abusive behavior flourishes in spaces that are rife with power dynamics, as academia and the ASC meetings can be. For example, a participant explained, "I think it's a big problem because you have a field that's so traditionally male-dominated and so the women in the field tend to be younger; they tend to be grad students; they tend to be lower rank," which creates "an inherent power differential between the more senior men in the field, and women in general" that can be exploited (Asian). This dynamic remains present even though "we're [ASC] dramatically changing in terms of gender representation" (Latina/o/x). When students are targeted, it feels "taboo and hush hush" because students don't want to harm their chances of not getting a letter of recommendation or research assistance from faculty who are sexually harassing them (Latina/o/x). One Division Chair recounted the steps students and early career scholars have to take to avoid or navigate harassment without "tripping retaliation," as "I don't

want to cause a mess because this person could have power over me at some point” (Division Chairs 1). During a focus group that ended up being comprised of all men, a participant said:

If you really want an inclusive organization, we—and I’m pointing the finger directly at myself, older white guys—need to police each other to say “knock it off” ... us white guys, older white guys—we created the environment to begin with. And we have done a really bad job of policing ourselves, to the point now ... if you don’t do something about yourself, somebody else will do it for you. We have got to deal with the predatory behavior that goes on. (General)

Bystander intervention was encouraged in multiple groups, but the sentiment remained that harassers need to be formally held accountable for their behavior.

Perhaps the one positive is that participants who could comment on sexual harassment at the ASC meetings over time noted more awareness and discussion that have been helpful to shift the conversation to these issues (General). Participants with long histories of attending ASC meetings noted that they knew of “horror stories from ASCs particularly in the 80s and early 90s” (Women 3), including sexual harassment being an expectation that was normalized, including by senior women faculty, such as being told “don’t make a fuss because if you do, there’s payment [retaliation] on the far end of that, so that’s how you protect yourself is laugh it off, joke around, walk away,” which was an encouraged response (Division Chairs 1). Awareness of sexual harassment, such as through the #MeToo movement, coupled with “greater representation of women [and] sexual minorities” has helped weaken the influence of the “old boys club” (Asian). Participants generally believed that it was the broader culture that has changed the meetings, such as clearer rules regarding sexual harassment in workplaces, not necessarily ASC’s actions (Women 3).

In summary, despite sexual harassment being a common occurrence in many professional contexts, there was a belief that ASC could do more. For example, “it’s a problem everywhere, but I like to think that we can be better than this” (Division Chairs 1). Having a designated person “at the meetings that people can reach out to if they feel unsafe or they feel like they’re being harassed, and they don’t know what to do or who to go to” would not only signal awareness, but would be a concrete step that ASC can take to address harassment (Women 3).

Action Item: Institute a sexual harassment policy and set of practices whereby conference attendees can report sexual harassment to an ombudsperson or DEI specialist at the annual meeting. This policy and set of practices should include a mechanism for investigation and sanctions (especially for repeated offenses), such as barring harassers from participating in the conference, holding membership, receiving awards, etc. Ensure these procedures are easily accessible via the ASC website, the conference app, the conference program, and on signage at the meeting.

Action Item: Train Division Chairs on the new processes; perhaps include a pre-conference sexual harassment training for attendees.

Exclusion based on logistical concerns

Barriers to inclusion go beyond harassment and identity-focused concerns to logistical ones as well. Our focus groups and interviews produced three major logistical concerns: accessibility, cost, and size, which we discuss briefly below.

Accessibility – We would like to refer readers to the section above entitled “Exclusion experienced by participants with disabilities” for a detailed discussion about (in)accessibility of the ASC annual meeting and sponsored events, which has related applications for individuals with various mobility concerns due to some other reason such as age (Division Chairs 1), pregnancy (Comment), child strollers (Students 2), or temporary injuries.

Action Item: Please consult the section on “Exclusion experienced by participants with disabilities” for accessibility recommendations.

Cost – This was of particular concern among students, early career scholars, and international students and scholars, but was widely noted. In the Students 1 focus group, the respondents collaboratively created a pretty exhaustive list of how costs can pile up: Membership fee, registration fee, traveling to major/large cities that often require flights (and are already expensive), cabs/ubers from airport to hotel (often no free shuttles), multiple meals out at restaurants, paying to print, a hotel room that has to be shared because it’s over \$200 per day every year, and often the room doesn’t include breakfast nor a fridge (preventing the use of groceries and necessitating eating out), it may not include Wi-Fi, and the ASC conference doesn’t provide access to Wi-Fi. All of these may be complicated by low student stipends (Students 2), low funding for conferences for those coming from anywhere other than large research-focused universities (Latina/o/x), and additional costs of visas or international travel (International). The Division Chairs 1 focus group also discussed the “exorbitant” costs of food at ASC events for groups trying to hold events onsite, which pushes many events offsite.

Action Item: ASC should look into options to subsidize participation from low-income groups, including scholarships, waivers, and hybrid presentation options.

Action Item: Consider other cities for the annual meeting that are large but not as costly.

Action Item: Revisit the process by which hotel contracts are negotiated.

Size of meeting – There was acknowledgement that the large size of the meeting has made it logistically difficult to have a robust number of attendees for every session (Comment) and to go to sessions and events of interest that do not conflict (Asian), which can be demoralizing to attendees seeking to present their scholarship and to network (Students 1). More broadly, the size of the meeting has made it harder to find a good fit and feel included right away, in that the meeting’s size made it “impersonal” and “way too overwhelming and not very welcoming” (Interviews). There were also concerns raised about which scholars have prime mid-day panels and which have the 8am, 5pm, and/or Saturday slots, with the observation that “premiere” scholars routinely get better placement compared to others doing more critical work (Women 1). In several focus groups (e.g., Women 2), the idea of not accepting everything (meaning having

some review process for abstracts/submissions) was raised, but was countered with concerns that this could lead to gatekeeping and prevention of critical and otherwise non-mainstream scholarship from being represented at the meeting.

Action Item: Revisit the process by which preferential program time slots (e.g., those assumed to draw larger audiences) are assigned to evaluate potential bias.

Exclusion based on alcohol

A somewhat unexpected finding was how many respondents were critical of the amount of alcohol—and indeed, focus on alcohol—at the ASC annual meeting. There was a perspective that so much alcohol has changed events from “professional networking events ... to some kind of grad school/frat party” (Women 2), with the “frat party” phrase being used specifically in multiple additional focus groups (e.g., General). Specifically, what was problematic in terms of exclusion is “the sort of reliance on alcohol and how that can feel very exclusionary for people who don’t drink, or who don’t want to be in drinking environments, and the receptions and that sort of culture at ASC is off-putting for some people” (Division Chairs 1). Whether because of sobriety (Students 1), pregnancy (Comment), or a hesitancy to engage in drinking during important professional interactions (General), a focus on alcohol was raised as problematic. For example, a focus group participant tellingly referred to the Poster Session as the “wine session with posters” (LGBQ).

An interviewee suggested that the sheer amount of drinking at the ASC Annual Meeting has become “a snarling, lurking menace,” with a notable portion of respondents saying they felt “unsafe” (Interviews) or “uncomfortable” (Disabilities) around so many intoxicated people, partly because of the risk for inappropriate behavior or sexual harassment. Indeed, some respondents shared their experiences of being sexually harassed or groped by an intoxicated person, whether at an event in the ASC hotel or an ASC-sponsored event that was offsite (Trans/Non-binary), with a handful of participants saying they had witnessed violence or aggression from drunk ASC attendees (Interviews).

While some respondents wanted to ban alcohol at ASC events altogether, others suggested keeping it but “creating more social activities that are not centered around alcohol quite as much would be a welcome change for some participants” (Division Chairs 1). This was seen as somewhat challenging not just for programming, but because the hotel bar is often centrally located and a gathering place for many. However, there was an encouragement to get creative because of the lack of comfort, with one respondent asking, “what spaces do we create for [attendees who do not drink] where they can network where they don’t have to be around a bunch of drunk people, which I’m told gets old pretty quickly” (Women 1). Both Student focus groups suggested that ASC invest in coffee, not alcohol, for example. The ice cream social came up in several focus groups as a model that could be emulated, provided that additional focus is on the networking component and not just the food incentive that brings people to the event.

Action Item: Create other options for socialization and networking that are alcohol-free.

Action Item: Create a room, with seating, that acts as a gathering space intended for conversations.

Action Item: Encourage bystander intervention and facilitate reporting of inappropriate behavior. (See Part I of this report, as well.)

Necessary action by ASC leadership

Focus group and interview respondents were fairly critical of the ASC's specific efforts to increase inclusivity—namely, they didn't think there was much outreach (Women 3), nor concrete actions beyond allowing Divisions, while noting that allowing Divisions does not necessarily result in deliberate efforts toward inclusivity on the part of ASC (Disabilities). Critiques included those provided in various sections above, such as a lack of inclusive programming at the annual meeting and a lack of clear policies and actions from ASC that demonstrate valuing diversity, equity, and inclusion. Participants wanted to see multiple demonstrations ranging from symbolic gestures, such as statements valuing diversity, to more tangible commitments that directly facilitate diversity, equity, and inclusion. Respondents encouraged ASC leadership to set the tone for this: “[it's important that] it comes from the top; that the ASC Executive Board values these issues, and that the institution as a whole needs to take ownership of these problems and doing things to address them” (Division Chairs 1). Another suggestion was that “it could be something as straightforward as ‘here are some guiding principles that the ASC leaders would like to see happen in all of our Divisions, for these reasons, and here are some very specific things to do.’ ... And some very clear action steps ... do's and don'ts, I think could go a long way” (African American 1).

Regarding the leadership structure, there were some pointed critiques about which groups tend to stay in power, the unwillingness to relinquish power, and the replication of structural privilege in ASC leadership historically and thus the replication of the status quo (Interviews). As mentioned prior, our respondents want to see ASC take strides to make specific and sustained efforts to diversify leadership, membership, and who is visible at the ASC Annual Meetings. Specifically, they want to see more women, people of color, LGBTQ+ people, graduate students and early career scholars, and people with disabilities—among others—in leadership.

Action Items that speak to what ASC's leadership can achieve—such as implementing specific policies and practices that support diversity and inclusion—have been provided throughout this report, with 5 key, overarching recommendations provided in the Executive Summary.

Some closing thoughts about the process

Overall, respondents were appreciative of being able to share their experiences, perceptions, and recommendations about the climate at ASC meetings and sponsored events with our committee. Many articulated that the work was “really important” (Women 3), inclusivity “needs to be addressed” and that this was a good starting place (Latina/o/x), as the process is “historic” (LGBQ), and the project's “attention to the issues makes me more hopeful” (Comment). However, we were cautioned that our fact-finding mission needs to be backed up by action: “It's good that this is happening, but something has to come of it” (Students 1), and we were advised

that the various groups making recommendations that will directly benefit their own experience “should be listened to” (Trans/Non-binary). Implementing the recommendations made in this report is a worthwhile and necessary endeavor, and attendees of the ASC Annual Meeting want to see change and results. Additionally, they are enthusiastic to read this report with our findings and are looking forward to it being publicly posted on the ASC website and distributed across various listservs.

Part III. Summary: The time for change is now

The work of the ad hoc committee on ASC meeting climate has uncovered problematic experiences and patterns related to the ASC meetings and sponsored events, on a number of dimensions. Our focus group and interview participants were frustrated with what they perceived as a lack of commitment to diversity and inclusion, and have generously provided the roadmap for sustained improvement. Thus, our committee’s extensive fact-finding work has gathered critically important suggestions from ASC meeting attendees to chart a bold new path for ASC meetings in the future. Attendees were clear in their desire to see a cultural shift at ASC meetings and sponsored events, and wanted this to be guided by intentional leadership from the ASC Executive Board.

ASC meeting attendees were invested in this process and provided dozens of action items. Some of these action items can be implemented by the ASC Executive Board immediately (e.g., starting the process to hire a DEI specialist); others can be implemented prior to the 2022 ASC Annual Meeting (such as changes to the registration process and conference facilities); while others will require more long-range planning of about a year (e.g., creating and implementing the anti-harassment policy including mechanisms for reporting, adjudication, and sanctions).

With the establishment of this ad hoc committee, we acknowledge the ASC’s readiness to pursue improvement. We hope this report emboldens the ASC Executive Board and relevant ASC committees to make brave and necessary changes to how ASC meetings and sponsored events are conducted. The time is now, for the good of ASC members and the future of the ASC.

Appendix A: Summary Detail of DEI and or Harassment Responses in Organizations and Annual Meetings

AEA – American Economic Association

Organization

Code of Conduct/Ethics Code

1. [AEA Code of Professional Conduct](#)
2. [Formal Policy on Harassment and Discrimination](#)

Standing Committees (with embedded links)

1. [Committee on Equity, Diversity, and Professional Conduct \(CEDPC\)](#)
2. [Committee on the Status of Women in the Economics Profession](#)
3. [Committee on the Status of Minority Groups in the Economics Profession](#)

Annual Meetings

Code of Conduct/Ethics Code

1. AEA has a Code of Conduct for Annual Meetings specified in Code of Professional Conduct for Organization (see [AEA Code of Professional Conduct](#))

Procedures for Reporting

1. AEA has detailed procedures for reporting described at <https://www.aeaweb.org/about-aea/aea-policy-harassment-discrimination/procedures>
2. Role of Ombudsperson - Members (or someone who has been harassed/discriminated against by an AEA member or at an AEA sponsored event) can contact the AEA Ombudsperson who will listen, record, and advise what the individual's options are. FAQ on ombudsperson: <https://www.aeaweb.org/about-aea/aea-ombudsperson/faq>

Formal Sanctions

1. Formal sanctions are found at Section III, letter I of the official complaint procedures (<https://www.aeaweb.org/about-aea/aea-policy-harassment-discrimination/procedures>), and include:
 - a. Private or public reprimand,
 - b. suspension, temporary removal or revocation of membership privileges,

- c. revocation of right to serve as a journal referee, editor, committee member and/or Board member
- d. other sanctions as determined in the Board's discretion.

APA - American Psychological Association

Organization

Code of Conduct/Ethics Code

1. [Ethical Principles of Psychologists and Code of Conduct](#)

Standing Committees (with embedded links)

1. [Ethics Committee](#)
2. [Committee on Disability Issues in Psychology](#)
3. [Committee on Ethnic Minority Affairs](#)
4. [Committee on Sexual Orientation and Gender Diversity](#)
5. [Committee on Women in Psychology](#)

Annual Meetings

Code of Conduct/Ethics Code

1. APA's Code of Conduct for the organization extends to behavior at the Annual Meetings (see [Ethical Principles of Psychologists and Code of Conduct](#))

Procedures for Reporting

1. Includes a detailed Rules and Procedures manual for the Ethics Committee (<https://www.apa.org/ethics/committee-rules-procedures-2018.pdf>), which includes:
 - a. Jurisdiction of committee and subject matters to be considered
 - b. Time limits for complaints (i.e., complaint has to be received less than three years after the alleged conduct occurred or was discovered by complainant, as long as it is filed less than ten years after the alleged conduct occurred)
 - c. Filing procedures
 - d. Adjudication and fact-finding process
2. APA does not have an Ombudsperson

Formal Sanctions

1. Formal sanctions are found in Section B.9 of Rules and Procedures manual for the Ethics committee, and include:

- a. Reprimand
- b. Censure
- c. Expulsion or voiding of membership
- d. Stipulated resignation
- e. Probation

ASA - American Sociological Association

Organization

Code of Conduct/Ethics Code

1. [ASA Code of Ethics](#)

(https://www.asanet.org/sites/default/files/asa_code_of_ethics-june2018a.pdf)

Standing Committees (with embedded links)

1. [Committee on Professional Ethics](#)
2. [Committee on the Status of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, and Queer \(LGBTQ\) People in Sociology](#)
3. [Committee on Persons with Disabilities in Sociology](#)
4. [Committee on the Status of Racial and Ethnic Minorities in Sociology](#)
5. [Committee on the Status of Women in Sociology](#)

Annual Meetings

Code of Conduct/Ethics Code

1. ASA has an Anti-Harassment Policy that is specified for the annual meetings (see <https://www.asanet.org/2019-asa-annual-meeting-anti-harassment-policy>)

Procedures for Reporting

1. Encourages bystander intervention
2. Includes a detailed Policies and Procedures manual for the Committee on Professional Ethics (https://www.asanet.org/sites/default/files/cope_policies_and_procedures_march_2020.pdf), which states:
 - a. Jurisdiction of committee and subject matters to be considered
 - b. Filing procedures

- c. Adjudication and fact-finding process
3. ASA does not have an Ombudsperson

Formal Sanctions

1. Formal sanctions are found in Part 3 Section 9 of the Policies and Procedures manual for the Committee on Professional Ethics, and include:
 - a. Private reprimand
 - b. Denial of privileges (i.e., ASA membership privileges and activities)
 - c. Public reprimand
 - d. Termination of membership

APSA - American Political Science Association

Organization

Code of Conduct/Ethics Code

None listed

Standing Committees (with embedded links)

1. [Professional Ethics, Rights, and Freedoms Committee](#)
2. [Committee on the Status of Asian Pacific Americans in the Profession](#)
3. [Committee on the Status of Blacks in the Profession](#)
4. [Committee on the Status of First Generation Scholars in the Profession](#)
5. [Committee on the Status of Latinos y Latinas in the Profession](#)
6. [Committee on the Status of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender Individuals in the Profession](#)
7. [Committee on the Status of Women in the Profession](#)

Annual Meetings

Code of Conduct/Ethics Code

1. APSA has an Anti-Harassment Policy for the Annual Meeting (<https://connect.apsanet.org/apsa2020/code-of-conduct/>)

Procedures for Reporting

1. Includes a detailed set of procedures for violations of the sexual harassment provisions of the Anti-Harassment Policy

https://www.apsanet.org/Portals/54/diversity%20and%20inclusion%20prgms/sexual%20harassment%20resources/FINAL%20Sexual%20Harass.%20Procedures%20Amended%205_7_18.pdf?ver=2018-05-07-093316-170

- a. Jurisdiction of committee and subject matters to be considered
 - b. Filing procedures
 - c. Adjudication and fact-finding process
2. APSA has two ombudspersons. The first is the Ombuds of the APSA, who is available for confidential consultation about a wide range of concerns, including but not limited to sexual harassment. The second is the Sexual Harassment Intake Advisor, who is the point of first contact if someone is considering pursuing the options APSA offers for reporting and responding to incidents of sexual harassment.

Formal Sanctions

1. Formal sanctions are found in section VII of the Anti-Harassment Policy, and include:
 - a. Warning the harasser to cease their behavior
 - b. Termination of any APSA meeting, conference, or workshop participation, as well as any ongoing APSA responsibilities and appointments held by the harasser
 - c. Barring the harasser from assuming any future governance positions within APSA
 - d. Barring the harasser from future APSA meetings, conferences, and/or workshops
 - e. Recommend to Council revoking APSA membership

AERA - American Educational Research Association

Organization

Code of Conduct/Ethics Code

1. [AERA Code of Ethics](#)

Standing Committees (with embedded links)

1. [Organizational Structure and Governance](#)
2. [Equity and Inclusion Council](#)
3. [Social Justice Action Committee](#)
4. [Ethics Committee](#)

Annual Meetings

Code of Conduct/Ethics Code

2. AERA Code of Ethics for the organization extends to all professional behavior.

Procedures for Reporting

3. Complaints can be submitted to the Ethics Committee; however, there is limited description on the procedures.
4. AERA recently implemented a procedure of contracting a conference ombudsperson to listen to any reports of harassment.

Formal Sanctions

1. Formal sanctions can include membership termination.

PAA – Population Association of America

Organization

Code of Conduct/Ethics Code

1. [Ethics Statement](#)

Standing Committees (with embedded links)

1. Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Committee

https://netforumpro.com/eweb/DynamicPage.aspx?Site=PAA&Webcode=LeadershipDetail&cmt_key=2a787402-b03d-456b-bd7b-ee49f1ea31a9

Annual Meetings

Code of Conduct/Ethics Code

1. PAA has an anti-harassment policy (<http://www.populationassociation.org/paaam/paa-meetings-anti-harassment-policy/>)
2. In order to register for the 2020 annual conference, participants had to agree to abide by PAA's anti-harassment policy.

Procedures for Reporting

1. PAA encourages bystander intervention and individuals to contact the Title IX Officer at their home institutions

Formal Sanctions

1. None. PAA encourages bystander intervention and individuals to contact the Title IX Officer at their home institutions