

**American Association for Public Opinion Research
Executive Council Minutes
May 11, 2015**

Michael Link	President	Present
Mollyann Brodie	Vice President	Present
Rob Santos	Past President	Present
Mary Losch	Secretary-Treasurer	Present
Dan Merkle	Associate Secretary-Treasurer	Present
Frauke Kreuter	Standards Chair	Absent
Ron Langley	Associate Standards Chair	Present
Dawn V. Nelson	Conference Chair	Present
David Dutwin	Associate Conference Chair	Present
Jennifer H. Childs	Membership & Chapter Relations Chair	Present
Kristen Olson	Associate Membership & Chapter Relations Chair	Present
Eleni Delimpaltadaki Janis	Communications Chair	Absent
Jordon Peugh	Associate Communications Chair	Present
Cliff Zukin	Councilor-at-Large	Present
Joe Lenski	Councilor-at-Large	Present
Staff		
Susan Tibbitts	Executive Director	Present
Crystal Stone	Administrator	Present

I. WELCOME, CALL TO ORDER

President Michael Link called the meeting to order at 3:02 p.m. EST and a quorum was established.

II. OLD BUSINESS

AAPOR Code of Professional Ethics and Practices

President Michael Link stated that the purpose of the Council meeting was to clarify the path forward for AAPOR following the conclusion of the membership vote on the Code set for 5:00 p.m. Eastern Time May 11, 2015. He added that he was not requesting formal action by the Council.

In anticipation of the close of voting and the active discussion on AAPORnet, Michael Link reported that he and Vice President Mollyann Brodie had reached out to members and to past members of the Executive Council including past presidents to request their input on next steps. Michael added that he and Molly felt that the Council needs to take a bigger step to address the comments that were made in reaction to proposed revisions to the Code, no matter the outcome of the member vote. Concern was noted about the loss of trust in AAPOR Council leadership expressed by some members. It was noted that some members appeared to be looking at revisions in isolation from related revisions and had not heard or been persuaded by the statement of reassurance that Council was listening, that Michael Link had posted to AAPORnet on May 1.

Michael Link proposed that Council postpone the announcement of the outcome of the vote until after the Council has met on Wednesday afternoon May 13 as scheduled. In the event the revised Code was approved by the membership as proposed, at the Council meeting, a motion would be offered to replace the language of the full clause 1. A., including all six parts, with the language currently in effect from 2010. In addition, the Council would be asked to form an ad hoc committee to review clause 1. A., and report a recommendation to the Standards Committee. Consistent with the Code revision process described by the By-Laws, the recommendation approved by the Standards Committee would come to the Council for a vote. The Council would act on the recommendation, and consistent with past practice, would post the proposed additional revisions to the Code for comment and discussion. A member vote would follow, most likely in the Fall, given the time needed for the required process of consideration to take place.

Council discussion followed with several councilors expressing the opinion that Council does not have the right to suspend the outcome of a vote by the membership.

The proposed action was clarified. Council would state the intent to suspend enforcement of the six parts of clause 1. A. and instead to enforce the applicable language contained in the current Code.

It was noted that the Council would not have the option of reverting to the 2010 Code because the current (2010) Code would cease to exist if and when the proposed revised Code was approved. The suggestion was offered that the Council would simply state the intent not to enforce the six parts of clause 1. A. with no further reference. There was agreement that the proposed action as clarified, was reasonable.

Discussion continued with the suggestion offered to preface suspension with “temporarily” and to emphasize that the review process for the revised language would be “expedited.” The suggestion was also made to refer to the clause addressing “disclosure of the sponsor to the respondent” to more narrowly focus the target of the suspension. There was agreement by the Council to the suggested changes.

A comment was made that the Council had not responded effectively to the repeated requests for the rationale that supported the revisions to the sponsor disclosure section. It was noted that the proposed revisions were specifically intended to deal with changes made since 2010 in the right to privacy as research subjects.

It was noted that Section 3 was not discussed but also had bearing on the issues raised in the listserv discussion. It was acknowledged that some members may be interested in revisiting changes made to other parts of the Code. Some councilors noted that such a broad review may not have a positive cost/benefit given the relatively small number of issues raised beyond sponsorship disclosure and the considerable work that has already been completed.

Concluding the discussion, there was agreement that Michael Link would post a note to AAPORnet on Tuesday morning, announcing the outcome of the vote on the Code and outlining the steps forward.

III. ADJOURNMENT

Michael Link stated that meeting was adjourned at 4:50 p.m. EST.