As the President for the Society for the Psychology of Women, I am heartened by the challenges and opportunities that we share as we join the voices of the many feminists before us who have made great strides in changing the field of psychology and the world in which we live. In this, my first month as President, I have been challenged with navigating one of the largest crises that the American Psychological Association has faced in recent memory. The Hoffman Independent Review explored APA's relationship with the Department of Defense (DoD) and revealed that there were efforts to curry favor with the DoD that were linked to serious conflicts of interest dynamics around psychologists' involvement in interrogations with detainees. While no psychologists openly endorsed the use of torture, the systemic decisions made by individuals and groups within APA led to loopholes that could have been used to support torture. As a member of APA Council of Representatives (representing my home state of Minnesota), I was one of the (almost unanimous) group of psychologists who voted to adopt a new APA policy that bans psychologist participation in national security interrogations. Along with Dr. Laura Baranel, I introduced a motion to begin the process of changing the ways in which conflicts of interests are addressed within APA Boards and Committees. Additionally, our goal was to generate a Composition Matrix that would assure more balance and diversity in terms of content expertise, gender, race and ethnicity on APA Boards and Committees. The Division in endorsing a Social Justice is one of proud. Along the way, we have positively changed girls, and we have impacted entire communities. Likewise, we have made mistakes through acts of commission and omission that have led to unintended consequences. We have been silent when we should have been screaming. We have sat down when it would have been better to stand up, and we have been divided when we should have been unified. The disturbing findings of the Hoffman report demonstrated how important it is to share power, oversight and responsibility for our group decisions, wrong or right. It has also shown us that we are indeed our sisters' keepers and that we are a Village of Feminists that no single person or single act can destroy. Our Division has a strong, resilient and powerful history. We are comprised of some of the most brilliant minds in psychology. From the difficult times that we currently face, using our feminist process, we can “Re-set our Feminist Compass.” We can utilize our strengths to overcome the challenges of silence, apathy, inactivity, and disharmony. We can stand up, we can scream, and we can lock arms to fight together. There is an African proverb that says: “When spiders unite, they can tie up a Lion.” Though we, as individuals, may feel powerless, we can unite and use our collective voices to fight, to change and to grow. In the ashes of our shame, guilt and anger, we can rise like the Phoenix to soar, though our wings may be tattered and scorched. We can still take flight and achieve the noble goals of Our Cause. The goals of Ubuntu (sacred value of humanity), Justice, Equality, Respect, Forgiveness and Hope.

“We have been silent when we should have been screaming”
This Division is larger than any of us and no single event in time has the power to destroy who we are. Single events, if taken wisely, only have the power to transform who we can become. We can make it if we re-focus on articulating our core values and principles, remind ourselves of the relational nature of our existence, and of the innate power of our indelible spirits! We can make it if we focus on our science, our history, our future and our capacity to understand situations contextually. We can make it if we choose to use this situation to help us learn, grow and forgive ourselves and each other. We can make it, indeed.

Although we have a very long, difficult road ahead of us, we will need strength and courage as we continue our collective journey. Our Feminist compass, like all compasses, has multiple directions. Yet, like the Northern star by which slaves pursued freedom, in order to move to freedom, we too must agree to follow the same light. Although we may take different paths, our goal should be to reach freedom--and to assure that all of us survive the trip.
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In the aftermath of the Hoffman report, many of us have a lot to say. Those of you on any of the division listservs will already know that division members have been sharing their reactions to the report and their recommendations for moving forward. To further the conversation, in this issue, we have created a Hoffman report special section. This section includes the official division 35 statement on the Hoffman report as well as statements from our presidential trio, past-president Maureen McHugh, current-president Brava Garrett-Akinsanya, and president-elect Olivia Moorehead-Slaughter. These statements were originally posted on the WOC listserv. We encourage all members to sign up for the Division 35 WOC Listserv. All discussion relating to the division and the Hoffman report are archived on this listserv. If you have a statement that you wish to be archived as part of the Hoffman report discussion, please post it to the WOC listserv. We have included instructions for signing up for the listserv, posting on the listserv, and for accessing archived materials posted to the listserv below. In the spirit of making sure our members are able to stay informed we have also included information about all the listservs used by division 35 (page 16), so that you can make sure that you are signed up.

In addition to sharing your thoughts and feelings on the WOC listserv and other listservs, we encourage you to put pen to paper (or finger to key) and send us your reactions to articles published in the newsletter. Did you read something you liked or found helpful? Do you want to comment on an article? Do you want to write about something related to the division? We want to hear from you!

Note: This listserv is the Women of Color Leadership listserv. The instructions below were sent out when the list was first created. We are using this listserv for discussion of the Hoffman report because division 35 members wanted to begin discussion of the Hoffman report immediately. As such, leadership chose to use an existing listserv that had been offline.

The name of the list: DIV35-WOCLEADERS

* The LISTSERV host name: LISTS.APA.ORG
* The list home page:
  http://lists.APA.ORG/cgi-bin/wa.exe?A0=DIV35-WOCLEADERS
* The list subscription page:
  http://lists.APA.ORG/cgi-bin/wa.exe?SUBED1=DIV35-WOCLEADERS

The following email addresses are used for the specified purposes:
* To send an email to the list: DIV35-WOCLEADERS@LISTS.APA.ORG
* To contact the list owner: DIV35-WOCLEADERS-request@LISTS.APA.ORG
* To send commands to the LISTSERV server: LISTSERV@LISTS.APA.ORG
* To unsubscribe from the list:
  DIV35-WOCLEADERS-signoff-request@LISTS.APA.ORG

(Continued on page 4)
The following URLs may also be useful:
*You may leave the list at any time by sending a SIGNOFF DIV35-WOCLEADERS command to: LISTSERV@LISTS.APA.ORG, or by sending a blank email to: DIV35-WOCLEADERS-signoff-request@LISTS.APA.ORG.
*You can also tell LISTSERV how you want it to confirm the receipt of messages that you send to the list. To send yourself a copy of your own messages, send a SET DIV35-WOCLEADERS REPRO command. Alternatively, to have LISTSERV send you a short acknowledgement instead of the entire message, send a SET DIV35-WOCLEADERS ACK NOREPRO command.
*Finally, you can turn off acknowledgements completely with the SET DIV35-WOCLEADERS NOACK NOREPRO command.
*This list is available in digest form. If you wish to receive the digested version of the postings, then issue a SET DIV35-WOCLEADERS DIGEST command.

WOC Listserv Rules

This listserv is currently unmoderated

If you subscribed to this forum and especially if you send messages to the forum, you are agreeing to three rules. These rules, by the way, apply to members of nearly any Internet news or interest group.

The rules are:

Rule 1: Do not use the forum for illegal purposes, including but not limited to defamation, violation of intellectual property laws, violation of antitrust or unfair competition laws or violation of criminal laws.

Rule 2: Do not intentionally interfere with or disrupt other forum members, network services, or network equipment. This includes distribution of unsolicited advertisement or chain letters, propagation of computer worms and viruses, and use of the network to make unauthorized entry to any other machine accessible via the Forum.

Rule 3: Do not use the Forum for commercial purposes. "Commercial" as used for purposes of evaluating listserv messages means communications whose primary purpose is to advance the business or financial interests of any person or entity, or otherwise to promote a financial transaction for the benefit of the author directly or indirectly. Examples of prohibited communications include advertisements for products or services, notices regarding rental of office space, or direct solicitations of listserv members to purchase products or services.

Examples of messages that may be of financial benefit to listserv members but are not prohibited because they do not inure to the financial benefit of the author include news of job listings or position openings, or discussion of professionally-related products or services where the listserv member conveying the information is not in the business of selling the products or services. Announcements that provide useful professional information to List members but may also have some incidental commercial benefit to the sender (e.g. an author who is a listmember merely advising the List of publication of a professional book) typically would not be "commercial" for purposes of this restriction.
In addition to these rules, various standards have emerged within the "culture" of electronic list forums. These standards do NOT mean requirements, however. By following these standards and rules, you will contribute to a climate of trust and collegiality that encourages a friendly, informed and, yet spontaneous discourse.

Standard 1: Please keep your messages constructive, courteous, and brief.

Standard 2: Please sign each of your messages, including your Email address. This enables us to be able to communicate with you in response to your message. Most Email software includes a signature option that automatically generates this information and any other you wish.

Standard 3: If your Email software program includes and you utilize an option that repeats the message to which you are responding, please, please do not repeat any part of the message that is not essential. This will save considerable space (bandwidth) for everyone who receives your message.

Standard 5: Please think global. Although most of our members are from the US, some list members may not be familiar with American culture as US members. Thus, try to avoid the use of Americanist terms that may not be well known internationally, or long and complicated sentences (think about your trying to wade through many messages in French, for example, if your first language is English!).

Standard 6: Please be supportive of fellow Forum members and show mutual respect.

Some day you may wish to unsubscribe from the Forum. If so, simply send a message to: listserv@lists.apa.org Use no subject line. Your message should say only: Signoff DIV35-WOCLEADERS

So, we welcome you to this Forum and look forward to your introduction.

To contact the owner of the list address your message to:
DIV35-WOCLEADERS-request@lists.apa.org

How to access earlier posts on the WOC listserv

You can access earlier posts (which we highly recommend) by going to the listserv site, http://listserv.apa.org, and clicking on the "click here" link to continue.

You will need to sign up with the email address you are using for the listserv and create a password. On the next page, you will see a long list of listservs.

Scroll down to the bottom and type in a large number where it says "lists per page," such as 5000, and click on "update."

On the next page, scroll down to the item for div35-wocleaders and click on that.

The next screen will list the months where items have been shared, beginning with the most recent month and going backwards.

Click on a month to get a list of all the items for that month.

Click on the "date," "from," and subject" headings to sort. Note that there is a search feature to the right.

There is a help feature in the upper right corner at the question mark in the green box.

Also, there is a link for help with log ins and listserv rules as well as a subscriber's corner at the top. On the subscriber's corner, each person can see the lists they are on using that particular email address.
Hoffman Report

The Hoffman Independent Review for Implications for Division 35
BraVada Garrett-Akinsanya, PhD

The objective for writing this column is three-fold. First, to provide background information about the Hoffman Report. Second, to highlight the implications of the report for Division 35. Third, to address the role(s) played (and not played) by Dr. Olivia Moorehead-Slaughter relative the issues brought forth in the Hoffman Report and to describe Dr. Moorehead-Slaughter’s future role within Division 35. On July 2, 2015, the American Psychological Association released a 542-page report produced by attorney David Hoffman, of the Sidley Austin law firm, who was retained by the APA Board of Directors last November to conduct a thorough and independent review detailing the relationship between various activities of the APA and Bush Administration policies on interrogation techniques. His charge was to “follow the evidence where it led.” Mr. Hoffman’s investigation was described as being “thorough and fair” by Division 35 EC members. The process spanned an eight month period and, along with affiliated activities, cost the organization almost 5 million dollars. The investigative process was initiated by a near-decade’s worth of allegations that after the attacks on September 11th the APA’s engaged in efforts to assist the government in its “War on Terror.” The contention was that APA’s engagement with the Bush Administration resulted in collusion with the Department of Defense (DoD), as well as the CIA, and subsequently lead to an effort in 2002 to change the APA Code of Ethics to support enhanced interrogations and torture. Key dissenters of APA’s practices included members of the Divisions of Social Justice such as Jean Maria Arrigo, Stephen Soldz and Steve Reisner.

More importantly, the Hoffman investigation yielded findings of individual collusion and organizational failures in APA’s activities. The Hoffman report described that the intent of the individuals who participated in the collusion was to “curry favor” with the DoD and, in turn, may have enabled the government’s use of abusive interrogation techniques. Furthermore, a 2005 Presidential Task Force on Psychological Ethics and National Security (PENS) report was created based on a three-day retreat/meeting. The stated intention of the report was to strike a balance between meeting the needs of the DoD, the psychology profession, and the APA’s commitment to human rights. Nonetheless, Mr. Hoffman’s independent review revealed that the process was tainted by behind-the-scenes manipulations, conflicts of interests, and poor organizational follow-through. The report also revealed that, counter to critics’ claims of APA collusion with the CIA, there was “no evidence of significant CIA interactions regarding PENS.” Additionally, Mr. Hoffman’s inquiry indicated that the changes in APA’s Code of Ethics was not the product of collusion to support government torture, but were revised to provide a defense for psychologists when their ethical obligations on client confidentiality conflicted with court-ordered directives ordering disclosure of confidential patient information. Mr. Hoffman’s report identified those he considered to be the “Key Players” who knowingly (or unknowingly) aided in the collusion by being intimately involved in the coordinated effort to align APA actions with DoD preferences through the vehicle of the PENS Task Force. They included: Stephen Behnke, APA Ethics Director, DoD Officials, Morgan Banks and Debra Dunivin (a lead psychologist supporting interrogations operations at Guantanamo Bay) and Scott Shumate (a former CIA official) as well as Kirk Kennedy at the counter-intelligence unit –CIFA. Mr. Hoffman also cited then-APA President Ron Levant, then-APA President-Elect Gerald Koocher, and then-APA Practice Directorate Chief Russ Newman. Mr. Hoffman also identified those who participated in the selection of a configuration of task force members that created increased vulnerability for manipulation and collusive actions to take place. He identified Levant, Koocher, and Behnke and then-APA Board member Barry Anton, (though involved substantially less than the others). Other members of the APA executive management group—namely, CEO Norman Anderson, Deputy CEO Michael Honaker, General Counsel Nathalie Gilfoyle, and communications director Rhea Farberman were identified as key players involved in relevant communications. APA President-Elect, Dr. Susan McDaniel and APA Past-President, Dr. Nadine Kaslow (Chair) were instrumental in the work of the Independent Review’s Special Committee. After receiving the findings, they invited Drs. Stephen Soldz and Steve Reisman to meet with the APA Board of Directors to provide their recommendations. During that meeting, Reisman and Soldz made several key recommendations, including ideas that set a variety of key actions into motion. In their July 2, 2015 comments to the Board, they laid out a framework – Contrition, Accountability, Transparency, Inclusiveness, and Genuine Change – that they believed should guide APA’s response to the current crisis. In the document they suggested the following actions.

On July 22, Drs. Reisman & Soldz presented a revised version of their original recommendations by including one more category to their framework: Policy Review, Development, and Reform. They introduced this document by making the following statement: “On July 2, 2015, Stephen Soldz and I presented our initial responses and recommendations to the Board, based on our, then, incomplete reading of the Hoffman Report. Since that time we have had the opportunity to give the report a more thorough reading and have, accordingly, updated our recommendations.” They attached a new statement: Immediate Actions Required in Wake of Hoffman Report: Recommendations to APA Council of Representatives and Board of Directors. Dr. Reisman went on the write: “This document details our understanding of the kinds of malfeasance delineated in the Hoffman report, the names of those, remaining on staff or in governance, who we see as most egregiously responsible, and a list of recommended actions.” In this document, they specifically suggested that APA should investigate the following staff and officials for gross malfeasance, as documented in the Hoffman Report: Barry Anton, Nathalie Gilfoyle, Larry James, Gerald Koocher, and Ron Levant. This time, they specifically eliminated the name of
Olivia Moorehead-Slaughter. The also suggested that further investigation into documented malleasance on the part of any additional staff and governance officials to determine if such malleasance warrants further action.

In conclusion, Dr. Susan McDaniel is quoted as saying: “The Hoffman report contains deeply disturbing findings that reveal previously unknown and troubling instances of collusion. The process by which the Presidential Task Force on Psychological Ethics and National Security (PENS) was created, the composition of the membership, the content of the PENS report and the subsequent activities related to the report were influenced by collusion between a small group of APA representatives and government officials.” Additionally, Past-President Kaslow stated that: “Our internal checks and balances failed to detect the collusion, or properly acknowledge a significant conflict of interest, nor did they provide meaningful field guidance for psychologists.” According to her, “The organization’s intent was not to enable abusive interrogation techniques or contribute to violations of human rights, but that may have been the result... [yet] “The actions, policies and the lack of independence from government influence described in the Hoffman report represented a failure to live up to our core values. We profoundly regret, and apologize for, the behavior and the consequences that ensued. Our members, our profession and our organization expected, and deserved better.”

IMPLICATIONS FOR THE SOCIETY FOR THE PSYCHOLOGY OF WOMEN (DIVISION 35);

Division 35 is one of the APA Divisions that self-identifies as a “Social Justice” Division. Social Justice Divisions hold as their bedrock, convictions to form coalitions to advocate for Social Justice and Responsibility in APA and society at-large. As a member of the group committed to Social Justice, the Society for the Psychology of Women has shown past leadership in many aspects of women’s rights and equity in other life areas. Feminists, by definition, are those who endorse a range of movements and ideologies that share a common goal of seeking equality in political, economic, cultural, personal, and social arenas, especially to improve the lives of women and girls. In Division 35, our brand of feminism also incorporates the intersections of ethnicity, gender, race and religious freedom as well as a commitment to an equal access to safety, respect and the dignity of humanity. We recognize how systemic power can be abused, shared or manipulated, and we seek to explore and influence those power dynamics within the contexts of the environments in which they are exhibited. The Hoffman report introduced new challenges to our brand of feminism because within the context of the environment, one of our own, our President Elect Dr. Olivia Moorehead-Slaughter was involved. Dr. Moorehead-Slaughter was selected to serve as the Non-Voting Chair of the PENS task force, partly because of her skills as a facilitator, her expertise in ethics (and her lack of expertise in defense and national security). The Hoffman report further elucidates that her selection was to bring in a member who represented the intersections of racial, cultural, and gender diversity. Thus, over the 2½ day PENS planning retreat, Dr. Moorehead-Slaughter facilitated a group process based on the disingenuous participation of some members who had ulterior motives and agendas. Additionally, as the Chair of the Task Force and eventual chair of the APA Ethics Committee, Dr. Moorehead-Slaughter was supported by Ethics Director Behnke, who exhibited the common-APA staff practice of providing guidance in the form of producing written materials for psychologist volunteers with the purpose of passing those communications on to committee members. His guidance, however, was (according to the report), often filtered through DoD operatives, which translated to collusion in policy development. When members of Division 35 discovered that our President-Elect was involved in the PENS Task Force, the dynamics of past votes of not standing with the Social Justice Division ensued. Additionally, although she was not named as a key player, and her name was removed from Reiser’s recommendations as being one of those with high capability, Dr. Moorehead-Slaughter’s role gave rise to considerable criticism, most notably about the concern that allowing her to lead the Division as President-Elect at this time would create an image problem about the Division’s lack of commitment to accountability about Social Justice. Dr. Maureen McHugh’s document (to follow) captures the sentiments of those, who during the Executive Committee Meeting in Toronto, expressed concerns. Knowing that we have no bylaws remedy to asking an officer to step down, members offered the option to Dr. Moorehead-Slaughter to leave her post or to explain how she may assist us in the restoration of our core values as feminists who support Social Justice. Dr. Moorehead-Slaughter’s letter affirms her commitment to social justice and explains her decision to lean forward into the process by remaining in her post as President-Elect. Dr. Garrett-Akinsanya’s letter describes the dynamics within Division 35 and offers steps we may take to use the best of feminist process to move forward together. These steps include the implementation of a series of Social Justice Seminars based on a re-examination of SPW’s core values and beliefs as well as the content analysis of member concerns. Her plans will also include the development of Executive Committee Facilitated Retreat during the Mid-Winter meeting. Discussions via Feminist Town Hall Conference Calls, a Division 35 Town Hall ListServ, as well as the establishment of multiple Solutions Board Surveys in an effort to engage SPW membership. The following links will help those of you who wish to read more about this historic event.

The Hoffman Independent Review:
http://www.apa.org/independent-review/

The initial letter from the presidents of APA:

Hoffman Timelines:

President Garrett-Akinsanya’s Video:
https://youtu.be/4xlZPFkR_iM
With dismay, we read the report of the independent investigator (the Hoffman Report), which was released on July 10, 2015. The Society for the Psychology of Women (Division 35) accepts this report as thorough and fair. We are ashamed that the result of APA’s failure of leadership, and our own, may have contributed to the torture of those held in detention by the U.S. government. The Society for the Psychology of Women strongly condemns the ethical violations of APA leaders, staff, and members involved.

We are deeply concerned about the attempts, and successes, of internal and external groups/individuals to distort the purview of our professional foundations through collusion and/or subterfuge. To regain the trust of the membership and the public, accountability is essential. As such we demand a thorough public acknowledgement of wrongdoing. Such accountability should occur in the context of due process, but calls for “due process” should not be allowed to obfuscate accountability or unreasonably delay action. In this spirit we acknowledge our failure in 2007 to join with other groups that opposed the composition and process of the PENS Task Force. We regret that we did not take an early principled stand and demand that the APA uphold the international standards associated with the Geneva Convention and the UN Convention Against Torture both through its development and enforcement of ethical policy. Despite our intent to indicate solidarity with the PsySR and the Divisions of Social Justice in 2012 by affirming the safety, justice, and well-being of all people as our priority, we acknowledge that our issuing of a separate statement appeared to contradict this. For this we apologize.

The Society for Psychology of Women pledges to contribute to the process of bringing our members and the large and diverse community of psychologists together to engage in serious and redemptive self-reflection and to take the necessary steps to (re)build a more conscious and compassionate organization. We stand with other concerned psychologists who are committed to reforming the American Psychological Association to ensure transparent and democratic process and to do all we can to reduce the possibility that such events will ever occur in the future. As feminists and as a social justice division, we affirm the importance of human dignity and well-being and of addressing all violations of human rights. We applaud the recent actions taken by the APA’s Council of Representatives to forbid the involvement of psychologists in national security interrogations and to plan for a Blue Ribbon Commission to evaluate and revise APA’s ethical standards and adjudication processes. We ask that APA make further amends and organizational changes that would prevent this type of inexcusable series of decisions to occur. We believe that all segments of the psychological community should be seated at the APA table during this critical time of repair and reorganization as well as afterwards, including the historically marginalized. The transformation we seek depends upon a much higher level of engagement from many more members of our profession. Change will require participation from all of us including those who actively denied the problem, those who remained silent, and those who have remained uninformed and unconcerned.

We appreciate that there is a diversity of views in our division and thus we do not speak on behalf of everyone. However, we believe it is important to state our response now as clearly as we can. We welcome further discussion on our listserv (Div35-WOLEADERS@LISTS(APA.ORG), and we will forward the concerns of our members to the APA leadership through our council representatives, or through additional position statements.
Past President Report: Discussion Regarding Division 35 Leadership and the Hoffman Report

Maureen McHugh, PhD

Discussions in response to the release of the Hoffman Report were the focus of the APA meeting in Toronto in August. (If you have not yet read the Hoffman Report, you should at least read the executive summary.) The report describes the role that Olivia Moorehead-Slaughter, our President-Elect, played as Chair of the PENS (Psychological Ethics and National Security) Task Force (TF). It is important that members who were not present understand that the issues that arose from Olivia’s role in the PENS Task Force and our EC discussion are both important to the division and are inherently conflict-laden. We need to move forward within the Division and within APA, but we cannot do that without acknowledging the past and current reality.

Here I am reporting on the discussion that occurred at the Division 35 EC Meeting at APA on August 5, 2015. Points of discussion are briefly reported as background to the anonymous vote of the extended EC indicating serious concerns about Olivia Moorehead-Slaughter assuming leadership of Division 35 at this time (30/41 indicated serious concerns, 5/41 indicated no serious concerns, and 6/41 abstained.) Olivia was given this information and has yet to indicate whether she is willing to step down.

Although we had a full agenda, and many traveled early to APA to attend and make reports at this meeting, the President and Secretary agreed to Olivia Moorehead-Slaughter’s request to address the members during the EC meeting. Due to family issues, Olivia modified her request to address the EC via phone connection. We supplied the necessary IT to schedule her address. Olivia presented about 20 minutes of prepared remarks, followed by 30 minutes of questions and answers. After Olivia was off the phone, the EC proceeded to have a 90-100 minute discussion of her presentation until the meeting was adjourned. The agenda was set aside and the other business of the Division was suspended to accommodate the discussion of division leadership.

In her prepared remarks Olivia indicated that she was devastated by reading the Hoffman report. She indicated that she had been manipulated by the other parties involved and she had not intentionally supported torture. And that she, only now, in reading the Hoffman report understood how her role as Chair was a problem—that she “unwittingly participated in a process …that likely facilitated harmful treatment and even torture to detainees” and she apologized for that and for misleading others by lending credibility to the PENS. “I didn’t know what I didn’t know.” “In the same circumstances with the same amount of information, it’s hard to say if anything would have been done different. But I didn’t have different information—I only knew what I knew.” “The good of the Division precedes any one individual including me. How we move forward is a critical decision that the Division has to make.”

There were 50+ people in the room when the discussion started, but some left before the ballot at the end. Initially some individuals repeatedly addressed the group, but we tried to give priority to people who had not spoken. As the discussion evolved, almost every person in the room offered some opinion or perspective.

Here are some of the points discussed:

Questions regarding Olivia’s leadership on the PENS TF, e.g. forwarding emails written by others as her own.

Positive interactions with and feelings towards Olivia.

Questions concerning whether Olivia could adequately represent the Div at this time given her role in the PENS report vis a vis the Division’s current stand on torture.

Concern that her involvement with PENS and the investigation will serve as a distraction during her 3-years through the Presidency cycle.

Concerns regarding the likely negative impact that her Presidency will have on Div 35’s credibility as a social justice Division.

Concern regarding the resignations of additional Div 35 members in objection to her leadership.

Questioning Olivia’s astuteness (e.g., Olivia’s reported lack of insight into the dynamics of the PENS TF and the problems with its positions, especially given that individuals opposed to the PENS report were repeatedly trying to convey them to her).

Argument that not knowing is not an acceptable position; in a leadership position you need to inform yourself, and attend to information presented by others.
Argument that the decision has to be about principles, not about individuals.
Perspective that others would have behaved similarly.
Problem with Olivia not listening to or considering the position of those dissenting
Concern for members of the division who were hurt by this whole process
In response to questions about the suppression and negative treatment of individuals opposed to PENS, Olivia stated that she had never shown disrespect for others.
Perspective that we should support Olivia as a member of our Division and as a woman of color
Question whether Olivia as PENS TF Chair had power to change the direction and actions of PENS.
Argument that she needed to use her position as Chair to support the whistleblower and three people on the PENS TF who objected to the resolution crafted by those with connections to the Department of Defense.
Concern that Olivia was being made a scapegoat, as often happens to members of minority groups. It was noted that white male TF members had not been made to relinquish their APA leadership positions.
Question if we can, with integrity, hold others involved in the collusion and deception responsible while protecting Olivia.
Problem with Olivia’s response to questions about her actions if she were to assume the position of President (i.e., she mentioned initiatives such as feminist mentoring that did not address concerns about her leadership or how to address conflicts within the Division)
Concern that having her as President will compromise our ability to work with other divisions and organizations who are moving forward on legislation and projects addressing the errors that led to the PENS TF’s resolution
Potential conflicts of roles as a division leader as we deal with addressing (ethical and other) problems in connection with PENS.
As we had exceeded our allotted time for the meeting, and some people had to leave, President Maureen McHugh asked if there was a general sense that we should take a vote on something. A number of options were raised. Most did not want a vote of no confidence per se but wanted to express their concerns about Olivia’s leadership.
A motion was made for attendees to vote anonymously on the following: “I have serious concerns about Olivia assuming leadership of Division 35 at this time.” President Maureen McHugh asked attendees if this should be a vote by only the EC or elected EC or all attendees. While there was not a consensus, the majority of the group supported the decision to have all attendees vote with the anonymous ballot. EC members wrote their votes on pieces of paper turned in to and counted by the secretary, Monique Clinton Sherrod, and Susan Basow in the meeting hall. This anonymous vote resulted in 30/41 indicating yes, they had serious concerns, 5/41 indicated no serious concerns, and 6/41 abstained.
On Friday, August 7, Maureen conveyed the results of this ballot to Olivia by phone. Olivia said she needed time to think about the expressed concerns about her leading the division. Olivia stated that the strength of the division was paramount; however, according to Maureen, Olivia never indicated to her any inclination to resign. After sending two follow-up emails to Olivia to urge her to address the issue, to which she did not reply, the situation was turned over to the new President of the Division, Bravada Garrett-Akinsanya.

The following is a letter written by BraVada Garrett-Akinsanya, president of division 35. This letter was posted to the Division 35 executive committee listserv, the WOC listserv and div35announce. A video version of this letter is available at:

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=4xJtZPkR_iM

September 2, 2015

Dear Executive Committee and SPW Members,

Thank you all for your dedication to our division and your commitment to working toward our continuous growth and accountability. I am proud to be the President of a group of feminists whose hearts and minds are invested in working toward our feminist values including collaborative process and social justice. As many of you know, the voting Executive Committee (EC) met with Dr. Olivia Moorehead-Slaughter on Friday, August 28, 2015. The meeting was held as a follow up to correspondence received from members as well as in follow-up to a straw poll that transpired on Wednesday August 5, 2015, in Toronto, when our Division 35 Extended Executive Committee held our business meeting prior to the Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association. During the course of Toronto EC meeting, among other agenda items, we received an unscheduled phone call, at the request of Dr. Olivia Moorehead-Slaughter, during which she described her sentiments about being mentioned in the Hoffman Independent Review report and her experience as the non-voting Chair of the PENS Taskforce. After making her statement, a conversation was held in a large group discussion format telephonically with Dr. Moorehead-Slaughter. Afterwards, without her present, additional discussion occurred, after which a "straw poll" was conducted in response to the question: "Do you agree that there are serious concerns about Olivia assuming leadership of Division 35 at this time?" A majority of the people voting reported that they had "concerns." There was no formal action, however, as there was no formal motion that the group passed regarding Dr. Moorehead-Slaughter. In follow-up to the straw poll, the group agreed that their "concerns" would be shared in conversation with the officer at issue, and that she would be asked if she could assume leadership at this time given the issues surrounding the PENS report. Furthermore, the mode and content of communicating the concerns represented by the poll were to be developed in collaboration with myself and our past-president, Maureen McHugh. In turn, Dr. McHugh independently communicated directly with Dr. Moorehead-Slaughter, both verbally and in writing, indicating that the group had concerns and suggested that she take the action of stepping down. Again, the spirit of our EC poll was not to ask her to step down, but to ask her if she felt that she could do the job given the circumstances around the PENS report. As you may be able to gather from some of the letters and emails forwarded, this is a painful time for Division 35 in that members feel strongly on all sides of this issue. There are members who have felt that nothing other than Dr. Moorehead-Slaughter’s resignation would suffice. Many others, as witnessed by the letters I have received, feel strongly that she should not resign. There are members who intended their straw poll vote to serve as a demand for Dr. Moorehead-Slaughter’s resignation, while there are others who agreed to it because it stopped short of that action. They wanted their votes to serve the function of mandating that she be more strongly aligned with social justice issues during her presidency by making this serious matter a part of her presidential mission. While some members felt safe speaking their minds at the meeting, others said that they did not see our EC as being “safe” for disagreement. There are members who believed that the process at the EC meeting was appropriate and just, while others saw it as a poor example of Feminist process. Finally, while one group contends that they will leave Division 35 if Dr. Moorehead-Slaughter stays, others contend that they will leave if she if forced to resign. These communications have come from students, early career professionals as well as our feminist elders. Thus, as you can see, most of the communications represented both process issues as well as possible legal vulnerabilities for our Division. Therefore, recognizing that the communication that had been sent to Dr. Moorehead-Slaughter did not appear to be in keeping with the motion that had been passed, in order to pursue due diligence in my role as President of the Division, I sought legal counsel on behalf of our Division. Specifically, I consulted about which actions were permitted by our Divisional bylaws, and about the rights and responsibilities of us as a Division as well as those afforded to Dr. Moorehead-Slaughter. In consultation with multiple attorneys (including those from APA), the interpretation of the Division bylaws that had been put
forth at the EC meeting were upheld stipulating that there is no statutory provision in the SPW bylaws to replace an officer in our Division, and that several legal vulnerabilities existed because of the way matters have been handled to date. In preparation for this letter, I had to figure out next steps depending on whether Dr. Moorehead-Slaughter decided to stay or if she decided to step down. Consequently, I sought the counsel of several Feminist Elders who hold divergent perspectives—all of whom articulated several viable options for the Division to move forward, including, but not limited to, the option involving her stepping down from her post. Additionally, I have participated on the Early Career Mentoring Discussion regarding the Hoffman report as well as individually sought the counsel of Early Career members of our EC to gain their fresh perspectives in terms of their personal opinions, as well as their suggestions for options and strategies for moving forward. I trust their wisdom and creativity, as well as that of the more senior feminists among us. The Early Career members represented both sides of the argument, but also described some common-ground solutions that could be achieved regardless of the choice that Dr. Moorehead-Slaughter made. For their creativity and willingness to be open, I am truly grateful. Finally, I have reviewed my notes from the numerous letters, emails, and phone calls that I have received. I have attempted to integrate the member feedback, my conversations with Dr. Moorehead-Slaughter, as well as the cautionary advice from legal counsel. Most importantly, I have searched my own heart to try to balance how I may feel as a member of the EC who staunchly believed my vote was the right thing to do and in the best interest of the Division, versus those who felt that their votes were ineffectual or rendered half-heartedly. In the end, the legal protection of the Division superseded any emotional needs that I may have had.

I have learned a great deal about our Division during those discussions, and from them I have also concluded that our Division has a strong, resilient and powerful history. We are comprised of some of the most brilliant minds in psychology. From the difficult times that we currently face, using our feminist process, we can “Re-set our Feminist Compass.” We can utilize our strengths to overcome these current challenges. To paraphrase Margaret Atwood from her book, Moral Disorder and Other Stories, “In the end, we all become [just a small part of] the [larger] story.” This Division is larger than any of us and no single event in time has the power to destroy who we are. Single events, if taken wisely, only have the power to transform who we can to become. We can make it if we re-focus on articulating our core values and principles, remind ourselves of the relational nature of our existence, and of the strength of our indelible spirits. We can make it if we focus on our science, our history, our future and our capacity to understand situations contextually. We can make it if we choose to use this situation to help us learn, grow and forgive ourselves and each other. We can make it.

I know that in my capacity as President, one priority is to protect the legal standing of the Division and not place it at risk for liability and to pledge to minimize the presence of strategies that involve intimidation, coercion and threat. I also believe that another priority is to protect the ability of the Division members to participate in our Division (bringing all of their gifts, talents and knowledge) without feeling undue pressure to conform to practices that they feel are unfair, inappropriate, unsafe or potentially illegal. Finally, my desire is to respond to the wishes of a majority of our members, who want answers and who want us to do the job of promoting feminist practices and ideals within the context of our long-standing commitment to social justice principles. The dilemma that I have faced in the first weeks of my presidency is one that calls for strategic planning, respect for both individual and group needs, as well as balancing our collective anger, fears, shame, guilt and need for change. While many are concerned about what others will think about our Division, I pose that our greater challenge should be what we will think about ourselves when all of this is said and done. Can we say that we explored all options, used the best feminist process, dealt with each other respectfully and honored the humanity of each person involved? Or will we say that we let “hurt people, hurt people?”

Consequently, and upon the advice of Counsel, our first task was to hold a meeting of the Voting EC members with Dr. Moorehead-Slaughter to openly discuss our group’s concerns, our leadership options and forward progress. During our meeting last Friday, she notified us of her intention to remain as President-Elect, and provided a compelling case for what she has learned and how she could assist us in moving forward. In her letter, she expresses her commitment to staying in conversation in this difficult process. I reiterate, the choice was hers to make as the purpose of our EC decision was to open the door to have those conversations, not to ask her to step down. Given her decision, our role now is to work for the unification and strengthening of the Division by moving forward with a plan of self-reflection and social justice initiatives. Therefore, the Voting Executive Committee believed that our second task was to develop a transparent, open and explicit strategic process that integrates and legitimizes divergent opinions in an effort to find solutions and create change. With that in mind, we decided that we must pay great attention to those who have expressed legitimate concerns about Dr.
Moorehead-Slaughter, APA and our Division. Dr. Maureen McHugh’s letter and Dr. Sharon Lamb’s letters were both instrumental in determining how we may proceed in identifying and addressing our members’ key concerns. In response, Dr. Monique Clinton-Sherrod, our current Secretary, and Ms. Michelle Santiago, our current Associate Professional Representative, agreed to perform a content analysis of the feedback that has been given in the areas of member concerns. As a result of our data-driven process, we will schedule a series of Feminist Social Justice Webinars on a variety of social justice topics from the Hoffman report, to exploring our commitment to racial justice, to gender diversity inclusion and reproductive justice — just to name a few. Each webinar will be followed by feedback opportunities such as listserv discussions, electronic solutions boards and listening sessions. Dr. Moorehead-Slaughter requested to be a leader in promoting this project and suggested that we begin the series with content-based webinars that address the issues related to PENS and the Hoffman report. She will be joined in leading this process by Drs. Peggy Signorella, our SPW Treasurer, and Dr. Jennifer Vencil, President of Section 4. I commend the willingness of these individuals to step forward, and truly value Dr. Moorehead-Slaughter’s statement and her desire to continue to dialogue with all of us. Finally, I am especially appreciative of those of you who are open to continued dialogue and growth. In turn, I would like to invite all SPW members who are interested in helping to plan and/or execute our webinar discussions and follow-up discussion boards to please contact me. In the end, it is our intention to produce a book that chronicles our collective and personal reflections as well as the actions taken by our Division in our collaborative journey to recovery, healing and transformation. We ask you to join us in this endeavor.

Finally, the Voting EC agreed that it would be helpful to meet with our APA attorney to make sure that we fully understand our leadership responsibilities as a Division, and explore the creation of bylaws changes that will give us a Feminist Conflict Mediation process, and provide statutory guidance in addressing matters such as this without creating legal exposure in the future. These three tasks must be done before we make any movement toward healing together.

Letter from the President Elect of Division 35: Relating to Leadership and the Hoffman Report

Olivia Moorehead-Slaughter, PhD

The following is a letter written by Olivia Moorehead-Slaughter, PhD, president elect of division 35. This letter was posted to the Division 35 executive committee listserv, the WOC listserv and div35announce.

August 31, 2015

To the Division 35 Executive Committee and Members:

I am writing at this time to communicate with you about my elected position as President Elect of Division 35. When asked to be on the ballot for President Elect of our division, I agreed to do so only after very careful consideration. I care deeply about issues related to social justice, issues which promote the growth and development of girls and women, and the intergenerational promotion of feminist psychology. Following the considerable personal and professional upheaval following the release of the Hoffman Report, I am even more committed to the aforementioned ideals. I remain committed to leading and do not intend to resign from my position as President-elect. I recognize that there are those who have expressed concerns about my leading Division 35 at this time. I pledge to remain open to hearing your concerns and to responding to them. I also pledge to you my commitment to remaining engaged to do the hard work of assisting our division to heal and to find the path forward. I am also committed to assisting our association to make the necessary changes so that we do not repeat our past mistakes. I recognize that this is a critical time for both our division and for all of APA. We are faced with the difficult task of reflecting upon decisions that we made individually and collectively over the past decade. As we do so, we are also faced with myriad emotions including anger, sadness, guilt and shame. I am personally devastated that I unwittingly participated in a process that produced a report that from 2005 until its retraction in 2013 likely facilitated harmful treatment and even torture to detainees by the DoD, despite the fact that “Mr. Hoffman stated unequivocally that the report did not conclude that APA supports torture. However, the
Hoffman Report
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report DID conclude that there was collusion between APA and the DoD to allow psychologists to be present where torture may have existed and that APA was trying to curry favor with the DoD. Mr. Hoffman stated that the report did not take a position on whether psychologists should be present in interrogations but noted that there was an inherent tension when psychologists were present in interrogation settings, even when designated as safety monitors. “(August 20, 2015, L. Grossman Council report to Division 31) I expressed my remorse about this when I spoke at the EC meeting during Convention. I am doing so again in this letter. I also apologized to those of you who were misled or felt harm, disenfranchisement or unheard by my endorsement of the credibility of the PENS process and report and I am repeating that apology in this letter. I assure you that I communicated what I believed to be true and never would have intentionally misinformed others or endorsed a work product that I would have even remotely believed to be potentially used as a tool for torture or pain. I am now determined to be a stronger leader who has learned from this very complicated time and I plan to use the lessons that I have learned for productive growth and healing. I have learned how to validate more, listen more and actively make decisions that are comprised of multiple perspectives. Consequently, I am prepared to do the hard work of leadership that will require patience, openness, honesty, and the willingness to listen and to learn. I believe that together, our division can move forward towards healing, acknowledging that this will be difficult work and that it will require that we stay in connection with each other through some very thorny terrain. This is the time for all of us to reaffirm our feminist values, to do the difficult and painful work before us, and to seize the opportunity to work across our diverse division to make this happen. I assure you that my continued deep self-reflection and seeking to learn from the experience of accepting the role as chair of the PENS task force will serve as a catalyst for moving the division forward during this very difficult time. My plans include those of working alongside our current President, Dr. BraVada Garrett-Akinsanya, and a fully committed Executive Committee, to move us forward. I will personally serve as a key leader in the development of a Feminist Social Justice Webinar Series with listening sessions, feedback and solutions boards that will allow us to address multiple social justice areas with our members.

I have asked that we begin the series with more dialogues about the dynamics arising from the Hoffman Report. Since the release of the Hoffman Report, I have spent countless hours reflecting about my decision to say “yes” to the role as a non-voting chair of the PENS task force in 2005. By now, I am sure that you have read the Hoffman Report and have taken note of the reasons that I was asked to assume the role of chair (expert facilitation skills, deep ethics experience, respect and credibility within APA across a broad range of colleagues and because I am an African American woman and represent diversity). What I did not bring to this role was expertise or experience in the area of national security or the military. I now feel that not having this expertise and being convinced to accept the position primarily because of my group facilitation skills and expertise in general ethics was a mistake. A chair with more content knowledge may have asked more and different questions. I, along with the majority of governance members over the next eight years truly believed that the presence of military psychologists would help PROTECT detainees.

In addition to sharing the lessons that I have learned from the mistakes that I have made, I plan to lead our Division toward a broader discussion of the roles of power and privilege within and outside of our group, as well as the roles of intersecting identities of gender and race.

Finally, my hope is that we will leave those discussions with greater understanding of the systems issues that initially put us in the current position (as a Division and as an Association) and that we will be able to collaboratively develop ways to prevent this type of event from happening in the future. Truly, this is a very layered matter. The division is choosing to process its considerable pain around past decisions through its focus on me as an individual. My individual accountability is certainly necessary, but it is not sufficient. Division 35 will not fully heal without a thorough examination of its own actions and inactions over the past decade. It will take courage to face these past decisions with honesty and to withstand the convenience of displacement. I am willing to accept responsibility for my decisions and hope that the division will be willing to do the same. Because of this experience, I truly believe that I am in a unique position to add value to our healing process on both micro and macro levels and I want the opportunity to try.

I fully embrace the complexity of the healing ahead for all of us and believe that our work together will strengthen us individually and collectively. I further believe that it is through our mistakes that we gain the most learning. As your President-elect, I commit to staying in connection with you, to listening to your voices, to remaining in dialogue with you, and to ensuring that our commitment to social justice remains evident and strong.

With sincere and warm regard,
Olivia Moorehead-Slaughter, PhD
As we were developing our expected Q&A on another early-career issue, the Hoffman Report was released. The story that unfolded in its pages was devastating for many psychologists, who felt duped and betrayed by the organization they have supported all these years. Members who have served on the front lines of feminist psychology have experienced personal and professional betrayals, and many have looked with wrenching hindsight at ways they might have helped the process play out differently. Many of us have found ourselves questioning what personal choices we might have made in similar circumstances, and what to do next. ECPs have been trying to absorb the bewildering events detailed in the report, without the benefit of familiarity with the people and committees and functions involved. At a time when young psychologists are developing their professional identities and beginning to engage in activities and divisions of APA, they are now also grappling with transgressions within the organization they expected to be their protective home, their voice, their ethical guide.

Among the most difficult questions they have asked is whether they should continue to be a part of APA and, by extension, Division 35. But mostly, they want information. And therein lies the challenge: Division 35 executive committee members have ongoing conversations and a midwinter meeting, and those who attend APA can sit in on the EC meetings in August, but what about the rest of the year? No newsletter column can fill in the gaps. And even then, how can ECPs get involved, and how will they be heard?

To begin to address this challenge, Amanda put together a webinar with five feminist psychologists who could provide more perspective, held on August 18, and invited ECPs, several of whom “attended.” However, due to technical problems, the voices of only two panelists could be heard: Jean Maria Arrigo and Linda Forrest. While Martha Banks and Brava Garrett-Akinsanya were in email contact, the resulting webinar, while very informative, was not as representative as it could have been. Thus we opted not to make it public yet, but hope that we can hold more webinars we can provide a more helpful set of perspectives. Discussions are taking place on various lists, and Lynn Collins is also exploring ways to make the Society’s web page and communication lists more accessible and responsive to discussions. Watch this newsletter for more information or contact KQuina@me.com.

Amanda has also created a closed Facebook group for Early Career Feminist Psychologists – to join send your facebook ID to AAlmond@citytech.cuny.edu. Several members have posted interesting current articles and shared announcements of upcoming events. We encourage all ECPs (and their allies) to participate! Finally, while we are planning more events at APA next August, we also encourage you to look for us at AWP in Pittsburgh in March. In the meantime, we have more questions than we have answers, and indeed there are no easy answers. Instead, we have heard nuanced, complex, and often different perspectives among people we respect and admire. This has led us to think about how to turn hindsight into wisdom, guilt and blame into leadership. Think about this: We are taught ethics from a set of rules to avoid lawsuits (and hopefully, also, harm); APA style from a complicated code which also marks entrance to our tribe; and the meaningfulness of our research from a collection of statistical analyses. Clinical decision-making is reduced to a process of matching categories in the “Bible” DSM to a restricted range of “evidence-based” therapies. Where in our graduate curricula do we learn to grapple with questions that aren’t in a manual? How do we learn to recognize concerns before they become betrayals, and how do we find the right voice to try to avoid or prevent them?”

Where in our graduate curricula do we learn to grapple with questions that aren’t in a manual? How do we learn to recognize concerns before they become betrayals, and how do we find the right voice to try to avoid or prevent them?”

‘Figure it Out Loud: Advice and Support for Early Career Psychologists
By Amanda Almond & Kathryn "Kat" Quina

As we were developing our expected Q&A on another early-career issue, the Hoffman Report was released. The story that unfolded in its pages was devastating for many psychologists, who felt duped and betrayed by the organization they have supported all these years. Members who have served on the front lines of feminist psychology have experienced personal and professional betrayals, and many have looked with wrenching hindsight at ways they might have helped the process play out differently. Many of us have found ourselves questioning what personal choices we might have made in similar circumstances, and what to do next. ECPs have been trying to absorb the bewildering events detailed in the report, without the benefit of familiarity with the people and committees and functions involved. At a time when young psychologists are developing their professional identities and beginning to engage in activities and divisions of APA, they are now also grappling with transgressions within the organization they expected to be their protective home, their voice, their ethical guide.

Among the most difficult questions they have asked is whether they should continue to be a part of APA and, by extension, Division 35. But mostly, they want information. And therein lies the challenge: Division 35 executive committee members have ongoing conversations and a midwinter meeting, and those who attend APA can sit in on the EC meetings in August, but what about the rest of the year? No newsletter column can fill in the gaps. And even then, how can ECPs get involved, and how will they be heard?

To begin to address this challenge, Amanda put together a webinar with five feminist psychologists who could provide more perspective, held on August 18, and invited ECPs, several of whom “attended.” However, due to technical problems, the voices of only two panelists could be heard: Jean Maria Arrigo and Linda Forrest. While Martha Banks and Brava Garrett-Akinsanya were in email contact, the resulting webinar, while very informative, was not as representative as it could have been. Thus we opted not to make it public yet, but hope that we can hold more webinars we can provide a more helpful set of perspectives. Discussions are taking place on various lists, and Lynn Collins is also exploring ways to make the Society’s web page and communication lists more accessible and responsive to discussions. Watch this newsletter for more information or contact KQuina@me.com.

Amanda has also created a closed Facebook group for Early Career Feminist Psychologists – to join send your facebook ID to AAlmond@citytech.cuny.edu. Several members have posted interesting current articles and shared announcements of upcoming events. We encourage all ECPs (and their allies) to participate! Finally, while we are planning more events at APA next August, we also encourage you to look for us at AWP in Pittsburgh in March. In the meantime, we have more questions than we have answers, and indeed there are no easy answers. Instead, we have heard nuanced, complex, and often different perspectives among people we respect and admire. This has led us to think about how to turn hindsight into wisdom, guilt and blame into leadership. Think about this: We are taught ethics from a set of rules to avoid lawsuits (and hopefully, also, harm); APA style from a complicated code which also marks entrance to our tribe; and the meaningfulness of our research from a collection of statistical analyses. Clinical decision-making is reduced to a process of matching categories in the “Bible” DSM to a restricted range of “evidence-based” therapies. Where in our graduate curricula do we learn to grapple with questions that aren’t in a manual? How do we learn to recognize concerns before they become betrayals, and how do we find the right voice to try to avoid or prevent them? Over 40 years ago a group of early-career feminist psychologists met over a period of years, and formulated the core principles of feminist therapy. They turned the profession on its head and healed a great deal of pain and suffering in our culture because they were willing to sit together and gnash out complicated issues while thinking differently. The resulting Feminist Therapy Code of Ethics remains a powerful guide for aspiring ECPs, even if we are not in clinical professions. Ken Pope offers a new starting point in Hoffman Report and APA: Meeting the Challenge of Change (http://bit.ly/KenPopeAPACHallengeOfChange). We hope ECPs will persist in the hard work of feminist process, bringing our diverse perspectives together for the betterment of women’s and men’s lives and the health of the Society for the Psychology of Women. Next issue we’ll be back on track – send your questions about your Early Career to Amanda at aalborg@CityTech.Cuny.Edu.
Join the conversation!

These are our current listservs and who you are reaching when you send messages to them.

Users of the listservs are required to follow the rules found at http://listserv.apa.org/infolist/APARules.html

**Div35EXEC** – an interactive listserv reaching the Div 35 extended EC.

**Div35ANNOUNCE** – a send-only listserv reaching all Div 35 members who have not opted out. This list is reserved for APA and Div 35 business, notices, and news only. It is moderated by the current Div 35 President who screens the content and for violations of APA listserv policy.

**DIV35-WOCLEADERS** – an interactive, SPW/Div 35 members-only interactive listserv created for the discussion of the Hoffman Report and related issues. To sign up for the listserv, you may click on the following link
http://lists.apa.org/cgi-bin/wa.exe?SUBED1=DIV35-WOCLEADERS&A=1
Or send a note to listserv@lists.apa.org and typing the following in the body of the note:
Subscribe div35-wocleaders firstname lastname

**SPW-APADIV35** – an interactive listserv reaching all Div 35 members who choose to subscribe that is moderated and screened by a couple Div 35 members for violations of APA listserv policy.

Post Message: spw-apadiv35@yahoogroups.com
Subscribe: spw-apadiv35-subscribe@yahoogroups.com

**POWR-L** – a joint initiative by Division 35 and the Association for Women in Psychology (AWP) that includes members of Div 35 and AWP who choose to join, plus some people who do not belong to either group. It is an open list (anyone can join), and is moderated and screened by a couple Div 35 and AWP members for violations of APA listserv policy.

Subscribe to POWR-L and send a message to the listserv (LISTSERV@LISTSERV.URI.EDU) that consists of only one line in the body of your message:
Subscribe POWR-L

**Do not include a subject heading.**

Unsubscribe from POWR-L by sending a message to the listserv that consists of only one line in the body of your message:
Unsubscribe POWR-L
Expanding Feminist Spaces: 2015-2016 Presidential Initiatives

BraVada Garrett-Akinsanya, PhD

My campaign to "Expand Feminist Spaces" is meant to emphasize the fact that we still have tremendous work to do in addressing the societal ills that befall us as women. For example, as a group, we continue to face lower pay and slower advances to promotion. For many of us, although glass ceilings have been shattered, we find that the newly constructed ceilings have been made of plexi-glass or even metal. Issues of women’s health, reproductive rights, and adequate access to health care remain inequitably distributed, especially among women of color, or those who are poor. Exposure to violence both nationally and internationally is reflected not just on our college campuses or in the armed forces, but in the fact that almost 300 Nigerian girls were abducted in broad daylight and sold into slavery. Further violence is evidenced by the fact that between 100,000 and 300,000 American children are at-risk for commercial sexual exploitation while estimates of 14,500 to 17,500 foreign nationals (mostly women and children) are trafficked into the US every year. Yes, we have work to do indeed. Therefore, I am committed to a campaign to Expand Feminist Spaces in which we have and share power by establishing: (1) a Research-to-Practice Task Force; (2) an Inter-Sections Taskforce on the Healthy Development of Sexually Diverse, Indigenous Girls and Girls of Color; (3) a Taskforce on Strategic Alliances for Social Justice; (4) a Taskforce on Feminist Economic Advancement and Entrepreneurial Leadership; and (5) a Work group on Media and Technology in Promoting Membership Connections, by using technology to promote an opportunity for SPW members to be seen, heard and involved.

One of my first goals will be to create a Research-to-Practice Task Force to explore ways in which shared knowledge and collaborative partnerships can be formed. Dr. Edna Esnil will chair this initiative in conjunction with a representative from Division 42, Dr. Josephine Johnson. Key leaders in the field will include Drs. Pam Remer and Sharon Jenkins. We will plan a collaborative activity, A Feminist Practice Retreat, when we meet time for our Mid-Winters meeting in New Orleans on January 28-31, 2016.

My second initiative will include an Inter-Sections Taskforce on the Healthy Development of Indigenous Girls and Girls of Color, as well as a Leadership Institute for Indigenous Women and Women of Color. Dr. Wendi Williams will chair this Task Force with the key directives of producing a book. She will be assisted by Dr. Beryl Wingate, who will develop a work-group to facilitate the development of the Leadership Institute. Our hope is to offer it in conjunction with the National Multicultural Conference and Summit in 2017.

The third initiative of my presidency will be to create a Taskforce on Strategic Alliances for Social Justice. The first charge of this taskforce will be to actively collaborate within and outside of our Division to address a variety of issues from the Hoffman report to disparities in health and wellness. I will encourage this group to propose an APA Convention Program, develop a membership project and/or projects and to seek CODAPAR grants that funds the development of Inter-Divisional Projects that will sustain our strategic alliances in this area over time. Through this group, a Series of Webinars and listening sessions will be developed, with a book to chronicle our shared growth, learning and self-reflections. In addition to support from Dr. Olivia Moorehead-Slaughter, I have asked Dr. Barbara Streets and Dr. Natalie Porter, our liaison to the Divisions of Social Justice, to head up these initiatives. My fourth initiative will be to assemble a Taskforce on Feminist Economic Advancement and Entrepreneurial Leadership. The goal of this group will be to explore and document creative strategies to promote feminist entrepreneurship and economic advancement along the developmental continuum within the profession of psychology. It will address issues ranging from overcoming oppressive student loans to planning for retirement. Through the development of Feminist Entrepreneurial Leadership projects such as forums, a webpage, video series or blogs, Drs. Jean Lau Chin and Peggy Signorella have graciously volunteered to assist with this initiative. Support from APA’s Department of Finance has been offered, but additional financial advice will be sought from the philanthropic organizations and advisors who work with private businesses and nonprofits. The final goal of my presidential year will be to further develop our ability engage with our members. To this end, within the last two weeks, we have been challenged to relocate a number of our archived files because the APA Communities site has been decommissioned. Our Committee On Technology has met and has begun to develop a strategic communications plan. Through the continued use of media and technology, our goal is to provide our members with innovative platforms that will facilitate collaboration and provide a means by which they can communicate their needs, challenges and successes. This initiative will be supported by Drs. Marlene Maheu and Shawna Wright.

In conclusion, I would like members to know that I am still seeking individuals who are willing to work on these specific initiatives as well as those who are willing to serve in any vacant leadership posts affiliated with our Executive Committee of Division 35. I ask you to join us in helping because you are needed and “Many hands make light work.” Feel free to contact me at: bravadaakinsanya@hotmail.com

I look forward to serving as your new President!
As newsletter editors we are committed to continuing the discussion started at the Division 35 midwinter meeting on racial justice. As such, we encourage members to send in their thoughts, stories and experiences as they relate to race and social justice to include in the Feminist Psychologist. If you wish to write a piece for the newsletter please send your article to fempsychnews@gmail.com

RACIAL JUSTICE: KEEPING THE DIALOGUE GOING

SOcial JUSTice

I, Racist

John Metta (Reprinted with permission)

What follows is the text of a "sermon" that I gave as a "congregational reflection" to an all White audience at the Bethel Congregational United Church of Christ on Sunday, June 28th. The sermon was begun with a reading of The Good Samaritan story, and this wonderful quote from Chimamanda Ngozi Adichie’s Americanah. Credit for this speech goes to Chaédria LaBouvier, who’s "Why We Left" inspired me to speak out about racism; to Robin DiAngelo, who’s "White Fragility" gave me an understanding of the topic; and to Reni Eddo-Lodge who said "Why I’m no longer talking to white people about race" long before I had the courage to start doing it again.

A couple weeks ago, I was debating what I was going to talk about in this sermon. I told Pastor Kelly Ryan I had great reservations talking about the one topic that I think about every single day.

Then, a terrorist massacred nine innocent people in a church that I went to, in a city that I still think of as home. At that point, I knew that despite any misgivings, I needed to talk about race.

You see, I don’t talk about race with White people. To illustrate why, I’ll tell a story:

It was probably about 15 years ago when a conversation took place between my aunt, who is White and lives in New York State, and my sister, who is Black and lives in North Carolina. This conversation can be distilled to a single sentence, said by my Black sister:

"The only difference between people in The North and people in The South is that down here, at least people are honest about being racist."

There was a lot more to that conversation, obviously, but I suggest that it can be distilled into that one sentence because it has been, by my White aunt. Over a decade later, this sentence is still what she talks about. It has become the single most important aspect of my aunt’s relationship with my Black family. She is still hurt by the suggestion that people in New York, that she, a northerner, a liberal, a good person who has Black family members, is a racist.

This perfectly illustrates why I don’t talk about race with White people. Even- or rather, especially- my own family.

I love my aunt. She’s actually my favorite aunt, and believe me, I have a lot of awesome aunts to choose from. But the facts are actually quite in my sister’s favor on this one.

New York State is one of the most segregated states in the country. Buffalo, New York where my aunt lives is one of the 10 most segregated school systems in the country. The racial inequality of the area she inhabits is so bad that it has been the subject of reports by the Civil Rights Action Network and the NAACP.

Those, however, are facts that my aunt does not need to know. She does not need to live with the racial segregation and oppression of her home. As a white person with upward mobility, she has continued to improve her situation. She moved out of the area I grew up in- she moved to an area with better schools. She doesn’t have to experience racism, and so it is not real to her.

Nor does it dawn on her that the very fact that she moved away from an increasingly Black neighborhood to live in a White suburb might itself be a aspect of racism. She doesn’t need to realize that "better schools" exclusively means "whiter schools."

I don’t talk about race with White people because I have so often seen it go nowhere. When I was younger, I thought it was because all white people were racist. Recently, I’ve begun to understand that it’s more nuanced than that.
To understand, you have to know that Black people think in terms of Black people. We don’t see a shooting of an innocent Black child in another state as something separate from us because we know viscerally that it could be our child, our parent, or us, that is shot.

The shooting of Walter Scott in North Charleston resonated with me because Walter Scott was portrayed in the media as a deadbeat and a criminal— but when you look at the facts about the actual man, he was nearly indistinguishable from my own father.

Racism affects us directly because the fact that it happened at a geographically remote location or to another Black person is only a coincidence, an accident. It could just as easily happen to us— right here, right now.

Black people think in terms of us because we live in a society where the social and political structures interact with us as Black people.

White people do not think in terms of we. White people have the privilege to interact with the social and political structures of our society as individuals. You are “you,” I am “one of them.” Whites are often not directly affected by racial oppression even in their own community, so what does not affect them locally has little chance of affecting them regionally or nationally. They have no need, nor often any real desire, to think in terms of a group. They are supported by the system, and so are mostly unaffected by it.

What they are affected by are attacks on their own character. To my aunt, the suggestion that “people in The North are racist” is an attack on her as a racist. She is unable to differentiate her participation within a racist system (upwardly mobile, not racially profiled, able to move to White suburbs, etc.) from an accusation that she, individually, is a racist. Without being able to make that differentiation, White people in general decide to vigorously defend their own personal non-racism, or point out that it doesn’t exist because they don’t see it.

The result of this is an incessantly repeating argument where a Black person says “Racism still exists. It is real,” and a white person argues “You’re wrong. I’m not racist at all. I don’t even see any racism.” My aunt’s immediate response is not “that is wrong, we should do better.” No, her response is self-protection: “That’s not my fault, I didn’t do anything. You are wrong.”

Racism is not slavery. As President Obama said, it’s not avoiding the use of the word Nigger. Racism is not white water fountains and the back of the bus. Martin Luther King did not end racism. Racism is a cop severing the spine of an innocent man. It is a 12 year old child being shot for playing with a toy gun in a state where it is legal to openly carry firearms.

But racism is even more subtle than that. It’s more nuanced. Racism is the fact that “White” means “normal!” and that anything else is different. Racism is our acceptance of an all white Lord of the Rings cast because of historical accuracy, ignoring the fact that this is a world with an entirely fictionalized history.

Even when we make shit up, we want it to be white.

And racism is the fact that we all accept that it is white. Benedict Cumberbatch playing Khan in Star Trek. Khan, who is from India. Is there anyone White than Benedict fucking Cumberbatch? What? They needed a “less racial” cast because they already had the Black Uhura character?

That is racism. Once you let yourself see it, it’s there all the time.

Black children learn this when their parents give them “The Talk.” When they are sat down at the age of five or so and told that their best friend’s father is not sick, and not in a bad mood— he just doesn’t want his son playing with you. Black children grow up early to life in The Matrix. We’re not given a choice of the red or blue pill. Most white people, like my aunt, never have to choose. The system was made for White people, so White people don’t have to think about living in it.

But we can’t point this out.

Living every single day with institutionalized racism and then having to argue its very existence, is tiring, and saddening, and angering. Yet if we express any emotion while talking about it, we’re tone policed, told we’re being angry. In fact, a key element in any racial argument in America is the Angry Black person, and racial discussions shut down when that person speaks. The Angry Black person invalidates any arguments about racism because they are “just being overly sensitive,” or “too emotional,” or— playing the race card. Or even worse, we’re told that we are being racist (Does any intelligent person actually believe a systematically oppressed demographic has the ability to oppress those in power?)

But here is the irony, here’s the thing that all the angry Black people know, and no calmly debating White people want to admit: The entire discussion of race in America
centers around the protection of White feelings. Ask any Black person and they'll tell you the same thing. The reality of thousands of innocent people raped, shot, imprisoned, and systematically disenfranchised are less important than the suggestion that a single White person might be complicit in a racist system.

This is the country we live in. Millions of Black lives are valued less than a single White person's hurt feelings.

White people and Black people are not having a discussion about race. Black people, thinking as a group, are talking about living in a racist system. White people, thinking as individuals, refuse to talk about "I, racist" and instead protect their own individual and personal goodness. In doing so, they reject the existence of racism.

But arguing about personal non-racism is missing the point. Despite what the Charleston Massacre makes things look like, people are dying not because individuals are racist, but because individuals are helping support a racist system by wanting to protect their own non-racist self beliefs.

People are dying because we are supporting a racist system that justifies White people killing Black people.

We see this in the way that one Muslim killer is a sign of Islamic terror; in the way one Mexican thief is a pointer to the importance of border security; in one innocent, unarmed Black man is shot in the back by a cop, then sullied in the media as a thug and criminal.

And in the way a white racist in a state that still flies the confederate flag is seen as "troubling" and "unnerving." In the way people "can't understand why he would do such a thing."

A white person smoking pot is a "Hippie" and a Black person doing it is a "criminal." It's evident in the school to prison pipeline and the fact that there are close to 20 people of color in prison for every white person.

There's a headline from The Independent that sums this up quite nicely: "Charleston shooting: Black and Muslim killers are 'terrorists' and 'thugs'. Why are white shooters called 'mentally ill'?

I'm gonna read that again: "Black and Muslim killers are 'terrorists' and 'thugs'. Why are white shooters called 'mentally ill'?"

Did you catch that? It's beautifully subtle. This is an article talking specifically about the different way we treat people of color in this nation and even in this article's headline, the white people are "shooters" and the Black and Muslim people are "killers."

Even when we're talking about racism, we're using racist language to make people of color look dangerous and make White people come out as not so bad.

Just let that sink in for a minute, then ask yourself why Black people are angry when they talk about race.

The reality of America is that White people are fundamentally good, and so when a white person commits a crime, it is a sign that they, as an individual, are bad. Their actions as a person are not indicative of any broader social construct. Even the fact that America has a growing number of violent hate groups, populated mostly by white men, and that nearly "all" serial killers are white men can not shadow the fundamental truth of white male goodness. In fact, we like White serial killers so much, we make mini-series about them.

People are dying not because individuals are "bad," all of this, is racism.

Non-Racist in a White Role" - but when we see a bad one, it's just proof that the rest are, as a rule, bad.

This, all of this, expectation, treatment, thought, the underlying social system that puts White in the position of Normal and good, and Black in the position of "other" and "bad," all of this, is racism.

And White people, every single one of you, are complicit in this racism because you benefit directly from it.

This is why I don't like the story of the good Samaritan. Everyone likes to think of themselves as the person who sees someone beaten and bloodied and helps him out.

That's too easy.

If I could re-write that story, I'd rewrite it from the perspective of Black America. What if the person wasn't beaten and bloody? What if it wasn't so obvious? What if they were just systematically challenged in a thousand small ways that actually made it easier for you to succeed in life?

Would you be so quick to help then, or would you, like most White people, stay silent and let it happen.

Here's what I want to say to you: Racism is so deeply embedded in this country not because of the racist right-wing radicals who practice it openly, it exists because of the silence and hurt feelings of liberal America.
That’s what I want to say, but really, I can’t. I can’t say that because I’ve spent my life not talking about race to White people. In a big way, it’s my fault. Racism exists because I, as a Black person, don’t challenge you to look at it.

Racism exists because I, not you, am silent.

But I’m caught in the perfect Catch 22, because when I start pointing out racism, I become the Angry Black Person, and the discussion shuts down again. So I’m stuck.

All the Black voices in the world speaking about racism all the time do not move White people to think about it—but one White John Stewart talking about Charleston has a whole lot of White people talking about it. That’s the world we live in. Black people can’t change it while White people are silent and deaf to our words.

White people are in a position of power in this country because of racism. The question is: Are they brave enough to use that power to speak against the system that gave it to them?

So I’m asking you to help me. Notice this. Speak up. Don’t let it slide. Don’t stand watching in silence. Help build a world where it never gets to the point where the Samaritan has to see someone bloodied and broken.

As for me, I will no longer be silent. I’m going to try to speak kindly, and softly, but that’s gonna be hard. Because it’s getting harder and harder for me to think about the protection of White people’s feelings when White people don’t seem to care at all about the loss of so many Black lives.

This blog was originally published on Medium.com.

Follow John Metta on Twitter: www.twitter.com/johnmetta
threatening to rape her.

Kate was shaken. She didn’t know what to do. She saw a female police officer and approached her, telling her what happened. The police officer, while friendly and sympathetic, said that she couldn’t do anything other than try to frighten the people in the car (which is what she ultimately did). I want you to remember that there were hundreds of people walking in the street when this happened. Not one person stepped in to defend Kate even though many heard her being insulted and threatened. Worse still, not one person asked Kate if she was OK or offered her any support or comfort. Those around her did nothing. Those around her were silent.

When I was talking to Kate about this incident she recalled how she didn’t tell anyone what had happened for a few days because she was too traumatized. As a clinician she was worried that recounting the tale would only serve to re-traumatize her. When she felt ready to share her experience she found that her white friends all responded in the same way. Knowing that she was a blogger, they suggested that she write about what happened to her on her blog. Kate was angered by this suggestion. “Why do I have to write something?” She said “why does it always have to be me? Why can’t they write something?”

Even though I barely knew Kate, I knew that I wanted to share her story here. Her anger at being told to write something herself reminded me of something that I learned at the division 35 mid-winter meeting. I learned that it is important for white women (and men) to use their unearned privilege and power to stand up for racial justice. We shouldn’t remain silent. We shouldn’t expect our brothers and sisters of colour to do all the fighting for justice.

“I should use our voices to fight for social justice.”

I haven’t asked Kate, but I imagine that if I were her, I would find the silence of others to be one of the most painful elements of this experience. People were silent on the street, failing to reach out to her and comfort her and check that she was OK. Kate had to use her own voice to defend herself, and then her own internal voice to comfort herself. In re-telling the story Kate was faced with a second silence. Her white friends listened, and like all good white liberals in Boston were horrified and sympathetic toward her. However, by asking her to use her voice to tell the story, they too were silent. They too expected her to use her own voice to defend and comfort herself. In previous newsletters we have talked about the importance of doing something. I hope this true story highlights the hurt that is caused by doing nothing. We should be aware of what is going on around us. We should be aware of what we can do to help people around us who need us. We should use our voices to fight for social justice.
At the EC meeting at APA, a resolution was approved by the extended EC to encourage the FDA to NOT approve Flibanserin as a medical treatment for women’s lack of sexual desire. The resolution was offered by Maureen McHugh. She communicated the resolution immediately with the officers in the FDA so that our position was included in the FDA consideration of Flibanserin on August 18, 2015. The background for this resolution was offered in the President’s Column of the summer issue of The Feminist Psychologist. To review the background, Flibanserin was not approved in previous hearings because of minimal efficacy, chronic use (you have to take it every day), and serious side effects. Also the pill is prescribed for a sexual dysfunction, generalized hypoactive sexual desire disorder; shifts in the understanding of sexual desire between DSM IV and DSM V have impacted this “diagnosis.” However, the pharmaceutical company, Sprout, organized a public relations campaign, Even the Score, recruiting women’s groups to rally for the drug’s approval under the argument that to not approve the ineffective and dangerous drug was a form of sexual inequality, since sex drugs are available to men. It was important for feminist groups to argue that there are non-medicalized approaches to sexual issues including sexual education and therapy, and providing not effective interventions for manufactured maladies is not a feminist goal.

Despite the warnings, the pharmaceutical industry plans to distribute the pill widely as demonstrated by the recent sale of the drug to Valinat Pharmaceuticals for 1 billion dollars. They must expect to sell LOTS of flibanserin!

"Despite the warnings, the pharmaceutical industry plans to distribute the pill widely as demonstrated by the recent sale of the drug to Valinat Pharmaceuticals for 1 billion dollars. They must expect to sell LOTS of flibanserin!"

Here is the link to a 7 minute video explaining Flibanserin. "What is Flibanserin (AKA “Female Viagra”)?" https://youtu.be/Ezp8ilSETA4

"FEMALE VIAGRA"

Women, the New View of Women’s Sexuality, and numerous other women’s groups and health organizations to argue against the FDA approval of this ineffective and potentially dangerous drug to treat sexual desire deficits in women, the new medication was approved. On August 18, 2015, the U.S. Food and Drug Administration approved Addyi (flibanserin) to treat acquired, generalized hypoactive sexual desire disorder (HSDD) in premenopausal women. Prior to Addyi’s approval, there were no FDA-approved treatments for sexual desire disorders in men or women. Recognizing the serious side effects, and the risks of a potentially serious interaction with alcohol, the drug was approved with a REMS (a risk evaluation and mitigation strategy) because an interaction between Addyi and alcohol increases the risk of severe low blood pressure (hypotension) and loss of consciousness (syncpe). Pharmacies and doctors who prescribe and dispense this pill must have REMS certification and must counsel the patient regarding these effects. Addyi’s approval also entailed a Boxed Warning to highlight the risks of potentially serious hypotension and syncpe if a patient drinks alcohol during treatment with Addyi. Also Addyi is contra-indicated in patients who are using medicines or supplements that interfere with the breakdown of Addyi in the body (moderate or strong CYP3A4 inhibitors), and in patients who have liver impairment. Despite the warnings, the pharmaceutical industry plans to distribute the pill widely as demonstrated by the recent sale of the drug to Valinat Pharmaceuticals for 1 billion dollars. They must expect to sell LOTS of flibanserin! After FDA approval we can continue to resist the prescription of Addyi to millions of women. We can lecture about the issue in our classes, inform our friends and family, and address the issue in community and professional contexts. Feminist psychologist and activist Leonore Tiefer has
Leonore Tiefer

Leonore Tiefer has been actively involved in challenging medicalization of women’s sexuality, and in particular she has been mobilizing against flibanserin using social media. She asks that you perform and tweet her parody:
http://bit.ly/1DskTFu. She also asks that you take a selfie with the logo (below) and upload it to Facebook. For more information on how to challenge the medicalization of women’s sexuality, you can check out the New View on Women’s Sexuality http://www.newviewcampaign.org/.

Perform and Tweet Tiefer’s parody:
Throw That Pink Pill Away | a song about rejecting flibanserin
(https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=YNouazagUrI)

There are three kinds of women, in my opinion: the first category is one of pure feminists; they are aware of injustices faced by women, the inherent sexism in various systems and actively take a stance on feminist issues, and share their views about their individual role as a woman in a largely male driven society, without fear of the consequences. A second category is the complete opposite: they are not aware of the term feminism or the concept of inequality; in other words, they actively engage in the tasks told they have been assigned by virtue of them being women and they offer no resistance to this role, in fact they might very well like and enjoy it. “Inequality?” they say, “it is a man’s world, and that’s okay. That’s how it’s been and that’s how it will always be.” The third category, the one I consider the most challenging to ‘live’ as would be what I would (with what may be perceived as hinting as pessimism) like to term, the ‘late-comers’, the women who probably knew of differences between men and women and likely even agreed with them in the past, in their years as young women, but now maybe (late) in life (post marriage, post two teenage children) are realizing the consequences of complying with the rules of sexist society, limiting themselves to doing what they were told was possible by them and nothing more, watching their daughters grow in the same culture they did, yet mindful of how they as mothers are sending and receiving messages to and from men, society and the media. It would be challenging to fall in this third category; to me this is analogous to being stuck in a no-win situation and essentially becomes a question of resolving one’s identity. If she speaks about her newly realized views that she was not aware she had, people might think she’s lost her mind. But if she continues to stay quiet every time she wishes to speak, she will feel guilty for not giving her new identity a chance to develop. What then is the solution to this situation? Well, it’s not as undesirable a situation as it seems; this woman is finding her voice. Though she may have missed out on living this identity and allowing herself the independence she now feels she deserves, she has reached there. She is wiser, reality is clearer and she is slowly dealing with her ‘stuckness’ in a confused world still battling with gender biases and assigned roles. The question we need to ask ourselves as psychologists: are we aware of these hidden, seeking feminists? Are we mindful of generational differences in feminists in a developing society and minority cultures? Can we identify and collaborate with these women in our fight for equality in society? Yes, we can and it’s never too late.
Women face significant barriers to negotiating maternity leave. This problem was highlighted when Nazareth College recently rescinded a candidate’s offer after she tried to negotiate one semester of paid maternity leave, among other requests (Konnikova, 2014). While she knew the administrators would not comply with many of the arguably “lofty” items on her wish list, she simply thought there was no harm in asking. When it comes to negotiation, women don’t ask much of the time. According to one study, 7% of women negotiated initial job offers, while 57% of men did (Babcock & Laschever, 2003). Facebook executive Sheryl Sandberg made a call for women to assert themselves more in the workplace in her bestselling book, Lean In (2013). However, we may be tentative for reasons other than passivity or internalized sexism. We may be sensing real penalties of negotiating, including when we negotiate maternity leave.

Hannah Riley Bowles (2014) conducted a number of studies on gender differences in negotiation. Bowles identified a social cost of negotiation for women who face backlashes in attitude and treatment in the workplace when they attempt to self-advocate. Interestingly, Bowles found women were viewed positively when advocating for others, but not for themselves. Bowles found that women are even penalized for business negotiations by other women. People are less likely to want to work with women who negotiate, reflecting an attitudinal penalty for asserting your needs. Gender stereotypes effects were worsened by ambiguous policies. If you work for an organization with unclear maternity leave policies, you may be particularly at risk of incurring negative attitudes from your negotiations. With the Family Leave Medical Act (FMLA), companies with more than 50 workers in a 75-mile radius of work location are entitled to grant the primary caretaker of an infant to 12 weeks of unpaid leave. Paid leave is another matter altogether. According to the Families and Work Institute’s 2012 National Study of Employers, 58% of mothers and 14% of fathers received some replacement pay in the U.S. (Matos & Galinsky, 2012). Only 9% companies have a fully paid maternity leave benefit. In fact, the U.S. is the only industrialized nation that doesn’t offer paid maternity benefits, and one of three countries in the world without them (Gallo, 2012). In previous editions of this column, Jill Kuhn (2006a, 2006b) cited findings that women lose $1.2 million to wage inequity, encountering a “baby gap” in career advancement in addition to the proverbial glass ceiling. She added that while pregnancy discrimination lawsuits are on the rise, women fear being blacklisted in future jobs when they fight back discriminatory bosses. It is essential to acknowledge the systemic nature of maternity leave problems. Hook (2012) noted tendencies for these discussions to place the responsibility on women to manage impossible scenarios posed by the systems within which we work, including Sandberg’s slogan, “lean in.” For example, we are told that as women we just need to strategize more effectively, access the right resources, or try harder to overcome the problems of our systems with regards to maternity leave. We are told to manage our schedules better, choose supportive spouses, time our children “correctly,” work from home, and stage our careers to peak later in life. Hook added that this discourse not only overlooks gender barriers faced by women, but also the class barriers among women with limited financial resources to help their families get by during maternity leave and thereafter. Hook reminded us that, “blaming the oppressed group for their mistreatment is a common tactic designed to maintain the status quo.”

Case Examples

I collected a number of case examples that bring to life the challenges of negotiating maternity leave. Several faculty members I spoke to were offered 10 days of paid maternity leave by their university, and 12 weeks of unpaid leave per FMLA. They weren’t allowed to access the sick bank for maternity purposes but were offered paid sick days, though this felt inappropriate since childbirth is not an illness. They were told to put some of their classes online, although they were still expected to teach their full course load following their 10 days off. Neither was offered an alternative assignment that other faculty in the university had received previously, and one was intentionally blocked by her department in learning about this option. One of these women pointed out that if she had any complications of childbirth, the 10 days truly would not have cut it. Negative departmental gender dynamics made her fearful of contesting what she was
offered. In the end, she felt she couldn’t take more than 10 days since she earned the primary income in her family. Both women acknowledged considerable guilt towards their colleagues and students around taking more time away from their work. They also feared covert repercussions on their evaluations for tenure if they advocated for more. A third faculty member was at a woman’s university, which ironically had no paid maternity leave policy. She used FMLA for 12 unpaid weeks, and would have to use sick leave to receive payment. As a new faculty member, she did not have much in savings. With the costs of a new baby, she couldn’t afford the pay cut. She asked a member of HR to extend sick leave pay and described the following exchange: “You see dear, she said smugly, ‘women wanted equal rights, so now we must be treated exactly like men. So, pregnancy is treated just like any other illness.’ Given her complete disinterest in my statement that pregnancy is not, in fact, an illness, I neglected to point out that treating us exactly like men does not make us equal. If anything, treating women just like men means that our unique needs are not being addressed, it makes us distinctly unequal” (personal communication, August 10, 2015). Ultimately, she was able to manage an additional 4 weeks of sick leave by accessing the sick leave pool at her university to allow for 10 weeks. As seen in the previous example, this option is far from ideal and not always available.

Finally, I spoke with a male faculty member who had been in an administrative position and also faced challenges with his leave. His supervisor attempted to renegotiate the maternity leave he was entitled to in his institution. He and his partner were planning to piece together their leaves in order to increase bonding with the newborn and avoid alternative daycare. His supervisor attempted to take away parts of his leave to fit what she felt was best for the office. All the while, he was preparing for the arrival of his adopted child from another country, making for a considerably stressful time. Luckily, an HR representative asserted the law to support his case, and he was able to take his planned leave. He noticed that following his experience, the maternity leave of a female colleague was not contested by their supervisor who was also her friend. He wondered if he had encountered negative gender effects as a man. His story demonstrates that there are also barriers to negotiating maternity leaves. Traditional parental leave policies assume the child requires care only from the mother, has a female primary caretaker, is produced biologically, and comes from a heterosexual, two-parent family. The Negotiation Process

The barriers to adequate maternity leave require major systemic changes. Until then, women are left to be savvy cultural navigators of the system and strategize their maternity leave negotiations. There is hope in negotiating, as a number of women have been successful in advocating for more reasonable maternity leaves. In fact, we can learn from the literature on gender stereotype effects to plan our negotiations. Based on her research on gender and negotiation, Bowles (2014) recommended making your requests sound persuasive by using a team-oriented framework. Bowles suggested a relational account, giving nod to Sandberg’s “think personally, act communally” motto of negotiation. This approach involves framing the negotiation in terms of the benefit your requests might have on your work, relationship, or otherwise. You can express care about your work relationships in planning for your leave, and frame your requests as legitimate and needed. You can be prepared to anticipate and address your supervisor’s concerns and communicate a collaborative intention in developing your plan (Riley, 2015). It can also help to identify what you hope to accomplish before you leave, and make specific plans to check in on your progress on those tasks. Of course you will want to make yourself aware of the policy within your organization, as well as state and national laws like the FMLA. Consider if the standard leave will be enough and talk to colleagues who have been on leave recently about what their problems were and how they solved them (Gallo, 2012). Organizations often revise policies and update them when they aren’t working for their workers, so it can be worthwhile to express your needs. You will likely want to give your supervisor the heads up before hearing it through the grapevine (Riley, 2015). If your supervisor is unlikely to be favorable to your negotiation, talk with HR. However, keep in mind that HR rarely deviates from official policy. Gallo (2012) recommended that you research similar companies and the leaves they provide. List the potential options that could work for you in taking your leave and rank them in order to have for your negotiation discussion. Then discuss with your supervisor the leave you want to take. Request the longest time you can receive since it’s easier to return early than extend your leave. While it does feel inappropriate and even offensive, you may need to consider utilizing sick leave to extend your maternity leave. You might also consider drawing from your vacation time, personal days, or borrowing paid leave against future time off (Riley, 2015). Another good idea might be to adjust your tax withholding to reflect extra deduction before baby born as a way to help with the financial burden of unpaid leave and/or child-related expenses. Conclusion

Our institutions require significant change to uniformly establish adequate parental leaves that are paid and have clear guidelines. Clarity in policy is key; researchers have found that the more transparent the policy, the less likely that negative gender effects will occur (Konnikova, 2014). We also need more affordable childcare, leaders who advocate for women and family, and schedules in schools and workplaces that support a
vibrant family life (Hook, 2012). Moreover, this discussion needs to involve the rights of graduate students. In a previous edition of this column, I've described the challenges parents have faced in graduate training in psychology (Mizock, 2014). I detailed reports of trainees who have lacked support and been sanctioned for their parental leaves on predoctoral internship and in postdoctoral training. Clearly, policy change is needed to better meet the needs of parents in psychology. Unfortunately, the dual pressures of domestic and occupational labor may make it difficult for new parents to become involved in policy change. The multiple demands placed on women at work and home can further block their abilities to take action against the system. Until change has occurred, we can continue to share strategies and support one another in navigating these impossible scenarios in the U.S. workforce. As chair of the Motherhood Committee of Division 35 and member of a family leave working group at APA, we are working to advocate for protection of parental leave. Check out the Motherhood Committee website for more information and resources to support mothers in psychology. Motherhood Committee of Division 35 Resource Page: http://www.apadivisions.org/division-35/leadership/committees/motherhood.aspx

Tips for Negotiating Parental Leave

Research the policy within your organization

Research state and national laws pertaining to your leave like the FMLA

Research similar companies and leaves they provide

Consider if the standard leave will be enough for you

List the potential options that could work for you in taking your leave and rank them in order for your negotiation discussion

Be sure to give your supervisor the heads up before hearing it through the grapevine

Talk to trusted colleagues who have been on leave recently about what their problems were and how they solved them

If your supervisor is unlikely to be favorable to your negotiation, talk with HR Otherwise, discuss with your supervisor the leave you want to take

Communicate a collaborative intention in developing your plan

Request the longest time you can receive since it’s easier to return early than extend your leave

Present the negotiation in terms of the benefit your requests might have on your work

Express care about your work relationships

Frame your negotiation as legitimate and needed

Identify what you hope to accomplish before you leave

Make specific plans to check in on your progress on those tasks

Anticipate and address your supervisor’s concerns

Consider utilizing sick leave to extend your maternity leave

Consider drawing from vacation time, personal days, or borrowing paid leave against future time off. Adjust your tax withholding to reflect extra deduction before baby born as a way to help with the financial burden of unpaid leave and/or child-related expenses

Seek out your mentors, family members, and others sources of support
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The Task Force on Gender Inclusivity
By Inga Schowengerdt

The taskforce on gender inclusivity kicked off its efforts in earnest this summer at the APA convention in Toronto, presenting programming on transgender and gender non-conforming experiences and recruiting a diverse and enthusiastic roster of members. In the coming months, we will be continuing our conversation on advancing gender inclusion within our division and more broadly within APA.

The program the taskforce presented at the APA convention featured thought-provoking presentations by taskforce members Mira Krishnan and lore dickey, as well as discussion and brainstorming around means of advancing gender inclusivity involving the psychologists in attendance. Taken together, these dialogues yielded an abundance of ideas, experiences and questions that will be valuable to our upcoming efforts. As chair of the taskforce, I noted the timeliness of organizational self-reflection on the issue of gender inclusion and that doing so would be require ongoing commitment among our membership and collaboration across divisions. In his remarks, lore dickey encouraged proactivity on the part of psychologists, explaining that our training makes us well-positioned to catalyze awareness and promote best practices for inclusion. Further, lore shared the exciting news of the publication of guidelines for psychological practice with transgender and gender non-conforming clients (American Psychological Association, 2015). As a member of the APA Committee on Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender Concerns (CLGBTC) and the Society for the Psychological Study of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender Issues (division 44) joint task that developed these guidelines, lore announced that they had successfully been adopted as policy. They are now available online and constitute a valuable resource for clinicians. Panelist Mira Krishnan described the discrimination and exclusion that transgender people continue to encounter, and spoke on the benefits of gender inclusive feminism (see for example Serano, 2013, 2007).

Important takeaways from the subsequent discussion included comments from taskforce member and president elect of the Society for the Psychological Study of Men and Masculinity (division 51) Holly Sweet, who stressed the need for safe places for individuals to become educated about transgender and gender non-conforming identity and experiences. Additional attendees spoke to the importance of cognizance around diversity of experiences within gender identities, the role of self-presentation in how we see gender, and the need for supportive and educational resources within academic communities.

Moving forward, the taskforce will work to identify barriers to gender inclusivity within our division, identify best practices and offer suggestions for maximizing our organizational inclusion. We will share our conclusions and suggestions at next years’ convention in Denver and present further programing. In the meantime, we invite your input. I can be contacted at ingaschowengerdt@cantab.net and look forward to hearing from you.
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Are you the head of a task force?
We want to hear about the proactive steps you are taking to improve the lives of those around you.
E-mail fempsychnews@gmail.com with a description of your task force.
It is my pleasure to announce that this fall newsletter can welcome the largest incoming cohort of Campus Representatives to date – this year, we have fifty-three Representatives coming from thirty-five universities and colleges across the country. Please join me in celebrating our Representatives’ dedication to and leadership in feminist practice and activism in psychology. Each representative’s name and affiliation is listed below; their complete biographies can be found at http://www.apadivisions.org/division-35/leadership/campus-representatives/index.aspx

I am honored to be serving as the Student Representative for the next two years and am grateful for the opportunity to be involved in SPW. This fall marks the start of my second year in my doctoral program and I find myself asking increasingly difficult questions as I discover and form my personal and professional identities. What does feminism mean to me? How does my feminist identity intersect with other identities and lived experiences? As several scholarly endeavors begin, I tried asking Google if there was a well-referenced and well-researched definition of feminism that might jumpstart my own conceptualization. What is feminism? I typed. In 0.49 seconds, Google replied with 47,400,000 results and a primary definition highlighted: “the advocacy of women’s rights on the grounds of political, social, and economic equality to men.” This definition felt too simplistic to me, not to mention gendered and frustratingly devoid of any of the rich complexity that I have experienced in my own journey as a feminist. Regretfully, anyone seeking an answer to the question “What is feminism?” is routed to this woefully incomplete definition and may assume it is accurate. Digging deeper into the millions of Google results unearthed an article published in 2012 in the magazine Everyday Feminism. The leading quote was by none other than bell hooks (1981, p. 194): Feminism is not simply a struggle to end male chauvinism or a movement to ensure that women have equal rights with men; it is a commitment to eradicating the ideology of domination that permeates Western culture on various levels – sex, race, and class, to name a few – and a commitment to reorganizing U.S. society so that self-development of people can take precedence over imperialism, economic expression, and material desires.

I felt immediately connected to this definition – it stated what feminism was not and also described what the ultimate goals of feminism were. Though this particular quote by hooks was written before my lifetime, the ability of her words to transcend our generational divide leaves me in awe of how many people before me committed themselves to the feminist cause, fighting to be seen and accepted for who they truly were instead of living within the boxes designated by society. While I struggle to understand and negotiate my own boxes, the work that I conduct in my various domains as a researcher, scholar, leader, and activist brings me closer to understanding my own feminist identity and to hearing others’ lived experiences with an open heart and mind. In these next two years, I echo similar goals to hooks in upholding feminist values. I am admittedly idealistic: I hope that we can continue to bravely bring the ideology of domination to light and encourage the development of complex, authentic, dynamic people.

“I am admittedly idealistic: I hope that we can continue to bravely bring the ideology of domination to light and encourage the development of complex, authentic, dynamic people.”

Eliza Wierzbinska, Adelphi University
Lauren Weisberg, Antioch University New England
Kendall S. Betts, Azusa Pacific University
Jean-Arellia Tolentino, California School of Professional Psychology (CSPP), San Francisco Campus
Katie Hannah, California School of Professional Psychology (CSPP), San Francisco Campus
Megan Mansfield, California School of Professional Psychology (CSPP), Los Angeles Campus
Alexis Hershfield, California School of Professional Psychology (CSPP), Los Angeles Campus
Tell us about your recent publications!

Information about recent publications on feminist issues, sexuality, or gender can be published in the newsletter as a brief announcement or as a brief newsletter article. Submission instructions are on the back cover of this issue.
Toronto APA offered a great opportunity for networking among members of SPW/AWP and the Canadian Psychological Association equivalent, the Section for Women and Psychology (SWAP). We organized a SPW/AWP Suite program on Saturday, August 8. Our primary goal was to strengthen the connections between SPW and SWAP and spark collaborative activism and research. Featured speakers were: Charlene Senn (University of Windsor), who discussed the success of her innovative rape prevention program, recently highlighted in the New York Times (http://www.nytimes.com/2015/06/12/health/college-rape-prevention-program-proves-a-rare-success.html?)

Paula Barata (University of Guelph), current President of SWAP and women’s health researcher (http://www.uoguelph.ca/psychology/page.cfm?id=707)

Alexander Vasilovsky (Ryerson University), graduate student and queer studies researcher (http://psychlabs.ryerson.ca/pgsa/portfolio/alexander-vasilovsky/)

Interest in this session (by those who could not attend APA as well as those who did) suggests that there is wide-spread interest in creating stronger connections between SWAP and SPW. SWP’s extended Executive Committee has had a liaison from SWAP for a number of years (currently Charlene Senn), but the liaison position by itself does not create strong enough linkages between our two groups. We’d like to develop momentum for strengthening the connection through identification of specific projects of mutual interest.

SWAP has a strong history of activism and applied feminist research and we see excellent opportunities for collaboration in both areas. Many SWAP researchers and practitioners, for example, are concerned with issues of sexual violence and women’s mental and physical health, and have begun large-scale intervention projects related to these topics. SPW members (whether or not they are also APA members) can join SWAP for $5.00CAD -- What a bargain! For more information on SWAP and to apply for membership, go to http://www.cpa.ca/aboutcpa/cpasections/SWAP/. SWAP meets annually at the Canadian Psychological Association (CPA) convention. In 2016 CPA will meet in Victoria, BC, June 9-11.
Division 35 students represent the future of feminist psychology, and fortunately, from my vantage point, student involvement is thriving. As feminist psychologists, providing feminist mentorship is among our strongest, and most rewarding, personal and professional commitments. One of the ways that Division 35 practices this commitment is through the Psychology of Women Quarterly (PWQ) student advisory board (SAB). The PWQ SAB was initiated in 1990, during Judith Worell’s tenure as PWQ editor. Its establishment was a proactive response to prevailing concerns at the time that women, were “reluctant to expose their work to external criticism or … too self-critical to submit their research for publication” (Worell, 1993, p. 1). The goals of the board were described as, “(a) teaching young psychologists how to review manuscripts effectively, (b) reducing personal anxiety about the publication process through guided modeling and feedback, (c) educating emergent scholars about the possibilities for manuscript revision, and d) affirming the self-confidence of graduate students that they can be a credible part of the publication process themselves,” (p. 1) Other key goals were increasing feminist awareness, promoting dialogue about feminist research between students and faculty, and lowering psychological barriers to publishing efforts. After a brief hiatus, Jacquelyn White reinstated the board in 2000. She emphasized that the inclusion of students is central to the journal’s commitment to diversity, as well as a way to promote educational development, leadership, and career advancement (White, 2000). Although just a decade later, I surmise that this shift in goals reflected the significant changes that took place in the field of feminist psychology throughout the ‘90s. By 2000 PWQ was no longer in its “teen years,” but 25 years old, and an emerging force in psychology. Thus, while the “confidence gap” in publishing might not yet have been completely closed, the foundation of feminist psychology was solidified, and we were ready, and needing, to talk about other pressing matters, such as building the next generation of leaders. To my knowledge, the SAB has been a standing feature of the journal’s editorial board structure since that time. This year, the SAB itself turns 25! Thus, it is timely that Mary Brabeck, PWQ’s incoming editor, approached me with an invitation to oversee the SAB, which over the years had grown significantly in its numbers. Our goal is to enhance the work of the SAB. To increase inclusivity, we put out a call for applicants and we received well over 100 applications! To ensure a quality experience, we increased the selectivity of the board and restricted the number on the SAB to 40. We will try to ensure that all SAB members are given ample opportunity to participate in the review process. Finally, all applicants were asked to nominate a mentor who will support and give feedback and mentorship throughout the review process. We encourage mentors to be peer reviewers. In their role on the SAB, students will be invited as an additional blind peer-reviewer for relevant PWQ articles. SAB members work with their mentor to evaluate the assigned manuscript and write their manuscript review. Once a decision on the manuscript is rendered, the student receives a copy of all the reviews. In other words, students are supported in their review process, and the pathway to publication is demystified. Although authors will receive a copy of the student’s evaluation, student board members are generally relieved to know that decisions are based on peer review and their student reviews are not dispositive in the editor’s decision to accept, revise, or reject a manuscript. Unfortunately, we had to turn away many excellent students who were interested in serving on the SAB this year; I have no doubt they would be excellent reviewers. We hope they will apply again! Further, we encourage students who want to know more about the publishing process to let their mentors know, and we encourage mentors to consider mentoring student reviewers. Once the mentor has received permission from the Associate Editor to include a student reviewer, the process is the same as mentioned above. While only SAB members will be listed on the masthead, all reviewers will be recognized in print annually. In the meantime, I am interested to hear more about your suggestions for, and experiences with, the PWQ Student Advisory Board. With help from past PWQ editors (thank you Jackie White and Jan Yoder!), we were able to uncover some of the SAB’s documented story, but there may be additional herstories waiting to be told. Please write me at rubinl@newschool.edu
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Linh is a doctoral candidate in Counseling Psychology at Lehigh University.

She is looking forward to starting her pre-doctoral internship at the University of Memphis Counseling and Testing Center starting in August. As a feminist, an API woman, and a third-culture kid with much experience living in different cultures, she has a special interest in social justice advocacy and multicultural issues and often integrates multiculturalism and advocacy in her counseling and scholarly work. She is also very passionate about women’s and racial ethnic minority issues, as well as training and supervision.

Dr. Asuncion Miteria Austria is a distinguished leader for women in psychology and has made outstanding contributions to education and training and to the delivery of psychological services to women through her teaching, writing, administrative leadership, mentoring, and guidance for their professional careers. At Cardinal Stritch University, she was a professor, chair, and director of Clinical Training, Founding Chair and Director of Clinical Training Graduate Program in Clinical Psychology from 2000-2012 and is currently a Professor Emerita of Psychology. She has been the recipient of numerous honors and awards, including the 2014 Sue Rosenberg Zalk Award for Distinguished Service, Society for the Psychology of Women (SPW), the 2009 Okura Community Leadership Award from the AAPA for "leadership, scholarship, and dedication" to the Asian Pacific American communities, the 2007 APA Presidential Citation "for her lifelong devotion to multiculturalism", and the 2007 Distinguished Elder/Senior Psychologist Award from the APA National Multicultural Conference and Summit.

Dr. Austria is a Fellow of 5 APA Divisions and is Chair of the Fellows Committee of SPW, Chair of the Finance Committee as well as the Governance Committee for APA Division 45. She is the current chair of the Sue Rosenberg Zalk award. As one of the most dedicated, respected and longest-serving members of SPW’s executive committee, she has provided invaluable mentorship and support for the formalization of Section 5.

Born in Saigon, Dr. Phi Loan Le came to the U.S. as a refugee with her parents and four siblings at the end of the Vietnam war. She went through her formative adolescent years as a 1.5 generation Vietnamese American. Her upbringing could be described as traditional and collectivistic, with occasional infusion of covert feminist values from her mother. Being the “quiet rebellion”, as her Mom called her, she decided to pursue neither medicine nor engineering at the end of her third year as an undergraduate at UCLA but chose psychology instead. Thus began her journey of becoming a “student of the heart”, a Vietnamese equivalent of a “clinical psychologist”. Many years later, she is now doing what she loves and her family has somewhat come to terms with her not being the “real doctor”. Currently, Phi Loan is a CA licensed psychologist and a training director of the APPIC doctoral internship program at Santa Ana College. Her professional passions include multicultural psychology, social justice, women issues, grief work, and training/supervision. Her personal passions are her daughter Maya and her son Joaquin, her life partner, and family and friends. Through all the joys and challenges of her daily encounters, she hopes to continue to grow and stay grounded in her identity as a Vietnamese American woman who is a feminist psychologist.
Celebrating the Moments:
Awards Special!

Toni M. Calasanti, PhD, & Kathleen F. Slevin, PhD
Denmark Award for Contributions to Aging
by Joan C. Chrisler, PhD, Committee Chair

This year we are very pleased to present the Denmark Award to two pioneers in the feminist study of women and aging. Our awardees are Toni M. Calasanti, Ph.D., Professor of Sociology at Virginia Tech University, and Kathleen F. Slevin, Ph.D., Professor Emerita of Sociology at the College of William and Mary. Together and separately, they have conducted research on ageism and on gendered aspects of aging, and they have advocated for better public policy on aging and for more attention to older women by feminist scholars. Of particular importance are their groundbreaking and often cited books: their co-authored Gender, Social Inequalities, and Aging (2001, AltaMira Press) and their coedited Age Matters: Realigning Feminist Thinking (2006, Routledge).

I thank them for their outstanding contributions, and I am also grateful to the other members of the committee: Ellen Cole and Mary Gergen.

Alyssa Croft (winner) & Janell C. Fetterolf
(honorable mention)
Geis Award

Alyssa Croft won the Geis award for her work entitled Life in the Balance: Are Women’s Career Goals Contingent upon Men’s Parenting Motivations? Janell C. Fetterolf received an honorable mention for her work entitled Negative Reactions to Sexually Agentic Women as a Form of Backlash against Female Power.

Sue Morrow, PhD
The Laura Brown Award

By Allie Laurie, B.A., Graduate Student at Alliant International University Division 35 IV Lesbian, Bisexual, and Transgender Concerns

A Psychologist of vision and passion, Susan L. Morrow is unafraid of new ideas. Her work on issues related to religion, culture, sexuality, gender and age demonstrate her commitment to feminism and carves out room in the field of psychology for the voices of the underserved and marginalized.

Dr. Morrow’s undergraduate alma mater is Concordia Teacher’s College, where she earned her Bachelor of Arts degree in elementary education. For her Master of Counseling degree, she attended Arizona State University, where she also earned her Ph.D. in counseling psychology. At the counseling program at the University of Utah, Dr. Morrow served as the program director of clinical training in the Department of Educational Psychology. She is also a staff associate with the University Counseling Center and the Women’s Resource Center at the University, and maintains her own practice in Salt Lake City.

Active in university service, Dr. Morrow volunteers for indispensable, behind-the-scenes work, which is essential to the dynamic development of our field. An exceptional mentor, she employs creativity, open-mindedness and humor as she helps students and mentees publish new and exciting work, focusing on issues related to sexual minorities, women, and conversion therapy. She is an advocate for feminist and LGBTQ issues in her community. In Salt Lake City, she promoted the development of supports for older, sexual minority women. Her publications show the breadth of her wide-ranging interests. Topics include gender conformity and nonconformity, aging, feminist multicultural therapy, career development for lesbian and gay youth and adults, coping strategies for survivors of sexual abuse, lesbian partner abuse, and group process models arising from movements of social change.

Dr. Morrow is deeply committed to her students, peers and the profession of psychology. She has dedicated her career to scholarship, practice, mentorship, advocacy, collaboration, and social justice that embodies the highest principles of feminism. In light of this, we recognize Dr. Morrow as the recipient of this year’s Laura Brown Award for her distinguished body of work.

Catalina Perdomo
Division 35, Section III: Latina/Hispanic Women Award

Catalina Perdomo won the Division 35, Section III: Latina/Hispanic Women award for her work entitled Are Bilingual Therapists Bilingual Enough? Congratulations to Catalina!
Awards Special cont...

Stephanie Riger, PhD  
*Carolyn Wood Sheriff Award*

The 2015 Carolyn Wood Sheriff Award was presented to Dr. Stephanie Riger for her sustained and substantial contributions to the field of the psychology of women as a scholar, teacher, mentor, and leader. Dr. Riger’s innovative work has opened up new areas of research in the area of sexual assault, epistemology in feminist psychology, community psychology, and women, work, and organizations. Dr. Riger is known for her originality and her capacity to bring together disparate literatures to create truly multidisciplinary scholarship. She is a dedicated mentor and her early work on sexual assault has brought many new scholars into the field. Awards at both undergraduate and graduate levels evidence her role as a mentor and teacher extraordinaire. Throughout her career she has emphasized the practical applications of feminist research and the importance of structural causes of violence against women and the need for interventions to address broader levels of the community and society. Dr. Riger’s work stands out for its theoretical and practical relevance to women’s lives and to the psychology of women.

Michelle Hoffnung, PhD  
*Heritage Award*

Dr. Michele Hoffnung received the 2015 Heritage Award for her distinguished, long-standing and substantial contributions to teaching and mentoring in the psychology of women and feminist psychology. Her nominators praised her inclusive, positive, and productive efforts to sustain a feminist home for her colleagues. As one nominator observed, “She worked hard to make the campus a place where women can thrive. I could say ‘single-handedly,’ but Dr. Hoffnung, true to her core feminist values, always collaborates. She talks the talk and walks the walk. Everything about her teaching, research, and service over the last 45 years is shot through with feminist values.” Dr. Hoffnung published an early and important collection of readings for the psychology of women in 1971, *Roles Women Play: Readings Toward Women’s Liberation.*

The Heritage Award is presented annually to a senior individual who has made distinguished, long-standing and substantial contributions pertaining to women or gender in one or more of the following areas: Teaching/Mentoring; Practice/Advocacy; Research/Scholarship. Deadline for nominations is May 15.

Bonnie R. Strickland and Jessica Henderson Daniel Mentoring Award

The Society for the Psychology of Women, Division 35 presented the Bonnie R. Strickland and Jessica Henderson Daniel Award for Distinguished Mentoring to Susan L. Morrow, Ph.D. in recognition of her lifetime of high quality, multicultural, feminist, and relational mentoring that has supported and nurtured many students, early career professionals and colleagues across the career lifespan. Dr. Morrow is known far and wide as an usually talented mentor who meets and far exceeds all of the criteria for this award.

Dr. Sue Morrow is a full professor in the Counseling Psychology Program at the University of Utah. Her nominator, Dr. Elizabeth Abrams and her three support letter writers, Carrie Castaneda-Sound, Laken Shirey, and Karen Tao, describe how Dr. Sue Morrow far exceeds ALL of the long list of criteria for the Strickland Daniel Mentoring Award. Congratulations to Sue, the goddess of feminist, multicultural mentoring!!!!

Jessica Payton (winner), Stav Atir, and Christin Bowman (honorable mentions)  
*Janet Hyde Graduate Student Research Award*

Jessica Payton from Duquesne University is the Spring 2015 winner of the Hyde Graduate Student Grant for research in the psychology of women and gender. Her project is titled Toward a Social Ecological Understanding of Survivor Reporting of Military Sexual Assault and Associated Health Outcomes. Stav Atir from Cornell University won an honorable mention for her project entitled Implicit reference bias: Mechanism and consequences of the first name effect for women. A second honorable mention was awarded to Christin Bowman from the Graduate Center of the City University of New York for her project entitled Women’s solitary masturbation experiences: An intersectional approach to understanding the role of social power.
Celebrating the Moments: 
Awards Special!
Pictures from the Ceremony

Phi Loan Le, recipient of the distinguished pioneer award, pictured with Asunction Miteria Austria

Nicole Jeffrey, recipient of the SPW/AWP annual prize for psychological research on women and gender

Morgan Jerald, recipient of the psychology of black graduate student women award, section 1, pictured with Wendi Williams

Shelly Grabe, recipient of Georgia Babladelis best PWQ paper award, pictured with Jan Yoder

Linh Luu, recipient of the student pioneer award

Christopher DeCou honorable mention for SPW/AWP annual prize for psychological research on women and gender
Celebrating the Moments:
Awards Special!
Pictures from the Ceremony

Jioni Lewis, recipient of the Carolyn Payton early career award, section 1, pictured with Wendi Williams

NiCole Buchanan, recipient of the Mary Roth Walsh teaching the psychology of women award

Nancy Baker, recipient of the Sue Rosenberg Zalk Award for Distinguished Service, pictured with Asuncion Miteria Austria

Asuncion Miteria Austria, recipient of the distinguished pioneer mentor award

Jan Yoder, recognized as outgoing PWQ editor, pictured with Mary Brabeck

Stephanie Riger, recipient of the Carolyn Wood Sherif Award, pictured with Stephanie Shields

Christin Bowman, honorable mention for the Janet Hyde Graduate Student Research Award
Division 35 Endorses Jessica Henderson Daniel for President of APA

JESSICA HENDERSON DANIEL, PhD, ABPP
Candidate for APA President in 2015

Current Positions:
Associate Professor in Psychology
Department of Psychiatry
Harvard Medical School (HMS)

Director of Training in Psychology
Department of Psychiatry
Boston Children's Hospital

Adjunct Associate Professor
Clinical Psychology Program
Boston University

Leadership Experiences:
APA Board of Directors (2005-2007)
Past President of Division 35 (2001-2002)
Chair, Board of Registration of Psychology,
Commonwealth of Massachusetts
APA Council of Representatives, Massachusetts
APA Council of Representatives, Division 45
Chair, Task Force Centering on Mentoring
Chair, Public Interest Caucus
Chair, Women’s Caucus
Chair, Education and Training Caucus

APA Governance Experience (Membership):
Committee for the Advancement of Professional Practice
Ethics Task Force (charged with revising the APA Code of Ethics)
APA Finance Committee
CEMRRAT Commission on Ethnic Minority Recruitment, Retention and Training

Awards and Honors:
Fellow Status in APA Divisions 12, 29, 31, 35, 42, and 45; Member 36, 53 and 54
Mentoring Awards - APA, APAGS, Div.12, HMS, and Elizabeth Hurlock Trust Award
Instruction and Training Awards - APPIC, Div. 12, and HMS
Leadership - Committee on Women in Psychology
Career Contributions - University of Illinois-Urbana and the Massachusetts Psychological Association
Innovator Award - American Psychological Foundation

Associate Editor: Professional Psychology: Research and Practice and Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology (Division 45 Journal)
Call for Papers: Feminism & Psychology Special Issue: Abortion in context
Editors: Jeanne Marecek, Catriona Macleod and Lesley Hoggart

Abortion is one of the commonest gynaecological procedures (Sedgh et al., 2012). The legal, social, and political contexts in which abortions are carried out differ considerably and these contexts dramatically affect women’s abortion experiences. The circumstances under which abortion may be legally performed vary widely. In some countries, there are virtually no circumstances under which abortion is legal. In others, abortions are available at the request of the woman to particular gestation dates. In countries where abortion is legal, the locus of decision-making differs: in some instances, medical practitioners must certify that abortion is indicated; in others, the woman herself makes that decision. In some times and places (for example, in Maoist China), the state has compelled some women to abort their pregnancies. Medical abortions (that is, those induced by drugs) have increased dramatically in recent years. These are not limited to clinic settings; abortifacient pills can be obtained via the Internet.

Cultural and social views of abortion differ widely across the world. Some societies (e.g. Japan and some post-Soviet societies) have been described as having an ‘abortion culture’; in such societies, abortion is an unexceptional way of terminating a pregnancy that would lead to social or economic hardship. In some locales, religious objections constitute a significant barrier to women’s access to abortion. In some contexts (mainly in the global North), anti-abortionists have vigorously promulgated claims that women who have had abortions suffer severe psychological consequences. Ironically, in countries (mainly in the global South) where women must resort to unsafe abortions, little attention has been paid to the psychological consequences. We hope this special issue will bring together a broad range of feminist scholarship on abortion. We invite contributions on abortion in diverse contexts, locales, and circumstances. Possible topics include:

- public and social discourses on abortion; the nature of stigmata associated with abortion in different national contexts;
- the relation between such stigma and experiences surrounding abortion; experiences associated with illegal and/or unsafe abortion or with medical (as opposed to surgical) abortion; abortion in the context of other reproductive issues; forms of, and pathways to, pro-abortion or anti-abortion activism in various national and historical contexts; the ways that abortion providers, other health care personnel, sex educators, counselors, psychologists and researchers negotiate the meanings and valences of abortion.

Contributions may draw on research, theory, practice, or reflections on abortion work or abortion activism. Submissions may be full-length manuscripts (up to 8000 words), observations or commentaries (500 to 2000 words), or brief reports (up to 3000 words) – see http://fap.sagepub.com/. Submissions will be subject to the usual review process.

Queries may be sent to the editors: Jeanne Marecek (jmarecek@swarthmore.edu), Catriona Macleod (c.macleod@ru.ac.za) or Lesley Hoggart (Lesley.hoggart@open.ac.uk).

Due date for submissions: 10 December 2015
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Modern Misogyny explores the landscape of popular culture and politics, emphasizing relatively recent moves away from feminist activism to individualism and consumerism where "self-empowerment" represents women’s progress. It also explores the retreat to traditional gender roles after September 11, 2001. It interrogates the assumption that feminism is unnecessary, that women have achieved equality, and therefore those women who do insist on being feminists want to get ahead of men. Finally, it takes a fresh look at the positive role that feminism plays in today’s "post-feminist" era, and how feminism does and might function in women’s lives. Modern Misogyny examines that rendering of feminism as irrelevant and as the silencing and marginalizing of feminists. Anderson calls for a revived feminism that is vigilant in combatting modern forms of sexism.

Kristin J. Anderson is Professor of Psychology at the University of Houston-Downtown. She earned a Ph.D. in Psychology from the University of California, Santa Cruz. Anderson’s research explores subtle prejudice and discrimination. Anderson’s scholarship has appeared in journals such as Sex Roles, Psychology of Women Quarterly, Journal of Language and Social Psychology, and the Journal of Latinos and Education.

AWP 2016

Association for Women in Psychology 2016 Conference
Strong Girls and Wise Women: Sustaining Feminism for the Future

March 3-6, 2016
Pittsburgh, PA
 Omni William Penn Hotel

- Keynote address by Lyn Mikel Brown
- Proposal submission beginning Summer 2015
- Reduced rate conference hotel

Learn More:
www.awppgh.com/2016
@awppgh
facebook.com/awppgh
Janet Taylor Spence died on March 16, 2015, at the age of 91, after a short illness and a long and fulfilling life. As a pioneer in the study of gender and a trailblazer for women in academic psychology, she was someone who made a difference for so many of us.

Even before Janet became recognized as a leading figure in gender research, her research credentials had been established with the development of the Taylor Manifest Anxiety Scale (MAS). This measure, which was the core of her dissertation work at the University of Iowa, was originally conceived as a way of assessing susceptibility to classical conditioning, but it became a far more reaching measure of individual differences in anxiety that has been used by generations of clinical and personality researchers.

In the early 1970s, Janet turned her focus to gender, a topic that would engage her interest for the rest of her academic life, and beyond. Over several decades, in collaboration with the late Robert Helmreich and numerous students, Janet probed the complicated web of associations that constitute our notion of gender. Her skill in developing scales, first honed with the MAS, was evident again with the Attitudes toward Women Scale (AWS), one of the first widely-used tools to assess people’s attitudes toward the rights and roles of women and men. The AWS was quickly followed by the Personal Attributes Questionnaire (PAQ), a measure of psychological masculinity (instrumentality) and femininity (expressiveness). Like the Bem Sex Role Inventory, which emerged in a similar time frame, this work moved the field beyond a bipolar model of masculinity-femininity to a dualistic model in which the two dimensions of gender could vary independently. Janet’s publications in this area were extensive, spanning a period of 25 years. Much of the empirical work is summarized in Masculinity & Femininity (1978), written with Robert Helmreich; her more probing theoretical analysis of gender identity was published in the 1985 Nebraska Symposium volume.

As a leader in professional psychology, Janet is distinctive in being the only person to serve as president of both the American Psychological Association (the sixth woman to do so) and the Association for Psychological Science (its first elected president). Both organizations have honored her for contributions to the science as well as service to the organizations: APA by awarding her its Gold Medal for Life Achievement in the Science of Psychology and APS by creating the Janet Taylor Spence Awards for Transformative Early Career Contributions, presented annually to five young psychological scientists. Janet also received honorary degrees from Oberlin College, the Ohio State University and the University of Toledo, as well as an award from the National Academy of Science for Excellence in Scientific Reviewing (the latter an especially appropriate recognition, as anyone who benefitted from her feedback on papers will attest!).

The roots of her achievements and commitment go deep. Both Janet’s mother and grandmother were graduates of Vassar, and her mother earned master’s degrees in both economics and social work. Home in Toledo in the 1930s was an active arena for human rights and political expression. Janet’s mother was for a time the Executive Secretary of the local League of Women Voters and later headed a social agency that was a precursor to Aid to Families and Dependent Children. Her father started a manufacturing business when he moved to Toledo (Janet’s mother’s home town); later he became a business manager for labor unions and also ran for governor on the Socialist ticket. Although neither Janet nor her sister followed the kind of activism represented by their parents, the energy and the sense of commitment that her parents displayed can surely be seen in the life that Janet led.

As an undergraduate at Oberlin College, Janet majored in both psychology and political science and graduated in 1945. After trying out clinical psychology, first during a year at Yale (where she had some
interaction with Catherine Cox Miles) and then in a one-year clinical internship in New York, her interests became focused on experimental psychology and she moved to Iowa, where she worked with Kenneth Spence and earned her Ph.D. in 1949.

For the next 15 years, Janet’s career was a combination of “first woman” and “second fiddle”. In her initial professorial position at Northwestern University in 1949, she was the first woman ever hired by the Psychology Department, a job offer that was regarded as a novel experiment by some faculty members and a very bad idea by others. Although another woman was not hired in that department until 1972, Janet’s 10-year tenure there proved to be both comfortable and productive. Marriage to Kenneth Spence in 1959 and a move back to Iowa City shifted Janet to the second fiddle role, the victim of existing nepotism policies that would not allow two spouses to be hired in the same institution. Four years as a research psychologist at a VA Hospital were followed by another research associate position in Texas when Kenneth accepted a job at the University of Texas. After a year or two, she was given a faculty position at the university in the Educational Psychology Department, but it was only after Kenneth’s death in 1967 that she was able to again be a member of a Psychology Department—and where again, she was the first and only woman in the department. She also soon became the first woman to chair the Psychology Department. Janet was no Queen Bee, however, and as chair of the department, she made hiring women one of her priorities, as well as mentoring both young faculty and graduate students.

When Janet retired from the University of Texas in 1997, she moved to Cape Cod where she had built a house in anticipation of this transition. Cape Cod had long been a part of her life, beginning with summer vacations with her grandparents when she was a young child. Although Janet lived her life as a single woman for almost 50 years after the death of Kenneth Spence, that life was in no way solitary or lonely. To the contrary, Janet was someone who enjoyed company and created communities wherever she was. On the Cape, she became an active member of numerous groups, including the public library, the Unitarian-Universalist church, the art museum, the theatre, and the local Democratic organization. As was true in her earlier years in the psychology community, Janet was fully committed to the organizations that she believed in and was unstinting in the contributions that she made to them. She also was fully committed to her extended family: a sister and brother-in-law, nieces, nephews, and step-children, and numerous members of the subsequent generations as well. For most of them, she was the wise and generous AJ (Aunt Janet), a source of advice and vitality, blueberry pies and lobster bakes and bocce games, whose home was always a place for the family to get together.

Janet also travelled extensively in the company of friends, with destinations scattered across Africa, Asia, Australia, and Europe. Just 4 weeks before her death, she had returned from a cruise that began in Chile and ended in Argentina. All of these activities well illustrate Janet’s post-retirement philosophy: develop interests that you didn’t have time for in your academic life, and seek out younger friends!

This obituary is necessarily professional but inevitably personal as well. I knew Janet for 50 of her 91 years. Although I first met Janet when I was a graduate student at UT, she was not involved in my dissertation work. At that time we were in separate departments (she in Educational Psychology, I in Psychology) and neither of us were yet doing research in gender, the area that would later provide common ground and foster lifetime bonds. In subsequent years, Janet mentored me in many ways, only some of which I recognized at the time. We had professional collaborations and we shared non-professional times as well (the latter including a vacation to Hong Kong and Singapore, compliments of frequent flyer miles that Janet had accrued during her busy APA presidential term).

I was able to visit with Janet 3 days before she died. Though she had just moved into hospice care, she was exactly the Janet I had always known: lucid, engaged, and direct. And from the many unforgettable parts of that conversation, one incredible piece: Janet apologized to me for not having time to give me feedback on a paper I had sent to her just before her South American cruise!

For me, and for so many others, Janet Taylor Spence will always be an important part of our lives, fortified and re-experienced by the legacy that she has left.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Work Phone</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BraVada Garrett-Akinsanya</td>
<td>President, 8/15-8/16, FC</td>
<td>Division</td>
<td>8/15-8/16, FC</td>
<td>(763) 522-0100</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dbravada@yahoo.com">dbravada@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olivia Moorehead-Slaughter</td>
<td>President Elect, 8/15-8/16, FC</td>
<td>Division</td>
<td>8/15-8/16, FC</td>
<td>(617) 274-6107</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mooreheadO@parkschool.org">mooreheadO@parkschool.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maureen C. McHugh</td>
<td>Past President, 8/15-8/16, FC</td>
<td>Division</td>
<td>8/15-8/16, FC</td>
<td>(724) 357-2448</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mcmchugh@IUP.edu">mcmchugh@IUP.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynn H. Collins</td>
<td>Past Past President, 8/15-8/16, FC</td>
<td>Division</td>
<td>Co-Chair of the Publication Committee</td>
<td>215-951-5046</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Lynn_Collins@verizon.net">Lynn_Collins@verizon.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monique Clinton-Sherrod</td>
<td>Secretary, 1/15-1/19, FC</td>
<td>Division</td>
<td>1/15-1/19, FC</td>
<td>(919) 597-5103</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mclinton@rti.org">mclinton@rti.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret (Peggy) Signorella</td>
<td>Treasurer, elected 8/11, FC</td>
<td>Division</td>
<td>8/11, FC</td>
<td>(412) 675-9052</td>
<td><a href="mailto:msignorella@psu.edu">msignorella@psu.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle Santiago</td>
<td>Professional Representative, 8/15-8/17</td>
<td>Division</td>
<td>8/15-8/17</td>
<td>(610) 861-1522</td>
<td><a href="mailto:santiagoom@moravian.edu">santiagoom@moravian.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie Wong</td>
<td>Student Representative, 8/15-8/17</td>
<td>Division</td>
<td>8/15-8/17</td>
<td>(510) 676-7911</td>
<td><a href="mailto:snw253@nyu.edu">snw253@nyu.edu</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
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<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wendi Williams</td>
<td>President, Section 1: Psychology of Black Women, 2014-2016, FC</td>
<td>Division</td>
<td>2014-2016, FC</td>
<td>(718) 780-4369</td>
<td><a href="mailto:wendi.williams@liu.edu">wendi.williams@liu.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yvette Flores</td>
<td>President, Section 3: Concerns of Hispanic Women/Latinas, 2014-2016, FC</td>
<td>Division</td>
<td>2014-2016, FC</td>
<td>(510) 229-8284</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ygfloresortiz@ucdavis.edu">ygfloresortiz@ucdavis.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Vencill, 2014-2016</td>
<td>President, Section 4: Lesbian, Bisexual, and Transgender Concerns, FC</td>
<td>Division</td>
<td>2014-2016</td>
<td>(612) 625-1500</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jvencill@umn.edu">jvencill@umn.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khanh Dinh</td>
<td>President, Section 5: Psychology of Asian Pacific American Women, 2015-2017, FC</td>
<td>Division</td>
<td>2015-2017, FC</td>
<td>(805) 493-3577</td>
<td><a href="mailto:khanh_dinh@uml.edu">khanh_dinh@uml.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juli Green</td>
<td>President, Section 6: Alaska Native/American Indian/Indigenous Women, 2015-2017, FC</td>
<td>Division</td>
<td>2015-2017, FC</td>
<td>(510) 530-6847</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jjgreen@alliant.edu">jjgreen@alliant.edu</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section Presidents Cont...

Rakhshanda Saleem  
Chair: TF on South and West Asian Women (2012-2015)  
Work Phone: 617-206-7371  
Email: RSaleem@lesley.edu  
Email (2): Rakshi.Saleem@gmail.com

Publications Committee

Maureen McHugh  
Publications Committee, Co-Chair, 8/15-8/17, FC  
Work phone: 724-357-2448  
FAX: 724-357-2214  
Home Phone: 724-733-3620  
Email: mcmchugh@IUP.edu

Lynn Collins  
Publications Committee Co-Chair, 8/14-8/16  
Work Phone: 215-951-5046  
Home phone: 732-988-2621  
Email: Lynn_Collins@verizon.net

Jan Yoder  
Journal Editor, Psychology of Women Quarterly, 2010-2015  
Work Phone: 330-972-8371  
Email: jyoder@uakron.edu

Mary M. Brabeck  
Journal Editor-Elect 2014-2015  
Psychology of Women Quarterly, (Editor role will be 2016-2019)  
Work Phone: 212-998-5330  
Email: mmb7@nyu.edu

Linda Beckman  
Book Series Editor, 2009-2015  
Work Phone: 626-270-3302  
Email: lbeckman@alliant.edu

Clare Mehta  
Newsletter Co-Editor, The Feminist Psychologist, appointed March, 2015  
Work Phone: 617-975-9362  
Cell Phone: 617-963-4965  
Email: Mehtac@emmanuel.edu

Emily Keener  
Newsletter Co-Editor, The Feminist Psychologist, appointed March, 2015  
Work Phone: 724-344-4698  
Email: Emily.Keener@sru.edu

Ellen Halpern  
POWR-L, 2011  
Work Phone: 908-361-3733  
Email: anamgirl@earthlink.net

Allie Minieri  
Chair, Committee on Technology  
Website Coordinator, appointed 9/12  
Work Phone: 848-702-4547  
Email: allieminieri@gmail.com

Martha Bergen  
Website Liaison Coordinator, appointed 9/12  
Work Phone: 817-723-0730  
Email: Martha.bergen@gmail.com

Standing Committee Chairs

Mimi Ormerod  
Adolescent Girls Committee, Chair, 9/14  
Work Phone: 217-493-3436  
Email: mimi.ormerod@gmail.com

Lynda Sagrestano  
Co Chair, Adolescent Girls Committee  
Cell Phone: +49 0160 4645193  
Email: lsagrstn@memphis.edu

Beth Haines  
Continuing Education Co-chair, appointed 9/12  
Work Phone: 920-832-6708  
Email: beth.a.haines@lawrence.edu or hainesb@lawrence.edu

Julii Green  
Continuing Education Co-chair, appointed 9/13  
Work Phone: 619-920-3891  
Email: julilgreen@yahoo.com

Amanda Almond  
Early Career Psychologists, Chair, appointed 3/15  
Work Phone: 718-260-5114  
Cell Phone: 860-389-3810  
E-mail: AAlmond@citytech.cuny.edu

Emily Keener  
Newsletter Co-Editor, The Feminist Psychologist, appointed March, 2015  
Work Phone: 724-344-4698  
Email: Emily.Keener@sru.edu

Ellen Halpern  
POWR-L, 2011  
Work Phone: 908-361-3733  
Email: anamgirl@earthlink.net

Allie Minieri  
Chair, Committee on Technology  
Website Coordinator, appointed 9/12  
Work Phone: 848-702-4547  
Email: allieminieri@gmail.com

Martha Bergen  
Website Liaison Coordinator, appointed 9/12  
Work Phone: 817-723-0730  
Email: Martha.bergen@gmail.com

Mimi Ormerod  
Adolescent Girls Committee, Chair, 9/14  
Work Phone: 217-493-3436  
Email: mimi.ormerod@gmail.com

Lynda Sagrestano  
Co Chair, Adolescent Girls Committee  
Cell Phone: +49 0160 4645193  
Email: lsagrstn@memphis.edu

Beth Haines  
Continuing Education Co-chair, appointed 9/12  
Work Phone: 920-832-6708  
Email: beth.a.haines@lawrence.edu or hainesb@lawrence.edu

Julii Green  
Continuing Education Co-chair, appointed 9/13  
Work Phone: 619-920-3891  
Email: julilgreen@yahoo.com

Amanda Almond  
Early Career Psychologists, Chair, appointed 3/15  
Work Phone: 718-260-5114  
Cell Phone: 860-389-3810  
E-mail: AAlmond@citytech.cuny.edu
Kat Quina  
Early Career Psychologists, Co-Chair, appointed 3/15  
Email: kquina@me.com

Asuncion "Siony" Miteria Austria  
Fellows Committee, Chair, 8/13 - 8/15  
Work Phone: 414-352-6281  
Fax: 414-410-4239  
Email: amaustria@stritch.edu

Debra Kawahara  
Feminist Professional Training and Practice Committee, Co-Chair, 2011 - 2015  
Work phone: 858-635-4613  
Email: dkawahara@alliant.edu

Phil Loan Le  
Feminist Professional Training and Practice Committee, Co-Chair, 2014 - 2015  
Work phone: 714-564-62163  
Email: le_philoan@sac.edu

Margaret (Peggy) Signorella  
Finance Committee, Chair, 9/13  
*Treasurer, elected 8/11, FC  
Work Phone: 412-675-9052  
Email: msignorella@psu.edu

Jean Lau Chin  
Investment Committee (subcommittee of Finance Committee), Chair  
Work Phone: 516-877-4185  
Email: ceoservices@yahoo.com

Rakhshanda Saleem  
Phone: 617-206-7371  
Email: RSaleem@lesley.edu  
Email (2): Rakshi.Saleem@gmail.com

Nancy Baker  
Chair, Governance, 9/14 - 9/2015  
Work Phone: 650-799-3096  
Email: nbaker@fielding.edu

Karol E. Dean  
Membership and Recruitment Committee, Co-Chair, 12/13 - 8/16  
Phone: 914-674-7517  
Email: karole.dean@gmail.com

Susan Basow  
Nominations & Elections, Chair, 12/13 - 8/15  
Work Phone: 610-330-5294  
Email: basows@lafayette.edu

Mindy Erchull  
APA Program Committee 2013-2016, Chair  
Work Phone: 540-654-1557  
Email: merchull@umw.edu

Wendy Peters  
APA Program Committee 2015-2017, Chair  
Work Phone: 937-654-0153  
Email: wpetersphd@gmail.com

Iva GreyWolf  
Awards Coordinator, 2014-2016  
Email: drgreywolf2015@gmail.com

Laurie Rudman  
Carolyn Wood Sherif Award, Chair, 8/2015

Stephanie Shields  
Heritage Awards Committee Chair, Aug 2014  
Work Phone: 814-863-1729  
Email: sashields@psu.edu

Karen Miranda, PhD  
Hyde Graduate Student Research Award, Co-Chair, 08/2015  
Email: karen.miranda@newbury.edu

Gail Sanford Bruce  
Incoming Co-Chair, Hyde Graduate Student Research Award  
Email: brucesan@msudenver.edu

Melinda A. García, Ph.D.  
Chair, Psychotherapy with Women Award, 10/2014  
Work Phone: 505-247-3303  
Email: drmagarcia@westoffice.net

Joan Chrisler  
Chair, Florence L. Denmark Award for Contributions to Women and Aging  
Work Phone: 860-439-2336  
Email: jcchr@conncoll.edu

Awards Standing Committees

TBD  
Membership and Recruitment Committee, Co-chair, 9/15-8/17
**Awards Standing Committees Cont...**

**Kim Case, 10/2014**  
Chair, Mary Roth Walsh Award Chair, 10/2011  
Phone: 281-283-3338  
caseki@uhcl.edu

**Tara Broccoli**  
Geis Scholarship Award Chair, 10/2014  
Work Phone: 860-629-6041  
Email: broccoli_t@mitchell.edu

**Nicole Buchanan**  
Div 35/AWP Student Research Prize Chair, 8/2011-8/2015  
Work Phone: 517-355-7677  
Email: nbuchanal@msu.edu

**Britney Brinkman**  
Co-Chair, Div 35/AWP Student Research Prize Chair, 10/2014-8/2017  
Chatham University  
Work Phone: 412-365-2476  
Email: BBrinkman@chatham.edu

**Asuncion “Siony” Miteria Austria**  
Chair, Sue Rosenberg Zalk Award, 9/14  
Work Phone: 414-410-4471  
Fax: 414-410-4239  
Email: amaustria@stritch.edu

**Linda Forrest**  
Chair, Strickland-Daniel Mentoring Award Committee, 10/2014  
Work Phone: 541-729-7440  
Email: forrestl@uoregon.edu

**Cheryl Travis**  
Chair, Barbara Strudler Wallston Award for the Representation of Underrepresented Groups in the Publication Process  
Work Phone: 865-974-3299  
Email: ctravis@utk.edu

**Jackie White**  
Co-Chair, Violence Committee 8/14  
Work Phone: 336-337-2100  
Email: jwwhite@uncg.edu

**Pearl Berman**  
Co Chair, Violence Committee 8/14  
Work Phone: 724-357-2105  
Email: PSBerman@IUP.edu

**Julia R. Steinberg**  
Reproductive Issues Committee, Chair, 8/14  
Work Phone: 415-476-7736  
Email: jrsteinb@umd.edu

**TBA, Strategic Planning Committee Chair**

**Allie Minieri**  
Technology, Chair 12/2013  
Work Phone: 848-702-4547  
Email: allieminieri@gmail.com

**Kate Richmond**  
C o-Chair, Committee on Academic Feminist Psychology  
Work Phone: 484-664-3423  
Email: krichmond@muhlenberg.edu

**Nicola Curtin**  
C o-Chair, Committee on Academic Feminist Psychology  
Email: ncurtin@clarku.edu

**Clare Mehta**  
Incoming Div 35/AWP Featured Feminist Science Track @ AWP  
Work Phone: 617-975-9362  
Cell Phone: 617-963-4965  
Email: Mehta@emmanuel.edu

**Katie Edwards**  
Incoming Div 35/AWP Featured Feminist Science Track @ AWP  
Work Phone: 603-862-2360  
Email: katie.edwards@unh.edu

**Lauren Mizock**  
Chair, Motherhood Committee  
Work Phone: 781-866-1655  
Email: lauren.mizock@gmail.com

---

**Special Committee Chairs**

**Joy Rice**  
Chair, By Laws Committee, 10/2014  
Email: jkrice@wisc.edu

**Jamila Bookwalta**  
Women and Aging, 8/14-8/15  
Work Phone: 610-330-5285  
Email: bookwalj@lafayette.edu
**Task Forces**

**Bravada Garrett-Akinsanya, President**

Edna Esnìl  
Chair: Research to Practice Task Force  
Work Phone: 650-255-2679  
Email: edna@doctoresnìl.com

Wendi Williams  
Chair: Inter-Sections Taskforce on the Healthy Development of Indigenous Girls and Girls of Color  
Work Phone: 718-780-4369  
Email: wendi.williams@liu.edu

Natalie Porter  
Co-Chair: Taskforce on Strategic Alliance for Social Justice  
Work Phone: 415-955-2137  
Email: nporter@alliant.edu

Barbara Streets  
Co-Chair: Taskforce on Strategic Alliances for Social Justice

Jean Lau Chin  
Co-Chair: Taskforce on Feminist Economic Advancement and Entrepreneurial Leadership  
Work Phone: 516-877-4185  
Email: ceoservices@yahoo.com

Margaret (Peggy) Signorella  
Chair: Taskforce on Feminist Economic Advancement and Entrepreneurial Leadership  
Work Phone: 412-675-9052  
Email: msignorella@psu.edu

**Maureen McHugh, Past President**

Suzanna Rose  
Chair: Leadership: Advancing Women in the Academy  
Work Phone: 305-609-4300  
Email: srose@fiu.edu

Martha Bergen  
Co-Chair: Feminist Perspective on Sizism  
Work Phone: 817-723-0730  
Email: Martha.bergen@gmail.com

Sonia Carrizales  
Co-Chair: Feminist Perspective on Sizism  
Work Phone: 214-886-1058  
Email: soniamarie0974@gmail.com

Inga Schowengerolt  
Chair, Task Force on Gender Inclusivity  
Cell Phone: 617-935-9118  
Email: ingaschowengerolt@cantab.net

TBA  
Chair, Task Force Chair: Feminist Psychology in Graduate Education

**Lynn Collins, Past Past President**

Julii Green  
Chair: Task Force on Reconstruction of Feminism.org web site  
Work Phone: 858-635-4847  
Email: jgree@alliant.edu  
Email (2): dr.juliigreen@gmail.com

Wendy Peters  
Co-Chair, Feminism.org  
Work Phone: 937-654-0153  
Email: wpetersphd@gmail.com

Erika Carr  
Chair: Task Force on Women Who Experience Serious Mental Illness  
Work Phone: 901-493-2481  
Email: rundaisy@hotmail.com

Lauren Mizock  
Co-Chair: Task Force on Women Who Experience Serious Mental Illness  
Work Phone: 781-866-1655  
Email: lauren.mizock@gmail.com

Debra Mollen  
Co-Chair: Joint Task Force with Division 17 to Revise the Guidelines for Psychological Practice with Girls and Women  
Work Phone: 940-898-2317  
Email: dmollen@mail.twu.edu

Sharon Lamb  
Co-Chair: Joint Task Force with Division 17 to Revise the Guidelines for Psychological Practice with Girls and Women  
Phone: 802-578-3437  
Email: Sharon.Lamb@umb.edu

Lillian Comas-Díaz  
Co-Chair: Joint Task Force with Division 17 to Revise the Guidelines for Psychological Practice with Girls and Women  
Phone: 202-775-1938  
Email: cultura@starpower.net
Additional Roles

Yuying Tsong
2017 NMCS Co-coordinator
Work Phone: 657-278-3950
Email: ytsong@fullerton.edu

Olivia Moorehead-Slaughter
National Multicultural Conference and Summit Legacy Fund, 2013
Work Phone: 617-274-6107
Email: mooreheadO@parkschool.org

Jennifer Wisdom
Committee on Women in Psychology Incoming Chair, 1/2015
Email: jpwisdom@gwu.edu
Work Phone: 202-994-7402

APA-related Personnel

Tanya Burrwell
Women’s Programs Office
Public Interest Directorate
Work Phone: 202-336-6049
Email: tburrwell@apa.org

Shari Miles-Cohen
Women’s Programs Office
Public Interest Directorate
Work Phone: 202-336-6156
Email: smiles@apa.org

Gwendolyn Puryear Keita
Public Interest Directorate
Work Phone: 202-336-6050
Email: gkeita@apa.org

LIAISONS

Monica Unique Ellis
American Psychological Association of Graduate Students (APAGS), 10/13
Work Phone: 323-351-9793
Email: monicaueillis@gmail.com

Rakshshanda Saleem
Committee on International Relations in Psychology (CIRP)
Work Phone: 617-206-7371
Email: RSaleem@lesley.edu
Email (2): Rakshi.Saleem@gmail.com

Bernice Lott
Committee on Socioeconomic Status, appointed 2012
Work Phone: 401-789-7003
Email: blott@uri.edu

Karol Dean
Liaison Association for Women in Psychology, 2014
Work Phone: 914-674-7517
Email: karole.dean@gmail.com

Florence Denmark
Liaison, Committee on Women in Psychology, 2013
Email: fdenmark@pace.edu

Natalie Porter
Divisions for Social Justice
Phone: 415-955-2137
Email: nporter@alliant.edu

Charlene Y. Senn
Section on Women and Psychology (SWAP), Canadian Psychological Association, 2009
Work Phone: 519-233-3000 ext 2255
Email: csenn@uwindsor.ca

Mary Brabeck
Coalition for Psychology in Schools and Education
Work Phone: 212-998-5000
Cell Phone: 917-238-5234
Email: mary.brabeck@nyu.edu
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