PRESIDENT'S COLUMN: Feminists in Action

By BraVada Garrett - Akinsanya PhD, SPW President

As I write the column for this issue, I recognize with both humility and pride the hard work done by my feminist colleagues every day to make the world a better place. We struggle against great odds and fight the ever constant micro-aggressions that are hurled at us due to the intersectionality of our existence. For months, we lamented that "Black lives mattered (too)," and before the grievous guttural moans for our dead children could reflect the sadness in our spirits, we experienced the death of Sandra Bland, who allegedly committed suicide after being arrested for a minor traffic violation - leading a Universe of arrested women to proclaim, "If I die in jail, I did not commit suicide." Before our tears could hit the pillow, we were shocked to discover a report stating that at least twenty of our trans sisters of color (constituting the diverse multicultural rainbows of ethnicity and race) were brutally murdered because the pot of gold they sought at the end of their rainbows was to simply "be who they were always meant to be," --and somebody didn’t like that. We took a breath, and then we came to our APA meetings to hear the intricate details of the 566 page, "thorough and fair" Hoffman report that came with a near 5 million dollar price tag. The report challenged our governance processes and shattered our self-serving beliefs that we, as psychologists, are something different than simple human beings who are capable of making bad decisions and doing bad things--especially when we (and others around us) are not paying attention or holding us accountable. So in order to manage our pain, some of us became more entrenched in what we believed to be "right or wrong." We failed to see the contextual nature of our decisions and virtually claimed "Off with their heads" as if we were in an extended chapter of "Alice in Wonderland." On one end of the continuum, many of us retrospectively reviewed the report, and sighed: "Oh no, that could have been me," while some of us resorted to slogans, and passionately shouted the powerful words: "First Do No Harm," to mark our commitment to human welfare. Yet, as if in an extended sequel of "Mean Girls," an even smaller subset of us engaged in hateful, blaming, self-righteous, disrespectful, and vitriolic rhetoric that drew a bright line between "us" and "them," -- so that we would feel safer in ourselves. I experience a visceral reaction to those types of responses to the report as I view them as being reminiscent of those people who blame girls for being assaulted by saying, "She should have known."

I recently wrote about the privilege of meeting Naomi Tutu, the daughter of Desmond Tutu. In conversation with her, I asked her "How can you purport forgiveness and moving forward when people have done such awful violations of human rights and dignity?" I told her that I was struggling with people who were racist, who had done me wrong, and who had done my people wrong. I was struggling with blaming "the man" for all of the atrocities that I (and my people and other people of color like me) had endured. Her answer to me was "Ubuntu." Ubuntu is a quality that includes the essential human virtues; compassion and humanity. Ubuntu is about compassion...
for mistakes (intentional and unintentional) and telling the truth about the harm done. Martin Luther King, Jr. once wrote: “We must develop and maintain the capacity to forgive. [S/he] who is devoid of the power to forgive is devoid of the power to love. There is some good in the worst of us and some evil in the best of us. When we discover this, we are less prone to hate our enemies.” In response to our organizational crisis, our Elected Executive Committee (Voting EC) has decided to meet monthly in an advisory capacity. In one of our Voting EC meetings, we agreed that “We cannot Heal, if we cannot Hear.” Thus, we need to be remorseful for the times that we did not hear, and did not speak; and become committed to shouting instead of being silent, and listening compassionately to all of the stories, narratives and hurts that have ensued because we did not hear. We also need to realize that “hearing” does not automatically translate into “agreeing.” Yet, I believe that when truly compassionate people listen, they then fight for reform. The battle for reform, may at times, require inexplicable grace and a level of self-reflection that compels the individual to engage in an internal battle from within. I believe fighting for compassionate reform is imperative. And “we cannot lead a revolution until we have experienced one in ourselves.” Ubuntu was not shown to the people who were tortured or even those detained without a trial in Guantanamo Bay. But, at the very least, we should be able to demonstrate Ubuntu toward each other. After I spoke with Naomi Tutu, I promised myself that I would try my best to remain in a perpetual state of cognitive reframing and strive to see all behaviors within the contexts in which they occurred. Only by listening with my heart, can I truly hear the contexts of why people do what they do and show Ubuntu towards them.

The internal issues of abuses of power within APA, (e.g. long standing systems of good ol’ boy and good ol’ girl networking) lead to the type of corruption that often abounds in monolithic, homogeneous groups and organizations. Despite those systems, however, Division 35 has always found a way (sometimes kicking and screaming) to do the right thing in the end. Please see the article (pg 24) submitted by my dear colleague, Dr. Linda Woolf, who has shared the powerful and inspirational history of Division 35 members working within the structure of APA to make influential strides in promoting social justice within the organization and beyond.

Our efforts should always be to not only influence the mechanisms inside of APA, but to challenge the societal issues of oppression outside of APA. I am explicitly stating that our Division must deal with the Hoffman report and what that report has meant for us as feminists in action, who promote social justice as a core part of our identity. Before we can authentically and credibly influence others, we must deal with ourselves. My Presidential theme for this year was established well before the Hoffman report came out. It is “Expanding Feminist Spaces for Social Justice.” The selection of that theme was to emphasize a resurgence of our external commitment to social justice in a clearly observable manner. This value to me, like many of you, is more than simply steeped in lip service, it is a core part of who I am. I was delayed while writing this article for the newsletter because two blocks from my North Minneapolis office (located in the Minneapolis Urban League building), a young man- Jamar Clark, was fatally shot while in police custody (with some witnesses contending that he was handcuffed). He was arrested for allegedly interfering with paramedics and witnesses say that in the process of restraining him, he was fatally wounded. Moreover, the police did not provide videotapes of the incident as there were cameras in the area and the policeman was supposedly wearing a body cam. “Black Lives Matter” protesters (who represented all types of people from all walks of life) occupied the site for over two weeks demanding further investigation and that the police release the tapes. To make matters worse, during that occupation, a group of white supremacists came to the site and shot five of the protesters. Once again, before I could gain my equilibrium, a gunman opened fire inside of a Planned Parenthood clinic, killing a mother of two and a veteran of the Iraq war. He also killed a police officer and left nine other people wounded. Consequently, after I walked and talked with the protesters to provide support and education and after I thought deeply about the terrorist attack on the Planned Parenthood facility, I recalled that the deepest meaning of feminism, for me, is action. Before the Hoffman report came out, our Division was on a trajectory towards social justice action.

I recognize that before Hoffman, almost 300 school girls were raped, sold into slavery in Nigeria - simply because they wanted an education. Before Hoffman, girls abroad and within our country were (and still are) victims of trafficking; black boys and girls were still being gunned down in the streets; girls who have been victims of sexual abuse and assault have been so overlooked that there is a clear connection to incarceration as we explore the “sexual abuse/assault to prison pipeline,” especially for girls and women from racial and ethnic minority population. Before Hoffman, Trans women (especially those of color) were being murdered and abused. Before Hoffman, women were fighting just to be able to buy birth control pills or to have control over their own bodies and to maintain their reproductive rights. Before Hoffman, men and women who were in the LGBTQ community or those with diverse forms of gender expression were fighting for a right to inclusion and to have unhampered access to the American dream. Before Hoffman, many families,
especially female headed households, immigrant and refugee families, and those living in poverty continued to battle unemployment and financial exploitation, as well as issues of disparities in health including low birth weight, trauma exposure, homelessness, and early deaths, especially those experienced through homicide and suicide. These are all just a few of the social justice issues that mattered to us in Division 35 before Hoffman’s report. Those issues still matter now. We have fought, we have clawed, we have scratched, and we have bled. Now we must create a space for healing to take place. Feminist action does not require that one ignores the source of our pain, but it does require an intentional act of Ubuntu, by courageously, consciously seeking healing, forgiveness and understanding. A wise teacher once told me: “You do not have to teach a wound to heal, you just need to create an environment for that healing to take place.” For the past three months, I, alongside many members of our Executive Committee, have been challenged to create spaces where we can “hear in order to heal.” Our goal is to create spaces where we can respectfully hear each other better, spaces where we can honestly, and truthfully define for ourselves who we want to become as a Division. To meet this goal, we have taken the unprecedented measure of creating a Division 35 Town Hall listserv, which promises to be a platform from which our members will be able to easily exchange information, ideas and concerns. It will provide a venue to post job announcements, share resources, an important news or accomplishments! Our Town Hall will also be an excellent place to ask for help, solicit support or to post comments about a variety of topics. Therefore as a member of this Division each person is cordially invited to propose any topics of discussion that you may find germane to the mission of advancing teaching, research, advocacy or practice in the psychology of women. We want to make our Town Hall “A Place where Feminists Speak and the World Listens!”

Over the course of the next few months, it is also our intention to engage SPW members in dialogues, webinars and conference calls that will tackle the institutional and systemic challenges related to social justice. To meet this goal, in collaboration with our newly formed Taskforce on Strategic Alliances for Social Justice, we have introduced a social justice conversation series called “SPW Lunch Counter Conversations.” These monthly conversations are designed to honor of the social justice legacies gained through the lunch counter protests of the sixties where nonviolent activism proved to be effective in implementing change. The Topic of the first conversation was “Reconstructing Power: Exploring Our Social Justice Identity in the Era of the Hoffman Report,” and was held on Monday, November 23rd at 12:00 noon until 1:00 CST. The call was graciously hosted by Dr. Peggy Signorella and facilitated by Dr. Olivia Moorehead-Slaughter and myself. The purpose of the program was to explore, with our members; (1) power dynamics in relation to the PENS Taskforce as well as to other system issues; (2) how we may strengthen our social justice identity and lead; (3) how we may commit to remaining in respectful dialogue about our past and our future together. Please see the flyer in this newsletter to register for future conversations. Members are encouraged to actively engage in discourse about the topics by participating on our Division 35 Town Hall listserv.

Feminists have been in action in other areas as well. Our taskforces and committees have been actively planning new initiatives focused on addressing the needs of our feminist community. For example, in addition to our Lunch Counter Conversations, and our Town Hall listserv, the Committee on Technology has been organizing our web-based suite of offerings. Look forward to changes in the way our SPW webpage looks as well as to using a “Members Only” section where important and historical documents such as minutes from our meetings and our Handbook may be archived. Our Inter-Sections Taskforce on the Healthy Development of Sexually Diverse, Indigenous Girls and Girls of Color is in the early stages of developing a book on the Healthy Development of Diverse Girls; while our Task Force on Feminist Evidence-Based Practice is busily planning a retreat with Division 42 (Independent Practice) and coming up with awesome projects for engaging our members in sharing knowledge with the public and with each other. For now, we are currently planning our Midwinter’s Extended Executive Committee meeting which will be held from January 29-31st at the New Orleans Marriott Hotel, in New Orleans Louisiana. Our business meeting will be held beginning at 4pm on January 29, 2016. We will have a retreat beginning at 8:30 on Saturday morning, and resume our business meeting after lunch that day, closing out around noon on Sunday. Members are welcomed to attend any business meeting of our Society.

I close by saying that we have critical work to do, and to quote Martin Luther King once again: “Human progress is neither automatic nor inevitable... Every step toward the goal of justice requires sacrifice, suffering, and struggle; the tireless exertions and passionate concern of dedicated individuals.” We will overcome, my feminist siblings. We are Feminists in Action.
“Look at a day when you are supremely satisfied at the end. It’s not a day when you lounge around doing nothing; it’s a day you’ve had everything to do and you’ve done it.” — Margaret Thatcher

Thank you to our wonderful students who helped with this issue!

Shana Davis
Slippery Rock University

Tabinda Khan
Emmanuel College
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Are we a division for women, for feminists, or both? Are we a social justice division? What does that mean? Does it mean the same thing to all the members? How does this organization run? Is it via feminist mentoring? Is it via feminist process? What does that mean? Do feminist mentoring and feminist process mean the same thing to all members? These are just a few of the issues we’ve seen the division deal with in the short time that we’ve been editing the newsletter. As early career psychologists and new editors of the newsletter, these seem like good questions to us.

We hope that one way members can answer some of these questions and learn about the division is by reading this newsletter. Reading the minutes from the last EC meeting (see pages 51-60) is a great place to start. There are also answers to these questions in the articles in this issue. These articles suggest we are a division who care about people—diversity, marginalized groups, and oppression. This emphasis is highlighted in the articles written about the experiences of students of color (see Ashley Tirado, Lisa Costas, & Marilyn Paradaa’s article on page 42 and Stephanie Carrera and Stacy Ko’s article on page 10), anti-Semitism and micro-aggressions (see Carol Witherspoon’s article on page x33), size-related bullying (see Samantha Lee’s article on page 7) and the intersection of race and gender identity and deadly violence against transgender people of color (see Shana M. Davis’ article on page 36). We also care about using our voices for change. This is highlighted in the report submitted by the Motherhood Committee updating us on their advocacy efforts for improved parental leave policies and in the Early Career Psychologists’ Figure it Out Loud column which provides suggestions for responding to microaggressions. We also see this willingness to use our voices in the suggestions for combatting ostracism provided in Karol Maybury’s interview of her daughter Grace Maybury-McIntosh on page 11. We are also a division that is willing to share our knowledge and expertise with one another. In this issue we have a film review and brief synopses of articles published in the Psychology of Women Quarterly (see Review of the Dark Side of the Full Moon on page 15 and Previews of Three Articles on Online First on page 16). Importantly, in the aftermath of the Hoffman Report, we are a division that is willing to have open and difficult dialogs about our own Organization and Division. In this issue several members responded to our last issue where our Presidential Trio wrote about the Hoffman Report (see articles by Linda M. Woolf, Lindsey R. Buckman, Sharon Lamb and Rakshanda Saleem and Kelly Vaughn-Johnson on pages 24, 27, 29, and 31).

Even with all of these answers, there are still some questions. One of the questions that Emily has been asking on the listserv is how people define feminist process as it relates to group processes. From the responses we have received it is clear that there is no one definition. We have included the responses received throughout this issue of the newsletter. We hope more people will join the conversation and will submit their definitions to fempsychnews@gmail.com for the next newsletter deadline on February 15th.

Although Division 35 may mean different things to different people, we hope that all members to feel that the newsletter is a place to learn about and connect with the Division. To this end, we encourage all members to use the newsletter as a place to share advocacy efforts, information on social justice issues, as well as advice and recommendations for improving members’ lives and the lives of others. We also want to encourage members to speak their mind in the newsletter—this is a “brave” place where we can have difficult but respectful conversations. We hope this issue of The Feminist Psychologist provides some indication of who we are as a division and what is important to us.

Your opinion matters!
Do you have a different opinion or response to something you read?

We want to hear from you!

Please submit responses to fempsychnews@gmail.com
Below, Lynn Collins provides a list of quotes and sources to help us understand feminist process. Be sure to look for more member responses to the question: “Using your Voice: What is feminist Process?” throughout this issue.

1. From Solidarity: http://www.solidarity-us.org/feministprocess

“Norms for How We Talk to Each Other: Listen Actively, Respect the people chosen to facilitate the discussion, Allow enough time for thorough discussion, On the other hand, Share the Air. Those who talk a lot need to take a step back to make more space for others. Take responsibility for how everyone in the group experiences the discussion. Acknowledge your own social location and modify your participation accordingly. Do not make attributions about people's motives. Make I statements. When someone makes you angry, address the behavior, do not shame or blame others. Do not be afraid to apologize or to ask for an apology.”

2. From Canadian Association of Sexual Assault Centres: http://www.casac.ca/node/143

“By Feminist Process we mean additions to good democratic practice which best suit organising women toward justice and equality for all. These practices enrich and explain rather than replace democratic organisation.”

“We can all improve ourselves as leaders. And in a feminist process we agree to do so...Consensus is a process of making decisions that is common in collectives.In the method of counting votes and determining who has the majority there is often a winner and a loser when there could have been more victory for all.In a consensus model women try to convince each other and compromise until everyone is satisfied that a reasonable decision has been made.Consensus decision making requires maturity and generosity on the part of the woman or women who are in the minority to not hold up the rest of the group needlessly and from the majority to value the intelligent contribution of the minority so much that time and compromise are well spent in accommodating that minority....”


“VI. DECISION MAKING AND ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE. A. All basic policy decisions of the organization are made by the membership. Insofar as possible, agenda items for business meetings (including important issues raised by individuals, committees, caucuses, or the Implementation Collective) will be published before the meetings for comments and additions by all members......

B. Implementation Collective. There is an Implementation Collective to act as a decision-making body to deal with organizational issues that arise between business meetings and are beyond the scope of the standing committees ....”

From the AWP website: http://www.awpsycho.org/

“One of AWP’s proudest achievements is our continuing, always evolving, reliance on feminist process (which includes cooperation and consensus). The Implementation Collective (i.e., Imps; our governing board) works as a cooperative unit, has voluntary members, and open meetings. The Collective and AWP overall includes lesbian, bisexual, and straight women, white women and women of color, academic and nonacademic women, and graduate students.”

From the second part of “Herstory.” http://www.awpsycho.org/about/ “Since our founding AWP has prided itself on a deep and enduring commitment to feminist process. Not only has that meant inclusiveness and respect, but active efforts to support members’ growth and benefit all women. We take feminist psychology research seriously, and that means we work to combat the many sources of stress and lowered self-esteem that seem an enduring aspect of female socialization. More than just a tone, however, we have been committed to a feminist operating process that honors consensus-building and consensus decision-making. As contrasted with Robert’s Rules of Order, with its parade of motions and votes and constant procedural maneuvering, we have operated since 1969 with a non-voting process of active listening, honest communication and attention to dynamics that makes room for everyone to speak and all positions to air. Two of our most active members, Donna Hawkhurst and Sue Morrow, even wrote a book about feminist process in 1984, and we are still at it, with and despite all its complexities.”

Lynn Collins, PhD
Youth at Risk for Growing up in a Sizeist Society: The Effects of Weight-based Bullying in Childhood and Adolescence

By Samantha Lee

According to the current understanding of obesity, as regulated by the widely accepted BMI scale, 10% of children worldwide are overweight or obese (World Health Organization, 2008), which means approximately 7.36 million children in the United States alone fall into this category. While the relatively limited body of literature exploring weight bias has experienced increased attention within recent years, prejudice and discrimination based on weight continue to be dismissed and disregarded with anti-fat bias failing to be acknowledged as a widespread and detrimental form of oppression (McHugh & Kasaro, 2012). Traditionally, literature exploring size has done so through the lens of pathology, with practitioners attributing more severe pathology to individuals of size (McHugh & Kasaro, 2012). Body size has been identified as a socially acceptable and often times, justified, prejudice with rates of fat-shaming increasing in recent years (Watts & Cranney, 2009). Anti-fat discrimination is occurring at rates paralleling that of racial discrimination with a 66% increase in occurrence documented over the past decade (Danielsdottir, O’Brien, & Ciao, 2010). Given the prevalence of anti-fat discrimination in light of the literature linking experience of discrimination to negative health outcomes (Hartley, 2004), it can be argued that the true threat to the health of our children is not obesity, but the widespread endorsement of weight-bias.

Psychological presentations of individuals of size have historically been, and in many cases, continue to be viewed as a result of the weight itself with recommendations for amelioration of the negative psychological effects surrounding weight loss (e.g., Tevie & Shaya, 2015). In recent years, some researchers have transitioned from viewing the correlation between psychological consequences and weight as a causal relationship to conceptualizing social and emotional consequences as the result of weight bias and size-related bullying experienced by individuals who identify as larger bodied (see Kornilaki, 2011 for review). Mediating variables increasing the likelihood of lower quality of life in larger bodied children and adolescents include several factors, such as self-image, bullying, and parents’ educational level (Butitta, Iliescu, Rousseau, & Guerrien, 2014). Through an expansion of our understanding of the experience of individuals of size, the currently invisible privileges afforded to thin individuals and the detrimental effects of weight-based discrimination and prejudice can be brought to light. The prevalence of weight-bias is evident through experiences of youth throughout the United States with youth and teachers identifying weight-related teasing as among the most prevalent forms of teasing within the school system with youth rating ‘being overweight’ as the most common reason for bullying (Puhl, Luedicke, & Heuer, 2011) and teachers and administrative staff rating weight-based bullying as more frequent than bullying related to disability, perceived sexual orientation, or gender (Bradshaw, Waasdorp, O’Brennan, & Gulemetova, 2011). Although relatively little interventions are currently in place within the school system to combat weight-based bullying, there has been an influx of research within the past decade with parents also increasingly identifying weight-based bullying as a problem (Puhl & Luedicke, 2014).

Overweight or obese children who experience peer victimization are at a higher risk for symptoms of anxiety (Puhl & Latner, 2007; Storch et. al, 2007; Young-Hyman et. al, 2006), depression (Eisenberg, Neumark-Sztainer, Haines, & Wall, 2006; Eisenberg, Neumark-Sztainer, & Story, 2003; Gibson et. al, 2008; Puhl & Latner, 2007; Storch et. al, 2007; Young-Hyman et. al, 2006), disordered eating (Gibson et. al, 2008; Hayden-Wade et. al, 2005; Puhl & Latner, 2007), suicidal ideation (Eaton, Lowry, Brener, Galuska, & Crosby, 2005; Eisenberg et al., 2003), decreased academic performance (Puhl & Luedicke, 2012), poor body image (Puhl & Latner, 2007), social isolation (Puhl & Latner, 2007), and lower self-esteem (Eisenberg et. al, 2006; Eisenberg et. al, 2003; Gibson et. al, 2008). Given the prevalence of weight-based bullying and the accompanying negative effects, the limited body of literature examining this phenomenon, deemed as a “rite of passage” due to its frequency (Robinson, 2006), requires additional research and consideration.
Weight-Based Victimization

Children and adolescents classified as ‘overweight’ or ‘obese’ in accordance with the current BMI standard experience bullying at a significantly higher rate than their non-overweight or non-obese peers. Overweight children are 10% more likely to be victims of bullying and obese children are 60% more likely to experience bullying (Lumeng et al., 2010). The severity of bullying incidents is positively correlated with the weight of the child or adolescent experiencing the bullying, with more severe bullying being experienced by children of a higher weight (Janssen, Craig, Boyce, & Pickett, 2004). While body dissatisfaction has been examined as a consequence of weight-based bullying, it is not only related to the experiences of victims of bullying, but also to the likelihood of children and adolescents engaging in the perpetration of weight-based bullying. Reubach and colleagues (2013) found that body mass index is not related to bullying behaviors; however, body dissatisfaction is. Body dissatisfaction served as a significant predictor of weight-based bullying in both boys and girls regardless of their weight class. Dismantling societal constructs that reinforce weight bias is therefore integral to the discourse seeking to prevent weight-based bullying.

It is important to note that while weight-based bullying is among the most frequent forms of bullying, it is also distinct in its progression. In contrast to other forms of bullying that generally peak in middle school and then become less frequent throughout high school (McKenna & Hawk, 2011), weight-based victimization may begin at a younger age (Hayden-Wade et al., 2005) and progress into adulthood. Furthermore, this victimization occurs in the school system as well as the home; it is perpetrated by peers, friends, parents, teachers, and coaches. While the majority of youth experiencing weight-based victimization identify peers (92%) and friends (70%) as the perpetrators of the bullying, adult perpetrators of weight-based bullying are also frequently identified with dual teacher/coaches being the most common adult perpetrators (42%), followed by parents (37%) and teachers (27%) (Puhl, Peterson, & Luedicke, 2013). In an exploration of the relationship between childhood weight and peer victimization, Gray, Janicke, and Dumont-Driscoll (2014) found a positive relationship between peer victimization and utilization of weight control practices by caregivers, such as restriction of food intake, an example of ways in which parents can serve to further reinforce weight bias experienced in other relationships.

Weight-based victimization can take many forms including verbal teasing, relational victimization, cyberbullying, and physical aggression (Puhl et al., 2013). Cyberbullying is currently the most common form of weight-based bullying, posing a unique threat due to its constant accessibility (Puhl, Peterson, & Luedicke, 2013). Resembling the nature of other forms of bullying in which bystanders play an influential role in either encouraging or discouraging the bullying (Denny et al., 2015), the expanding literature on weight-based cyberbullying further emphasizes bystanders as a point of preventative intervention. Dissenting responses have been found to not only discourage bullying behaviors, but also to encourage reactions that support the victim of bullying (Anderson, Bresnahan, & Musatics, 2014). Researchers suggest fostering dissenting models of communication for bystanders, therefore encouraging ally behaviors (Anderson et al., 2014). Advocacy for our children begins with increasing knowledge and dismantling the myth that the true threat is a matter of weight, rather than one of prejudice.
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Reflect, reflect, and reflect on our reflection. These are the words we enter our program hearing, and these are the words we use to describe our experiences as we prepare to leave. We’re asked to reflect on our thoughts, emotions, reactions, and identities we bring into work as graduate students. Our multicultural training challenges us to process how our cultural identities appear in our academic and clinical experiences. Yet, a common experience the two of us share has been a lack of opportunity to reflect on our intersecting identities as graduate womyn of color. We form part of the majority in our program with respect to gender, but our racial/ethnic identities represent the minority. The latter has become especially salient for us in our teaching and clinical experiences on a predominantly White campus.

Teaching. We have had the fortune of being able to teach both mainstream psychology and diversity topics in psychology. Specifically, we have taught the Psychology of Women as a summer seminar course. Our initial hope was to use this teaching opportunity as a way to educate students about womyn’s experiences with marginalization and oppression, particularly for womyn of color. We felt excited and determined to incorporate our research findings, clinical cases, and life experiences into our lectures and discussions. Little did we know that our seemingly conflicting status as instructors and as a womyn of color would challenge this goal. Of the 32 students who have taken this course with us, three identified as students of color. The majority of students identified as White and had never taken a diversity course before. Reflections on their course needs demonstrated that they took this course solely to satisfy their general education requirement. Uncertainty consumed us knowing that we faced a room made up of predominantly White students who were there to “fulfill a requirement.” Will our efforts matter? How can we show them the importance of these diversity topics? Even before class started, questions like these anticipated our difficulty highlighting the importance of intersecting racial/ethnic identities among womyn.

When we think back to the sea of students’ faces in our audience, we remember feeling an uncomfortable mismatch in power and privilege, particularly in our interactions with White male students. Two of these students would repeatedly ask for assistance on assignments, only to disregard our efforts to give feedback and submit their unedited papers past the deadline. These students recommended that we provide more structure to the written assignments, limit the number of discussion questions, and allow them to leave early when discussion waned. How could we maintain our influence as instructors while still acknowledging these students’ requests? We felt confused, used, and alone in our experiences.

Clinical. We also face unique challenges in our clinical practice. While we are largely shaped by our experiences of privilege and oppression through our intersecting identities (i.e., non-White, womyn of color), honoring these experiences can be difficult due to the demographics of our clients. Our sensitivity to issues of diversity and multiculturalism, as well as our personal experiences of discrimination, prejudice, and stereotyping, remain an untapped resource that can provide much therapeutic understanding for racial/ethnic minority clients. Minimal contact with these clients means that our stories that may be greatly beneficial for them go unnoticed. Additionally, the notion that cross-racial therapy solely describes White therapist-racial/ethnic minority client dyads makes us wonder why the challenges that we face with White clients are not explored. This inattention seems to suggest that we should know how to adjust to White clients’ experiences without considering our cultural beliefs, values, and intersecting identities in the therapy room. For example, Asian American female therapists who have been harassed and “exoticized” by White males may react to clients who trigger familiar sentiments. Latina therapists who have been mistaken for maids in professional settings might question their competence with White clients. Given that privilege is ubiquitous across professional lines and in relationships where one possesses “power” as a therapist, these issues are not given the attention they deserve.
Recommendations. With respect to teaching experiences, our wish for graduate womyn of color teaching undergraduate courses is to receive practical and emotional support. Teaching of psychology courses should provide content related to womyn of color experiences, as well as space to reflect on the process of sharing such content. Faculty and staff may form professional networks for graduate womyn of color to provide sample activities, lesson plans, and opportunities for students’ own discussion of teaching achievements and hardships. Such a network would allow us to form mentoring relationships and support instructors with various levels of experience in our efforts to educate students about womyn of color. We deserve a sense of solidarity and community; once we establish this foundation, we can “pay it forward” by expanding our network beyond our home department and university in the future.

Next, we encourage others to challenge the assumption that cross-racial therapy only refers to White therapists and racial/ethnic minority clients. University counseling centers might provide support groups for womyn of color therapists to discuss how issues of privilege, prejudice, or discrimination affect their interactions with clients. This may empower womyn to speak up about meaningful moments in therapy and to develop a sense of cohesion among colleagues with similarly challenging experiences. Lastly, womyn of color therapists may engage in outreach with students of color to familiarize them with the nature of counseling services and meet therapists who identify as womyn of color. In this way, therapists’ life experiences and cultural knowledge specific to racial/ethnic minority groups may be fully utilized and appreciated. We hope that sharing our stories has allowed you to reflect on how your intersecting identities interact with your work experiences. Whether you are a trainee, educator, or major professor, our professional and personal worlds often blend together via your cultural identities; such blending can ultimately challenge and strengthen our potential for growth as womyn.

Feature Article

Peer Rejection: An Interview with a Teen and Some Tips for Coping

By Karol Maybury

Karol Maybury (a social psychologist at the University of Maine) interviewed her daughter Grace Maybury-McIntosh (a high school sophomore) about social exclusion at the middle and high school levels. The audio can be found at the Division 35 website.

There are multiple theories about the prevalence and reasons for children and teens’ relational aggression (indirect aggression designed to hurt another child’s social and emotional well-being). Peer rejection is one type of relational aggression. Many social scientists believe that relational aggression can be explained by social-cognitive learning theory. Notably, Nelson & Crick (2002) found that behavior learned in micro-social units, like the family (particularly psychological control of fathers toward their daughters (e.g., withdrawing affection as punishment)), predict a child’s inclination to engage in relational (peer) aggression such as ostracism. Bolstering the idea that social learning is at the root of relational aggression: a study that showed that having a close friend who uses relational aggression tactics in elementary school predicted a child’s inclination to enact social aggression one year later (Werner & Crick, 2004). Given this, and a long body of research that has shown that female (direct) anger is perceived less positively than male anger in response to the same stimuli (e.g., Salerno & Peter-Hagene, 2015), relational aggression may be one result of societal condemnation of direct expression of anger by females. With this background in mind, the current interview focused on what relational aggression looks like in one rural New England community, as well as the exploration of wise responses when a girl is faced with relational aggression. --------

KM: Grace McIntosh, welcome.
Grace McIntosh: Hello! Thank you for having me

KM: So Grace, in the last podcast, we covered the psychological research on ostracism, as well as the book Wonder (by R.J. Palacio) and The Hundred Dresses (by Eleanor Estes). Both books examine how kids exclude ‘the other’ and how bystanders and targets are influenced by what happens. GM: I remember those books! They are both so good. KM: They were! So for this segment, we wanted to ask a pro—a high school student who understands ostracism from a
Peer Rejection: An Interview with a Teen, cont.

Boots-on-the-ground perspective. Can you advise us about girls and social exclusion? How are girls ostracized? GM: I think the first thing that is striking about girls and social aggression is how indirect it is. If a girl gets mad at someone, they often don’t tell the person, or at least not in a straightforward way. They let them figure it out by ostracizing them. A girl group may try to get other people involved in the exclusion. A quick way to ostracize a girl is to start a rumor about her, which may or may not be based in a nugget of fact. There may also be pressure in the group to not defend the girl if one of the group members hears someone else repeat a rumor. KM: I see. How else do people let a girl know that she isn’t welcome or ‘part of the crowd’?

GM: These include ignoring a girl when she walks into a classroom, sits down in a club or meeting, or pretending not to see her in the hallway. In a more obvious move, they may block her when she tries to sit down in an open seat on the bus or in the lunchroom (those are two prime spots for ostracism). Some girls will cluster together and laugh at some inside joke, or turn the cold shoulder when the odd-girl-out tries to say hello. Whispering to another girl and looking blankly or harshly at the odd-girl-out is another way girls let a girl know that she’s not wanted. KM: I think everyone can relate to how much exclusion can hurt. In our last segment we looked at some psychological research that has shown that being excluded in the ways you mention actually impacts the human brain like physical pain. GM: Everyone has had some degree of being pushed away and ostracized. And I think everyone can relate how much it can hurt. The hierarchy of a friendship group is a key part of understanding social exclusion. You often have a queen or queens who feel they can treat others as less-than because they have a higher state of social power. In order to maintain their status, they may target certain girls whom they don’t like and get their friends in on it too. The target may be a low status girl, or a higher status girl that she feels threatened by.

KM: Yes, I remember reading exactly that in Rosalind Wiseman’s book on the roles girls play in cliques. Like in the movie Mean Girls, the girl comes to a new school and a war breaks out between the existing and aspiring queen bees. They end up doing some pretty harsh things to each other to gain social power. GM: Yes I love that movie. I remember it portrays really well the common and tough choice of “ostracizing the girl and staying in the group, or defending the girl and losing the group.” This is what I like to call the “Better her, than me” situation. I think girls fear losing their friends so much that they will do aggressive things to other girls like ostracizing them or starting a terrible rumor. It can be anything from ignoring someone in conversation, ignoring their texts, all the way to deliberately targeting them with something completely made-up.

In social media, it can involve unfriending, or not including a girl’s name from your friend group when making a list with a bunch of friends and a hashtag like #bestfriends4ever! Or a caption stating “I love all of my bestfriends” On Instagram: taking a photo of girls at a party and posting it. The ‘odd girl out’ sees it and is given the message loud and clear: you don’t belong. Or, posting a photo and deliberately cropping out a girl or not tagging her name in the photo.

KM: Yes—Rachel Simmons just did a great article in Time on how girls may use Instagram to figure out their social standing and jockey for social position. http://time.com/3559340/instagram-tween-girls/

GM: Instagram is a great way to stay connected but there’s a dark side to it. A friend visiting from another state just told me that sometimes a girl will cancel plans with a friend, then post a photo of herself another event, on the same evening. That’s a pretty strong message: I chose a better social option. You lose. It’s a real put-down. But it’s often done so subtly so that only the one girl gets the message. On another social media app, Snapchat—girls will post photos of their group of friends hanging out to their “story” Which allows all of their friends on Snapchat to view the picture for 24 hours. The odd girl out might view this photo on Snapchat and feel disconnected, hurt, and of course: ostracized.

KM: Wow. I appreciate getting this insight into how some of this works. Those apps, and how they work are, to some degree, out of the eyesight of parents and teachers. Simmons has also said that triangulation: getting some girls on one girl’s side, and against another girl... often in a really subtle manipulative way, is used by girls to isolate a girl. Some feminist theorists have proposed that the inclination to use indirect aggression is based in a society that gives less approval of direct anger by females than males. The idea that girls should only be ‘nice’ when in fact, everyone gets angry sometimes. Since girls are given a hard time about directly showing anger toward another person, perhaps it warps the way they interact with other girls, and they are more likely to use indirect methods to show their displeasure. GM: Yes. Girls do tend to be more indirect with their aggression and the target will often not want to point out what’s happening to a parent or teacher out of
embarrassment. They don’t want to seem babyish, or like a loser. Another way girls make a girl feel ostracized is to start a rumor about her, or call her names (sometimes a name is a play on her actual name, which is really cruel and can make her feel even greater self-doubt.) The rumor thing is especially hurtful because someone can start one and just step back and watch the damage happen to the girl. Rumors get repeated really quickly because people often love a juicy story, without evidence of whether it is true. It can be confusing because some of this can happen without a girl’s knowledge, and she only sees the result—people ignoring her or being cold.

KM: So what can people do (girls, their parents, teachers and others who want to help?)

GM: I think being tactful is the first order: remembering the golden rule: do unto others as you would want done to you. ‘Be kinder than necessary’ is a great rule of thumb for school, and life in general. Seek out that type of person when you’re considering a potential friend. Also, I think it is smart to think carefully about the person in your girl group that has the most social power. Do you trust her? Not trusting a friend is a really harsh place to be in life, and there are other options. KM: Rachel Simmons has a story about a girl who was bullied terribly in middle school, but then found some true friends later in life, and she talks about the contrast. She compared her adult women friends to the people she thought were her friends in high school. She said they were completely trustworthy. She said: ‘I’d give them my car keys, my wallet, my dog, and I know I’d get them back’.

GM: Yes. We need more of that earlier in life: in high school and middle school! When thinking about your friends, think: is this someone who talks meanly about other people behind their back? It’s tricky because sometimes the girl CAN be nice. Or she may have a wicked sense of humor, and she’s nice to the people who like her, or has other attributes, like popularity, or easy-going parents. All of this can make it difficult or confusing to decide to distance yourself from a girl, but at the end of the day here’s the deal: you want to be with a person who is inclusive, and is the same person to people’s faces as she is behind their backs. A good friend, even one or two, are worth way more than even the most sought-after girl, if she’s cruel even part of the time. It’s better to be alone, even, then to be someone’s doormat. Thanks so much for sharing these ideas, Grace. Grace and I have some other suggestions to combat the power of ostracism in your school, your circle, your town:

- GM: Let your daughter know that you ‘get it’. Be attentive and sympathetic. Open your arms rather than rushing to open your mouth to solve the problem.

- KM: If your daughter is facing exclusion, as her: ‘what do you think would help?’ and ‘what is the end result that you want from this situation?’ It may not be tied up in a neat bow, but helping your daughter advocate for herself, or advocating for your daughter, can be done effectively. Sometimes it’s not even about resolution, but a sense that you and your daughter have set the boundary of contact. I recently watch a really good video about how to end a friendship using the direct method, if you have good reasons for doing so. The video, produced by the Girls’ Leadership institute may be helpful in social exclusion circumstances, as well as other times when a girl finds she needs to set boundaries in her friendships. A link can be found here: http://girlsleadership.org/resources/videos/how-to-end-a-friendship/?utm_source=newsletter&utm_medium=email&utm_content=How+to+End+a+Friendship&utm_campaign=How+To+End+a+Friendship+July+2015

- GM: Make home an oasis. Limit the reach of ostracism through social media by parking devices after a certain time of day. If she’s willing to share, ask her to show you how people ostracize on Instagram, Facebook, etc. She’s the pro, here! Ask her to help you understand.

- KM: Help your daughter make new friendships. (This may take time). Think about your
daughter’s interests that are outside of the ostracizer/ostracizing group. Try to prioritize those social / athletic / music/ scouting / book group opportunities. Recognize that popularity is often important in middle and high school, and don’t dismiss her concerns about not being part of the ‘in’ crowd. You and she might be comforted by the fact that research shows that being able to socialize with a large variety of kids rather than only the ‘in’ crowd actually predicts social competence later in life.

- GM: If you, the parent, think that the group isn’t healthy or positive, but your daughter doesn’t necessarily see it the same way, ask her these questions suggested by Nancy Gruver, author of “How to Say it to Girls: Communicating with your Growing Daughter”: “How do you feel inside about this group?” “Does this group do the things you care about?” “Can you be yourself with them?” I remember my parents asking me, once, when I was sizing up a peer: ‘What does he/she think is funny? A person’s character is often revealed in what they find humorous.”

- KM: It can be healing to reach out to others who are in need through volunteer work. Helping others who are in distress will provide perspective and sense of power. Mary Pipher advises this in her classic book Reviving Ophelia. Pipher suggests that volunteer work with those in need provides a girl a better understanding of empathy, and can put her own setbacks into perspective.

- GM: I would add that when parents understand that her current situation sucks, that helps, too. But they can add it is also just a snapshot in life. Things will get better.<

- KM: Parents have the luxury of perspective—living longer than our daughters who may feel like ‘this will last forever’. Watch a movie like Mean Girls, which not only shows ostracism in it’s different guises, but also has a hopeful ending. Life won’t always be like it is now, and she’ll have more and more power to bring good people into her life, and avoid the toxic ones, as she grows older.

Finally, if your child is being ostracized, it might be tempting for her to lash out angrily to her tormentors. Some previous research suggests that this is not preferable, and can often escalate the situation.

Consider the Dog Whisperer, Cesar Milan’s advice: a ‘calm assertive’ response to aggression. She may have to practice this, because ostracizers can be intimidating. Having a goal of gentle distance, cordiality, and switching her attention and energy toward forging friendships with those with mutual interests. Also, you can advise her that people sometimes change (whether it’s a year or a decade later). Some research bears out this idea that considering the reasons a girl, or girl group ostracizes others can be beneficial in reducing aggressive responses: https://www.psychologytoday.com/blog/ulterior-motives/201306/can-you-make-teens-less-aggressive.

Finally, for our teen and parent listeners: if you hear this and have second thoughts about something you, yourself, handled poorly, you’re not alone. Kudos to you for thinking through how to be the change you want to see in the world. That takes courage. I loved this line from the book Wonder: “One mistake does not define you.... You must simply act better next time.” Thank you for listening. In our upcoming podcasts, we’ll be examining some of the most-requested topics from a recent listener poll: We’ll examine the psychology of how to encourage your daughter to have high standards for seeking a peaceable partner, one who shares power, in a romantic relationship someday; and also dealing with jealousy in academic, athletic, and social settings. Finally, there is a growing body of research on gratitude and how to foster that in our lives for psychological benefit. We’ll examine how gratitude can help us (girls, women, and parents) navigate the adolescent years for maximum positivity and minimal pain. Grace, thank you for joining us today and giving us some insights into girl world. GM: Thank you for interviewing me. I enjoyed it.

This is the Adolescent Girls Podcast for the Society for the Psychology of Women. Until next time, thank you for raising, and being strong girls.

For further reading:

Review of Dark Side of the Full Moon
by Eliza Wierzbinska

In the documentary, The Dark Side of the Full Moon, written, directed, and produced by Maureen Fura, there is a clear message—a crisis is surrounding maternal mental health in the United States and there needs to be a better solution. The Dark Side of the Full Moon is filled with heartfelt moments depicting mothers’ despair and recovery from postpartum mood and anxiety disorders. It is filmed in an elegant and intimate tone that treats postpartum depression and psychosis with the importance it deserves, respecting women’s individual experiences. Fura speaks with mothers from all over the United States about their experience with a mental health illness after their baby was born and the poor treatment they had received from their health care providers. The documentary also explores the, at times, harsh realities of maternal mental health with OB/GYNs, psychologists, and experts in the field such as Katherine Stone from Postpartum Progress and Joy Burkhard from the 2020 Mom Project. The documentary took two years to film and Fura included the breaking news stories during that time of mothers who had harmed themselves and/or their children because they did not receive proper mental health treatment. She asked the poignant question, how many mothers have to die before maternal mental health is taken seriously?

A mother’s physical health on the other hand is given top priority, the film points out that one hundred percent of mothers are screened for gestational diabetes, HIV, Syphilis, preeclampsia and hypertension but more women will get a maternal mental health complication yet less than five percent are screened. Fura asks the question, why? High blood pressure gets treated, diabetes gets treated, but the health care field often considers mental health issues as optional. How can there not be mandatory perinatal depression screening when it is such a common illness among women? One in seven women will experience a pregnancy and postpartum mood and anxiety disorder and one in one thousand will experience postpartum psychosis. This makes postpartum depression the number one complication during pregnancy and postpartum, however it is most often under diagnosed and overlooked. Dark Side of the Full Moon brings maternal mental health into the forefront and reveals the inconsistencies to effectively screen, refer, and treat more than 1.3 million mothers who may be suffering in the United Stated each year.

Using your Voice: What is Feminist Process?

With respect to process in decision-making groups, feminists are flexibly attentive to the work of the group. They avoid hierarchy when it is helpful to include everyone in discussions. They reach out to others, including shy persons, to find out what they have to say. Feminists also welcome fluidity and sharing of leadership across persons and occasions. However, feminists accept leadership responsibility when it facilitates coordination or reflects their task-relevant expertise. In mixed sex groups that may well be hierarchical, feminists do not fall silent but have the courage to speak up and participate equally with their male colleagues.

Alice Eagly, PhD

Are pre-teen girls objectified in the same ways as adult women? Elise Holland and Nick Haslam find that well before girls reach womanhood, the way they dress--how sexy they look-- affects our evaluations of them. In their article titled, “Cute Little Things: The Objectification of Prepubescent Girls,” Holland and Haslam report that college students judged girls who were portrayed in more revealing clothes, as having lower moral worth, and less mental capacity, compared with fully clothed girls. In a second study, college students cared less that sexually objectified girls had been bullied and reported less of an inclination to help them. The students also reported that they believed that girls in scanty clothing were more responsible for being victimized than comparison girls. Drawing on philosophical and psychological accounts of objectification, the authors share their measures of agency, experience, and moral status in supplemental materials. Holland and Haslam make recommendations for reducing sexualized depictions of pre-teen girls in the media, and provide advice for clinicians who work with pedophiles.


Could common sexist organizational policies be as damaging as blatant sexual coercion in the workplace? This meta-analytic review explores the relationships among harmful workplace experiences and women’s occupational well-being. Analyses showed that more intense, yet less frequent harmful experiences (such as sexual coercion) had similar negative effects on women’s occupational well-being as less intense but more frequent harmful experiences (such as gender harassment or a sexist organizational climate). The authors also suggest policy changes and interventions aimed at helping organizations to reduce the incidence of harmful workplace experiences.


How have attitudes toward working mothers changed over the past several decades? Using nationally representative data going back to 1976, Donnelly, Twenge, Clark, Shaikh, Beiler-May and Carter examine both cultural change and generational differences in attitudes toward women’s roles inside and outside of the home, finding strong trends towards increased acceptance for working mothers. At the same time, the authors found that attitudes toward women’s roles within marriage became more traditional between 1995 and 2013. Support for stay-at-home dads did increase, but ultimately plateaued in the mid 1990s. In their practice implications, the authors suggest that policy makers adapt to the now majority position of support for working mothers and create programs that support work-life balance.
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In 2014, the Motherhood Committee of Division 35 successfully advocated for changes in the Commission of Accreditation for APA-accredited internship sites to mandate disclosure of their parental leave policies. Since then, the Motherhood Committee has become a part of a cross-divisional work group to advocate for policy changes in parental leave and disability for psychologists in training and early career. The following memo was submitted to the CoA to advocate for more changes to policy in APA-accredited graduate programs, internships, and postdoctoral fellowships. September 29, 2015

Memo

Dear Members of the Commission on Accreditation (CoA),

We are writing to suggest recommendations for the Standards of Accreditation (SoA) for Health Service Psychology and the associated Implementing Regulations (IRs). We have formed an ad-hoc Working Group on Family Leave and Disability Issues comprised of graduate trainees, early career professionals, APA members, and APA staff members in order to address the needs of trainees who may not be protected in the current standards and regulations in doctoral and postdoctoral training, specifically with regards to parental/family leave, sick leave, and disability accommodations.

We are pleased to see changes in the new SoA document that may have been in response to specific language requested in a public comment made by the Motherhood Committee of Division 35 in June 2014. Namely, these changes in the new SoA encourage internship programs to disclose their maternity, paternity, and sick leave policies. (“The program describes ... administrative policies and procedures, including vacation, sick leave, maternity and paternity leave policies ... in documents available to current interns, prospective interns, and other publics” – found in SoA doctoral section V.A.2.c.) In addition, we request that these changes also be extended to accredited doctoral and postdoctoral training programs in order to provide similar protections to all trainees under CoA’s purview. Several constituencies represented in our working group requested such policies during the SoA’s public comment phase and we formed our working group in part to clarify and reiterate these requests.

Per the public comment made by the Motherhood Committee of Division 35, former trainees and interns have reported problems at their training sites related to a lack of relevant policies, inadequate length of parental leave, pressure to take shorter leaves, fear of disclosure of pregnancy or disability, and discrimination related to pregnancy/family or disability status. As a result of necessary leave due to illness, pregnancy, or disability, former trainees have reported diminished wellness, disillusionment with the field, and punitive action.

According to the Department of Labor, the Family Medical Leave Act (FMLA) provides for twelve weeks of unpaid, job-protected leave in a 12-month period for (a) the birth of a child or the adoption or foster care placement of the child and subsequent care; (b) caring for a spouse, child, or parent who has a serious health condition; (c) a serious health condition that makes the employee unable to perform the essential functions of their job; and (d) any qualifying need arising as a result of the employee’s immediate family member serving on active military duty.

Many trainees do not qualify for the Family Medical Leave Act (FMLA). To clarify, FMLA only covers employees who have completed 12 months of work in an institution with 50 or more employees, and internships and postdocs are typically one-year positions at institutions that vary in size. Therefore, it is critical that doctoral, internship, and postdoctoral sites openly disclose their leave policies to their applicants.

We reiterate that the existence and disclosure of policies is crucially important. While parental leave maximizes child-parent bonding, infant health, postpartum recovery, and provides assistance to parents of diverse family structures and sexual orientations, it is also necessary to ensure the gender, economic, and cross-cultural equity trainees need to
ensure completion of their training. It is also important that sites provide sick leave, disability leave, and related accommodation policies. To this end, we recommend required disclosure of vacation, holiday, and sick leave policies given that many people utilize these options as part of their family and disability leave. This information should be publicly accessible and openly communicated so that applicants are afforded the right of non-disclosure.

To avoid being placed at a competitive disadvantage, applicants to doctoral, internship, and postdoctoral training programs may choose not to disclose circumstances around chronic or periodic illnesses, and disabilities. It is essential that written disclosures be made available to all applicants without prompting or "outing oneself by asking." These policies would also assist enrolled trainees in navigating life circumstances with full awareness of the protections, accommodations, and compensations provided (or lack thereof) by their accredited doctoral, internship, or postdoctoral training program. Finally, these disclosures will enable trainees to make informed decisions regarding placement.

We propose the following general adjustments:

1. We recommend that CoA require sites to publish their policies online (if the program has an online presence). Otherwise, policies should be mailed or emailed to prospective applicants along with any other general information customarily provided. These policies can also be offered within a handbook given to enrolled trainees/employees.

2. Given that many states and institutions differentiate between sick leave and disability leave, we recommend that CoA adds specific language to the SoA and IRs that is inclusive of the disclosure of policy related to disability leave.

Our specific recommendations are listed below in sections A, B, and C pertaining SoA and sections D, and E pertaining to the IRs. Additions to existing text are underlined and deletions are struck.

Suggested changes to the SoA:

A. SoA - Doctoral Internships

Section 2. Communication with Prospective and Current Interns:

“c. The program describes its aims; requirements for admission and completion; curriculum; training supervisors, facilities, and other resources; administrative policies and procedures, including vacation, sick leave, disability, maternity, and paternity and adoption leave policies; the kinds of experiences it provides; anticipated workload requirements; and training outcomes in documents available to current interns, prospective interns, and other publics. (p. 34)

We recommend the revisions in this section be extended similarly to the Doctoral Training and Postdoctoral Residency sections, with the following recommendations for amendments to the language:

B. SoA - Doctoral Programs

Section 2. Communication with Prospective and Current Students (p. 21)

c. Descriptions of the program should include information about its requirements for admission and graduation; tuition and other costs; curriculum; time to completion; faculty, students, facilities, and other resources, including distance learning technologies; administrative policies and procedures; leave policies, including personal, days, holidays, vacation, sick leave, maternity leave, paternity leave, adoption leave, and disability leave; the kinds of research, practicum, and internship experiences it provides; and its education and training outcomes.

C. SoA - Postdoctoral Programs

Section 2. Communication With Prospective and Current Residents (p. 46)

c. The program describes its aims and expected resident competencies; its selection procedures and requirements for completion; its training supervisors, residents, facilities, service recipient populations, training settings, and other resources; its administrative policies and procedures; its leave policies, including but not limited to personal days, holidays, vacation, sick leave, maternity leave, paternity leave, adoption leave, and disability leave; the kinds of experiences it provides, including the average amount of time per week residents spend in direct service delivery
and other educational, training and program activities; and the total time to completion.

Suggested changes or additions to IRs:

D. Section C.20. Disclosure of Education/Training Outcomes and Information Allowing for Informed Decision-Making to Prospective Doctoral Students (p. 46)

       6. The program describes its administrative policies and procedures, including but not limited to personal days, holidays, vacation, sick leave, maternity leave, paternity leave, adoption leave, and disability leave.

E. Since IR-C20 applies to doctoral programs, we would propose the development of similar IR language at the internship and postdoctoral level, as well, to be placed in appropriate sections as new IRs are drafted.

In keeping with APA values and guidelines, ultimately we would like sites to adopt policies for trainees that are equivalent to the protections and accommodations made available to all regular, full-time staff employed by the program. This is the approach taken by other national associations for trainees (e.g., the National Postdoctoral Association). We believe these immediate changes about disclosure are a good first step. Members of the working group are eager to provide further guidance to CoA about ideal content in these policies should such consultation be helpful and desirable.

We are pleased to see changes that have been made to the current SoA, and we hope to see these additional changes put in place to best support the needs of psychology trainees.

Please feel free to contact the working group through Eddy Ameen (eameen@apa.org) with any questions or information.

Sincerely,

APA Family Leave and Disability Working Group:

Eddy Ameen, PhD
   Assistant Director, American Psychological Association of Graduate Students

Jennifer M. Doran, MA
   Immediate Past Chair, American Psychological Association of Graduate Students Board
   Member, Division 31 - State, Provincial, & Territorial Affairs

Ian Gutierrez, MA
   Chair-Elect, American Psychological Association of Graduate Students

Phillip Keck, PhD
   APAGS liaison to the APA Committee on Disability Issues in Psychology

Anju Khubchandani, MA
   Director, APA Office on Disability Issues

Lauren Mizock, PhD
   Chair, Motherhood Committee of Division 35

Kimberly Smith, PsyD
   Education Representative, Committee on Early Career Psychologists

Jennifer Pelt Wisdom, PhD
   Chair, APA Committee for Women in Psychology

Using your Voice: What is Feminist Process?

I can start by saying what feminist process is not. It is not consensus, unless we agree it is. It is not hierarchical, unless we say it is. It is not by committee, unless we want it to be. Feminist process is process. How do we speak to one another, how do we respond to what was spoken, how do we decide who speaks and who listens and in what process do we go about this. Feminist process is maddening and empowering. It is enlightened and bogged down. Feminist process is intricate and powerful, like we are. Feminist process comes from all of the lines of feminism--so it is political, social, postcolonial, cultural and it touches literature, psychology, architecture, arts, technology and more. Feminist process is all that is human.

Nancy Maguire, Psy.D.
An ECP and an OCP (Older Career Psychologist) arrive early to a department meeting, as colleagues are engaging in casual chat: the majority group brings up “reverse racism,” or say there should be a men’s history month too, or they get upset when people wish them “happy holidays” as opposed to “Merry Christmas” or that refugees should go back to where they came from, or that All Lives Matter..... What do we do?

There are no easy answers, partially because the people making these statements have widely differing levels of willingness to engage in a meaningful conversation. Should we just overlook it, especially an ECP who might be harmed by speaking up? What about the stress that you both feel? Having to suppress reactions has negative health consequences, and a constant state of rage is not a fun place to be. But there is no avoiding the reality: This is microaggression.

Consider the following real-life examples: A senior psychologist shares a “joke” at a divisional executive committee meeting (not 35, thankfully!) with the punch line “bomb the Arabs.” A middle-eastern-born ECP is openly upset. The sender dismissively says his friends thought it was funny; other members express dismay at the ECP’s “emotional overreaction.” A well-meaning psychology department, wanting to be more diverse, recruits several minority students. When those students raise concerns about differential treatment, personal and professional, faculty react with widely varying support and sensitivity, leaving the students frightened about their future. The president of a publishing firm with years of a close affiliation with an APA division (again, not 35) includes a “rape joke” in his report. Only one ECP in the room objects. He responds dismissively and a senior woman colleague scolds her for making her feel uncomfortable.

Kat: I chose the three situations above because they did lead to positive change. The first ECP found a better home in feminist psychology, and one group of individuals will always think twice before distributing a joke. The feminist chair of the diverse-in-face-only department gave the students her full support; APA experts were brought in and retreats were held, and a number of personal and structural changes resulted in substantially improved conditions for all students. After the publisher got an earful from his adult daughter (much to his shock), he personally reached out to the ECP, realized her brilliance, and she became his most trusted editor.

Here are a few strategies that I have used to address microaggressions: • An ECP should not be expected or required to bear sole responsibility for identifying, correcting, confronting, educating, debating, or rectifying microaggression. OCPs should be willing to do these things, providing validation and collaborative support while not taking power or voice away from the ECP. • If you are offended by a comment or behavior, others probably are too. Draw strength from this even when they are silent. Share your own discomfort and how it could affect others, but don’t speak for others (“you insulted Amanda!”). Think of it as an intervention: with social media and cell phones, ignoring concerns can lead to public shaming and “leaving to spend more time with the family.”

“Creating an environment that encourages trust and is accessible can enhance learning for everyone”

ECP, “Good people” can behave badly. The microaggressor may be unaware of the impact of their actions, or may be well liked by others, but that does not excuse bad behavior. Try to engage them in discussions about privilege and the invisibility of “isms” (to the “ists”). I share one time I made a thoughtless comment, and how grateful I am that a student trusted me enough to correct me; that difficult dialog led to a lifetime friendship. • Appeal to the “good teacher / mentor” most of us want to be. A hurtful experience disrupts learning; an upset listener will not hear what you say next. Conversely, creating an environment that encourages trust and is accessible can enhance learning for everyone (see the literature on Universal Design in pedagogy). Amanda: This question demonstrates one of the components of cumulative stress experienced by Early Career Professionals in any number of settings. For me, it brings up concerns related to stereotype threat—when an aspect of your identity, one that is particularly salient to you, is brought up in this context, there is a physiological as well as a psychological and emotional reaction that begins to unfold within us. I will be honest and admit that certain microaggressions threaten me more than others due to my intersecting identities; race, gender, and age being a particular concern of mine (i.e., to say more so than Happy Holidays vs Merry Christmas might bother me as a Christian). Whatever aspect of yourself is being threatened in that moment, it is essential to our
well-being to take care of it. Whether it be addressing the concern as it comes up, or meaning-making of the experience with a colleague at a later time; we must take care of ourselves. Like all forms of coping, a person does not have one style that they use for all occasions in which they encounter stress. Dependent upon the personality, time, place, weather, or emotional/cognitive load of the person—a reaction to one incident can and often will be different from others. When I have cognitive resources available I tend to tackle the problem head on! I do this with the confidence that I will not jeopardize my career because the perpetrator in any instance has revealed more about themselves than they will “get out” of me. In some respects I feel bad for that person. I imagine how low of a place one would have to be to feel the need to bolster aspects of their identity at the cost of damaging an other’s. In other instances when burdened and often traumatized by the repeated demonstrations of racial violence on the internet and social media sites (many of which we frequent at the start of our day), a comment such as “All lives matter” from a colleague silences me. It rocks me to my core. I will choose to not engage with that colleague, and I don’t question whether or not that withdrawal is damaging to my professional self, because I know that without my well-being intact, there would be no professional self. To be blatant- I will hold a grudge. I do not need to let that individual know that their words have hurt me, because in many instances that will not improve my sense of wellness. In formulating this response I have come to realize that I may not offer solutions useful to all ECPs, but I can shed light on what it might feel like for a young woman of color in a tenure-track faculty position. Is it disheartening? Absolutely. Does it happen often? Yes. Is it damaging? It can be at times. For me it has often led to losing trust or faith in a once respected colleague—and while I would want to offer them a chance to prove otherwise, that chance is often not granted because I fear that it would not be reciprocated and my expression of concerns would be viewed as “over-emotional” or “sensitive.” The end result—isolation from those who might perpetrate such microaggressions.

Focusing on my long term aspirations, I value most the practices that will keep me sane. I hope that for many of you reading this, such interactions are not coming from those in leadership positions; but I also know that they often do. I mentioned the term cumulative in this response as these comments tend to gain momentum in our thinking and in our daily lives. I advise that we turn our attention to ourselves and aspects of our lives we can control. Exercise, meditation, eating healthy foods, maintaining positive relationships—that is what will ultimately protect us from the long term effects of these types of actions. A fantastic resource for self-care that is available to us is the sisterhood of our Division 35 members. For example the opportunity provided within this newsletter: to have this discussion with others for whom the topic is meaningful and worthy of their time. Another example, in terms of a solution that achieves well-being, is the Division’s ECP’s Facebook page and the once popular “Self-Care Tuesdays.” It has lost some steam, but is slowly gaining momentum again. Our Facebook page gives the opportunity for us to share with one another the ways in which we take care of ourselves (in this case, on Tuesdays). Whether it’s taking several deep breaths, going for a long walk, treating yourself to a manicure, or catching your favorite yoga class: I am lucky enough to be part of a community who values me and my health as a priority. I encourage you to join in by sharing images and posts of how you take care of yourself because it is particularly important when dealing with cumulative stressors and seeking balance in your life. We have offered some perspectives here, but we also welcome your ideas and discussion on our Facebook page at https://www.facebook.com/groups/apadi35ecp/.

Using your Voice: What is Feminist Process?

When I think about what it means to me to engage in feminist process, some things come to mind: inclusion, collaboration, sharing of power and information, and egalitarian relationships. In my role as department chair, I attempt to ensure everyone has a voice (although that still may mean only one vote when votes are required), and to the extent that we disagree, we are able to freely communicate that and work toward consensus whenever possible. I work to ensure that everyone has access to the same information in order to process and make decisions, and I make decisions as collaboratively as possible. I go with the ‘will of the department’ even when I don’t personally agree with the decision, and try to always make decisions about what is good for the department as a whole. Although I acknowledge that hierarchies exist in all aspects of life, I attempt to diminish the impact of them within the department as much as possible. Finally, I would add that in feminist process, context matters. It doesn’t always change the outcome, but it matters to know the background, the obligations that are visible and those that are not visible, and the contingencies that make up the whole picture of any given situation.

Jennifer S. McGraw, PhD
Become a Fellow of Division 35!
Division 35 Application Deadline: January 9, 2016

The Division 35 Fellows Committee is seeking nominations and applications for Fellow status in the Division. Self-nominations are welcome.

There are two paths to Fellow status in the Division:

First, members of Division 35 who are APA members, but are not Fellows of APA, may apply for Fellow status inDivision 35. They are known as “New Fellow” applicants and must meet both APA criteria and Division 35 criteria for fellow status.

Second, any member of Division 35 who is already a current Fellow of APA may apply to become a Fellow of the Division. These applicants are known as “Current Fellows.” Current fellows are only evaluated by the Division Fellows Committee. APA Fellow Criteria include:

Five (5) years of acceptable professional experience beyond receipt of the doctoral degree. Membership in APA for at least one year. Unusual and outstanding contributions that have had national or international impact in psychology. Division 35 Fellow Criteria
Division 35 requires evidence of unusual and outstanding contributions that have had national or international impact in the psychology of women. "Unusual and outstanding contributions" with respect to scholarly publications, for example, should include evidence of citations. Leadership in Division 35 and other psychological associations are also relevant. In either case, evidence of accumulation of impact and performance over time is required. Please refer to Division 35 Fellows Criteria below:

Process for New Fellows:
The process to apply to be an APA Fellow is done via the APA Fellows Online Application Platform. This system allows nominees, endorsers, and Division Fellows Chairs to submit all required documents online.

The online system replaces the previous, paper-based process and all candidates’ applications must be added to the system to be considered by the Fellows Committee. Applications for New Fellow status require letters from three current Division 35 Fellows and completion of other materials described in the APA Fellows Online Application Platform. Please visit the Fellows webpage for more information and to access the online system:

All materials, including letters of reference, must be completed by January 9, 2016. The candidates’ applications are reviewed by the Division Fellows Committee. Those receiving a positive recommendation will be forwarded to the APA Fellows Committee for their review. Fellow status is granted by the APA Fellows Committee. Please remember that there can only be one nominating Division. The deadline for division fellows chairs to submit new fellows nominees to APA is Feb. 9, 2016.

Process for Current Fellows:
Current Fellows of APA from other Divisions may apply for Division 35 Fellow status by sending a current vita and a letter highlighting the reasons that one has met the criteria for Fellow status in the Division. These candidates’ applications must be emailed to Silvia Canetto (silvia.canetto@gmail.com). The due date for Current Fellows applications is March 31, 2016. Current Fellows applications are evaluated by the Division Fellows Committee only.
In late 2004, news media reported on psychologist involvement in torture and other forms of abusive interrogations as part of the “global war on terror.” In 2005, APA released the Psychological Ethics and National Security (PENS) report, which was immediately criticized both in terms of content and process. Over the past 10 years, many changes have occurred within APA, including the development of strong anti-torture policies. However, the shadow of PENS and the argument that APA colluded with torture remained. In response to these concerns, APA commissioned the Hoffman Report to examine these claims. Last July, APA released the independent Report, which has shaken the Association to its core and drawn into question the actions of many APA leaders and highlighted serious systemic organizational flaws. Since the release of the Hoffman Report, there has been extensive dialogue, analysis, and soul-searching within Division 35: Society for the Psychology of Women (SWP) as well as APA. Sadly, this dialogue has fueled us/them perceptions about SWP, its leadership, and among its members. Obviously, we need to understand what happened over the past 10 years, with a focus on transparency and accountability. However, the Hoffman Report only provides a very limited glimpse into the past. The history is complex and involved an evolution of thought, context, and decisions over the past 10+ years both within and outside of APA. I’ve presented a small bit of the SWP timeline below.

As someone who has ALWAYS argued against psychologist involvement in any form of interrogations in national security settings (and indeed beyond), it would be easy for me to just say that all who worked in key leadership or staff positions within APA colluded with torture. However, that analysis would be simplistic and not accurately reflect what happened or even what is written in the Hoffman Report. Some individuals were highly culpable; others were mislead, misinformed, succumbed to situational pressures, held different political beliefs, etc. Even Dr. Jean Maria Arrigo, a PENS Task Force member, who has since played a pivotal role in arguing against PENS for over a decade, and is an oft cited "Dissident," wrote, while a member of the Task Force and referencing PENS, "The depth, scope, and wisdom of this document are indeed impressive, and I approve it as a Task Force member" and "Thanks to all, especially the military psychologists, for an enriching and heartening experience of democratic process. I am grateful for the opportunity to participate in this process." The fog of decisions during 2005 cannot be reduced to a simple "she colluded with vs. she was against" torture argument.

Many have argued that APA desperately needs to convene something akin to a Truth and Reconciliation Commission. The reasons for such forums are to help all come to a deeper and broader understanding of the complexities involved with deeply flawed decisions, atrocities, etc. No one walks into such a Commission with absolute knowledge of everything that happened or everyone’s perspectives at that time. The goal is not to simply push the dirt under the rug but rather to get a more complete picture of what happened at a time, to have individuals accept responsibility for what they did or did not do, to increase accountability, and most importantly, learn from the processes that led to
the destructive situation to prevent such problems in the future. In relation to most individuals, we cannot assume a conclusion grounded in retributive justice prior to engaging in the process.

The Hoffman Report is only a small (and yes, flawed) window into the events within APA from largely 2002 to 2008. Much of what took place was omitted from the Report, key witnesses were never interviewed (including a number of women who are or have been leaders in SWP who worked on APA anti-torture policies), and a host of other issues. Nonetheless, the gestalt of the Report is highly significant and based on the Report, I immediately wrote about my suggestions for next steps within APA (Woolf, 2015a). There is little doubt that these were dark years and more discussion, analysis, information gathering, etc. needs to take place. Such a process will increase accountability as opposed to diminish it. Having said all of that, I think it is important for those within SWP to know a bit more about some key actions of the Division over the past 10 years. What is important to bear in mind is how much was accomplished from 2006 to the present despite the best efforts of some within APA to stall this work. SWP leaders in conjunction with the Divisions for Social Justice (DSJ) supported and worked for the passage of the 2006 APA Resolution Against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman, and Degrading Treatment or Punishment (CIDTP). This Resolution is a broad based policy addressing prohibitions against torture against all individuals in all contexts—not just national security but wherever torture/CIDTP may occur impacting the most vulnerable and marginalized among us. The primary concern since its passage has been the wording of the definition of CIDTP—no good definition existed at the time and clinicians at Council insisted on a definition over concerns of spurious lawsuits. A new definition based on improvements to international law was passed and supported by SWP Council Representatives in 2015 to update this policy.

SWP leaders in conjunction with the DSJ supported the passage of the 2007/2008 APA Reaffirmation of the American Psychological Association Position Against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman, or Degrading Treatment or Punishment and Its Application to Individuals Defined in the United States Code as "Enemy Combatants" (inclusive of the 2008 amendments). This policy focused specifically on national security settings and expanded the definition of torture and CIDTP to include "conditions of confinement" (a key policy element, which facilitates the implementation of the Petition Resolution*). Sadly, SWP as well as a few of the other DSJ voted against the Moratorium Resolution (it lost by a landslide at Council). I wrote about my disappointment with this vote at that time (Woolf, 2007). SWP leaders in conjunction with the DSJ supported the passage of the 2010 Ethics Code 1.02/1.03 changes. Some within APA endeavored to stall the 2010 change to the Ethic Code. Nonetheless, the change to 1.02/1.03 is incredibly important as it highlights the inviolate nature of human rights in the Ethics Code and closed the PENS "Nuremberg Defense" loophole. It would have been easy for those working for passage of the Ethics Code change to simply give up, but they continued their efforts. Judy Van Hoorn and Corann Okorodu were particularly noteworthy in pursuing this endeavor and almost single-handedly pulling it across the finish line.

SWP Council Representatives supported the 2013 Policy Related to Psychologists' Work in National Security Settings and Reaffirmation of the APA Position Against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman, or Degrading Treatment or Punishment. The 2013 Policy is APA's strongest and most comprehensive anti-torture policy that places the Petition Resolution and human rights at the forefront of APA policy.

In 2013, the SWP Council Representatives also voted to eliminate PENS as APA policy.

In 2015, the SWP Council Representatives voted in favor of NBI 23b, which included the call to remove
psychologists from all national security setting interrogations and to implement the Petition Resolution.

As an aside, I look at all of the other work of SWP and such work argues for continued support of the Division/Society (e.g., http://www.apadivisions.org/division-35/news-events/index.aspx). I urge SWP members to read the various APA Anti-Torture policies and learn more about the actions listed above. These are good policies that didn’t exist prior to 2006. It is no surprise that a key CIA contractor/psychologist involved in torture dropped his APA membership at that time. Can these policies be improved? Certainly—we should constantly work to improve all of APA policies with the evolution of knowledge. Would any of the above policies have been possible in 2005? Absolutely not. As I sit watching the information about the terrorist attacks and horror unfolding in Paris and elsewhere, I am reminded of the fear, terror, anger, confusion, and helplessness that many experienced in the U.S. in the days, months, and years following 9/11. Decisions made in times of extreme crisis/war rarely have the clarity of vision of those looking back to evaluate history. In the present, I think we need to focus on fully implementing the Prohibition of Psychologist Involvement, either directly or indirectly, in National Security Interrogations and implementation of the Petition Resolution as voted on by Council in August.

It is also my sincere hope that we, as individuals and a Division, can work together to bring human rights to the forefront of APA’s mission and policy; conduct a review of structures that led to this dark chapter in APA history; and continue the broad-based work of feminist psychology.

References

2008 APA Petition Resolution Policy, Psychologists and Unlawful Detention Settings with a Focus on National Security, "psychologists may not work in settings where persons are held outside of, or in violation of, either International Law (e.g., the UN Convention Against Torture and the Geneva Conventions) or the US Constitution (where appropriate), unless they are working directly for the persons being detained or for an independent third party working to protect human rights."


---

How to Join the Division 35 Town Hall Listserv

Division 35: Society for the Psychology of Women (SPW) has set up a new listserv for discussion about topics related to the Psychology of Women. The listserv is: div35townhall@lists.apa.org

We invite you to join the listserv if you would like to participate in discussions. Since this is a discussion listserv and messages can flow freely back and forth without moderation, we cannot automatically add all the membership of the division to the listserv. If you want to participate, you will need to sign up. To join send an e-mail to listserv@lists.apa.org and typing the following in the body of the note: subscribe div35townhall

Current membership in Division 35 will be required in order to join the listserv.

You can manage your subscription through the site http://listserv.apa.org

The APA listserv usage rules apply to this list and are available at http://listserv.apa.org/infopages/APARules.html.
In July 2015 after the Independent Review was released, a group of concerned Early Career Psychologists formed the Early Career Psychologist (ECP) Coalition for the Advancement of Psychology. The Coalition was composed of a diverse group of 11 ECP leaders representing psychological practice, education, science, and public interest. The Coalition was formed independently, and the members were not speaking on behalf of the American Psychological Association (APA), APA Practice Organization (APAO), nor for any governance boards/committees. The Coalition’s purpose was to provide a voice for ECPs to influence APA’s organizational culture in a positive direction. Following the disturbing claims made by the Independent Review, the Coalition deliberately chose to gather feedback from ECPs and provide a measured, data-driven response. To this end the Coalition developed a survey about the Independent Review to better understand the ECP perceptions of APA governance. The Coalition received over 250 responses to open-ended survey questions.

In summary, many ECPs reported feeling disappointed, angry, or betrayed. Many reported they have lost trust in APA, and others were deeply concerned about the potential for this scandal to negatively affect their careers and psychology’s public standing. Nearly half (46%) of our respondents indicated they were considering resigning their APA membership; an additional 19% were unsure. Thus, approximately two-thirds of the ECP respondents were not committed to retaining their APA memberships. The potential for APA to lose more of the current ECP membership is sobering. Yet, some were still able to garner a sense of hope for a revitalized Association. Many called for increased organizational transparency and heightened oversight of Association workgroups. The respondents also called for a renewed focus on human rights and ethics in APA; this included recommending dismissal of governance members and staff who were aware but did not act to prevent the egregious collusion and human rights violations described in the Independent Review.

Echoing our ECP colleagues, the Coalition calls for increased accountability, transparency, and integrity in APA. The Coalition call APA/APAPO leaders (including ourselves) to the highest standards of human rights for our beloved profession and the public. The Coalition also petitioned for concrete changes in our ethical standards as well as in the governance processes.

**Recommendations for a Revitalized Association**

"Many ECPs reported feeling disappointed, angry, or betrayed. Many reported they have lost trust in APA, and others were deeply concerned about the potential for this scandal to negatively affect their careers and psychology’s public standing."

The ECP Coalition would like to offer our sincere gratitude to the APA leaders who commissioned the Independent Review. The Coalition applauds Council’s decision to pass Resolution 23B to “clarify the roles of psychologists related to interrogation and detainee welfare in national security settings.” The Coalition are encouraged by the Board of Directors’ steps towards new Association executive staff, the formation of a Commission on Ethical Processes, and the recommendation to begin an Office of Human Rights. The Coalition is thankful for these initial steps, but increased organizational self-awareness and promises for a brighter future are NOT sufficient. The Coalition will be satisfied only with tangible and persistent changes to Association governance processes that lead to increased accountability, transparency, and integrity. Below are our recommendations towards these goals:

1. Our Association values should publically reflect a commitment to defending and enhancing human rights/potential. The Coalition recommends that the Board of Directors form a workgroup to review and propose updates to the APA mission, vision, and core values statements (http://www.apa.org/about/apa/strategic-plan/default.aspx).

2. The Coalition recommends the development of a robust Conflict of Interest (COI) policy that includes procedures to regularly assess and
address conflicts for all APA staff and Association governance members.

- It is essential that this policy include a process that instructs individuals on how to report COI concerns of themselves and others.

3. The Coalition reiterated the Board of Directors’ recommendation to begin an Office of Human Rights within the Association. The Coalition believes that this Office could be tasked with responsibility for the COI policy and its enforcement, as well as prevention of (a) Association breaches of human rights/ethics, and (b) Actions by Association leaders that would potentially lead to damage for the professional of psychology or serious harm to society. The Coalition also recommends this Human Rights Office be tasked with proactive education and advocacy. The Coalition believes the Human Rights Office would differ from the current APA Ethics Office by focusing on COI and large-scale Association behavior rather than member ethics.
   - Within the new Office of Human Rights, the Coalition recommends the development a member-led ombudsman program. This program could serve as (a) the mechanism for reporting of troublesome conflicts of interest, abuses of power, etc. in Association central governance, Divisions, and SPTAs, and/or (b) the entity of the new Human Rights Office to arbitrate such complaints.
   - It would be untenable for the Human Rights office or an ombudsman committee to review all Association governance activities. Therefore, the Coalition must develop an effective triage method, akin to screening in health care. The Coalition recommends the identification/development of a simple rating scale (e.g. 1-5 Likert scale) to assess potential risks to human rights/ethics. The Coalition envision that each governance group could annually self-rate its own initiatives, workgroups, etc.; a potential role of an ombudsman committee could be to evaluate these ratings, modify as necessary, and ensure appropriate oversight based on ratings.

4. Effective communication is the key to any healthy relationship. Therefore, the Coalition recommends developing a comprehensive Association organogram, highlighting key roles and information flow. Such a document would allow those new in governance and the general membership to better understand decision-making processes in the Association.

5. The Coalition recommends an increase in Association transparency, particularly in regards to members’ access to governance information. It is important to develop improved methods of communication to members who wish to access appropriate governance documents (e.g. agendas, minutes) and/or attend open meetings. The Coalition recommends that organizational best practices guidelines be identified or developed, which could then be disseminated to boards/committees, Divisions, SPTAs etc. for review and adoption.

6. The Coalition believes that it is important to provide training for new Association talent towards leadership and ethical decision-making. Therefore, the Coalition recommends the development of a Leadership Institute to assist new talented psychologists in developing the necessary skills for effective and ethical leadership in Association, Division, STPA, and community governance.

7. It is important for our Association not only to create new leadership opportunities for members, but also to prevent leaders from gaining undue power and influence. Therefore, The Coalition recommends instituting centrally-governed term limits for all APA board and committees, including the Council of Representatives. The Coalition recommends consideration of the following options:
   - After 10 consecutive years in APA central governance, a 3-year break will be required. This would limit members from continually moving between leadership positions on boards/committees, Divisions, and Council.
   - After serving two consecutive terms in any central APA governance role(s), members would be required to take a 2-year break from all central governance roles.
   - Impose a maximum lifetime limit on the number of years that members can serve on the Council of Representatives.
Division 35 is facing a crisis of ethics with its president-elect, Olivia Moorehead-Slaughter, having played a prominent role during and since her time as the chair of the PENS Task Force in facilitating the denial of APA’s involvement in torture as outlined in the Hoffman Report. Despite its current identification as a social justice division, its leaders are ignoring calls for reform of APA and the Division. Other divisions are demanding accountability and resignations from positions of power of those directly named in the Hoffman Report. Instead of leading or even joining such efforts, Division 35’s leadership continues to support Olivia Moorehead-Slaughter as president-elect of the division, thus demonstrating its disregard for and a lack of commitment to solidarity with the victims, i.e., global voiceless and powerless people of color against which atrocious social injustices were committed.

What is worse is that the support of Dr. Moorehead-Slaughter is being morally and ethically justified by putting forth a very narrow view of feminist solidarity and anti-racist politics as it refers to White/Black relations in the U.S. To support this narrow view of social justice, leaders appear to be redirecting the conversation by pointing to and sometimes creating a divide among racial solidarity lines reducing the issue to one about supporting one of our own (right or wrong). This framework has been deployed as an ideological weapon to defend the morally indefensible role Olivia Moorehead-Slaughter played (wittingly or unwittingly) in the cover-up of the psychologist’s role in the torture. Led by some of the Black leadership in the division, it is perpetuating the very problematic dynamics they themselves, rightfully have criticized in White feminists, i.e., not being sensitive to the issues and injustices impacting those outside of their own racial-identity group. These current justifications and support for Olivia Moorehead-Slaughter’s leadership exhibit a blatant disregard for the racist brutalities committed against global Brown/people of color by defining social justice solidarity as solidarity to only about protecting only one’s own identity-group. While identity politics serve a purpose for movements in certain times and circumstances, ignoring immense injustices against other disenfranchised populations, locally and globally, clearly highlights the serious limitations of identity politics and shuts the door on those who have already suffered from torture, for those globally who are in serious need of feminist support.

In this limited perspective, which at best is a misguided characterization of anti-racist and feminist solidarity and at worse about reducing anti-racism work to promoting women of color’s careers within the Division and APA, we are completely losing the objective of feminism, i.e., fighting against all forms of injustice and inequality. Feminism was never an effort to raise women over men or some racial groups over other racial groups. Fighting racial injustice was never only about placing women or people of color in positions of power, but doing so that they would, from their experience, fight for justice for all and definitely not to provide Brown or Black faces to hide the atrocities behind.

This is precisely what Olivia demonstrated she was unable or unwilling to do including taking on the responsibility of listening to the voices that brought these concerns forward at great risk to their positions and well being. Her credibility and competence as a leader is not helped by her extremely weak claim that she simply “did not know” what was publicly being debated as the biggest controversy within APA in decades and what she defended APA for years until the Hoffman report made it impossible. Division 35’s leadership and EC is replicating this pattern, i.e., choosing to not attend to the concerns, choosing to not take ethically and morally just positions, and choosing to continue to defend Olivia’s role while not leading a.
Global Racism of Division 35, cont.

movement for addressing global racism within Western feminism and APA that led to these circumstances.

Division 35’s leadership in their urging and encouraging of “moving on” without serious critical analysis and accountability of the past is creating superficial communities of friendship and familiarity not rooted in principled and ethical opposition to all forms of social injustice. In an unfortunate similarity to the so-called war on terror’s exploitation of the rhetoric of women’s rights (or women’s liberation) to justify the unleashing of bombs, Division 35’s leadership is exploiting the language of racial solidarity and sisterhood in a way that undermines transnational solidarity with underprivileged global communities. We ask, how can we all come to understand what is happening to Black people in prisons in the US if we ignore what has happened to Brown people in Guantanamo? And how can we ask for accountability of a police officer or department for their role in committing horrors against people of color within U.S. when we support and defend those who have played a role in hiding such horrors by our own profession?

We call for Olivia to resign, and for Division 35 to engage in a deeper and more meaningful discussion about global racism and feminism that could potentially result in our leadership in APA on these issues. Regardless of what any one of us believes were the reasons for Olivia Moorehead-Slaughter to have played this role, the fact remains that she did play an important and harmful role. We ask that she step down from leadership and engage in honest introspection as a peer in the division, allowing others in the division to move forward with our division’s continued response to the report and its aftermath.

We call on Division 35’s leadership to take a strong stand against institutional corruption and conflicts of interest that led to APA’s involvement in supporting torture. Knowing Olivia’s role, supporting and defending her despite serious concerns expressed both by the larger membership and overwhelmingly by the EC vote straw poll at the Toronto meeting replicates what APA did with the calls for concerns about torture for decades. We need to restore our damaged credibility as a division and not be complicit in racism against the globally marginalized and powerless.

We want to hear from YOU!

Like what you see here? Contribute your own article to the newsletter! We welcome submissions related to feminism and psychology as it relates to your professional roles, personal life, community involvement, and activism! We also welcome committee and task force updates, reflections on teaching, and student contributions (both graduate and undergraduate). Articles usually range from 2-4 pages, and should be submitted by the next advertised deadline.

To submit an article or get more information, email the editors, Clare Mehta & Emily Keener at fempsychnews@gmail.com
We find ourselves in a precarious position within the Society for the Psychology of Women. It seems we cannot move forward and refuse to be pushed back. We continue in this standstill in part due to the concerns of both our own and our division's accountability in the past events and current reforms, especially as they regard the direct involvement of our President-Elect Olivia Moorehead-Slaughter. The intent of this call is to solicit your feedback in order to provide a neutral location to share thoughts and resources regarding these issues that are available to all concerned.

There has been much debate on the WOC-Leaders list, POWR-L, and 35 Executive listservs since the release of the report. Emails have been flying while letters and articles circulated. How much of that information made it out to the general membership? Where do the “other” members, student affiliates, and interested parties stand? Have any of us seen all of the responses? Should our President-Elect step down or remain on the executive? The latter question has paralyzed the division and all but silenced the strength of our collective voices in the reforms.

Who am I and why do I care?

The calls for transparency and accountability are vital for me. I am a long time student affiliate of the division. I am not currently on any APA or division boards or taskforces, though have served in the past on the division 26 executive, 35 heritage committee, and am a former Association for Psychological Science Student Caucus President. As a psychologist in training who specializes in history my first instinct is to collect and organize the materials in front of me for a full assessment. When questions of information access regarding these important discussions came to light, but with no action, I volunteered my services. Though only with conditions. In the spirit of transparency, I also proposed this collection of materials because many of us are missing large portions of conversations concerning the accountability calls regarding our President-Elect and other related issues. Bringing as many voices to the table seems vital if we are to work together as a unified division moving forward in both division and organization reforms.

What is it?

The intended database will be a single webpage intended to be as inclusive as possible with voices from all sides of the debate within the division. It is a neutral non-division/non-APA general collection spot. Letters and emails (in any format) can be sent to a singular email set-up for this purpose. To date, I have copies of those sent to the WOC-L and POWR-L lists since August. The goal is to add all those previously sent to the executive or individual members directly and new ones from those who have not participated in those discussions. ALL VOICES and perspectives are welcome and wanted: Fellows, Members, Affiliates, Students, Executives, and interested parties on any side of the issue or even if apathetic to the outcome.

What can you do?

Your help is needed to build the database of our comments, letters, emails, and thoughts, regarding these events as they relate to Division 35, the report, debates over reforms, our President-Elect’s role, and accountability. It is not your labor but your words that are needed. Make your voice heard on the issue of accountability as it applies to our President-Elect: Do you call for her to step-down or stay on the executive?

Articles that may be relevant, background material, or concerns/comments regarding other 35 member’s involvements are also welcome. Your comments and thoughts on needs for reform are also encouraged. You
can either submit letters or emails that you have already written or develop something new. Submit in any format directly to: letterstoswp@gmail.com.

How it works?
You submit to the email above. The email address is monitored by a neutral third party who works with me on an external project, but is Canadian and not a member or affiliate of APA or division 35. She will distribute one copy of all materials to me and to an appointed member of the voting executive for the division. This is to balance concerns of bias. The Executive member appointed opposes our President-Elect stepping down and I have publicly called for her to do so. Neither of us will have access to the email directly and no filtering or editing will take place. All submissions to the email will be made accessible on the web page by me for division members, affiliates, and interested parties. The executive member will be able to see that all materials are represented. Please submit all materials within 30 days of the date of this publication. Items will be posted as they are received to facilitate the prompt availability of materials to all.

What will happen to the information?
As my calls for transparency have been, anything received at the email above is considered eligible to be shared, posted, and preserved for the historical record as well as distributed to the division announce list, listservs, and any other interested parties. It is not currently nor will it become owned, operated, or (most likely) endorsed by the division but will be made available for a one-year period online. If you would prefer password protection for documents, please note that in your email. If enough people request password protection the full page will be password protected, with this password will be made available to all listed above. The contents will be retained and made available to the Psychology’s Feminist Voices project and will be donated in full to the APA PENS Debate Collection at the Univ. of Colorado at Boulder archives to be made available in five years.

Using your Voice: What is Feminist Process?

As a Feminist Social Justice Division, we Aspire to Feminist Process

Feminist process involves the expansion of the democratic process. In a democracy everyone has a vote/voice. In a feminist process we recognize how power dynamics have often limited or silenced the voices of some (women), and we intentionally solicit their input. In non-feminist organizations and groups, women are often not invited to speak, are not actively listened to or heard, and may even be ridiculed or disparaged. In feminist process, we commit to actively listening to others, and although we may disagree, we do not ridicule or disparage others. In other groups, Parliamentary procedure and Roberts Rules are used to limit discussion, silence the minority, and often to manipulate the meeting. Feminist process works to include everyone’s voice, to work toward consensus, and to minimize competition among and manipulation of members. In non-feminist meetings a member often presents a monologue, or repeatedly makes assertions without regard to others’ voices. Feminist process works to maintain a democratic discussion and cut off individuals who try to monopolize the discussion.

A feminist leader tries to ensure that feminist process proceeds, giving all members a chance to speak; she does not close off disagreement. Difficult dialogues and dissent are necessary in feminist process. Just being agreeable or polite is not feminist process. We cannot fail to solicit and actively listen to the perspectives of the members, and then say we just didn’t hear them. Feeling, commitment and passion are part of the feminist process although they are often deemed unacceptable to non-feminist public forums. Feminists realize that emotion and passion are not the opposite of intelligence and rationality and accept speech and action that integrates intelligence and passion. Finding, recognizing, and voicing one’s truth is at the heart of the feminist process. A fruitful discussion occurs when individuals with different perspectives and standpoints tell their truth, and actively listen to the truth told by others. Dismissing or denying or distorting others’ perspectives dissolves feminist process. Attempts to bully or manipulate others is NOT feminist. Feminist process is an open and transparent process. Secrecy and silence are not part of feminist process. Feminist process proceeds independently of legal systems and organizations.

In Division 35 we must recognize the importance of acknowledging the various voices of all participants and must provide space and opportunities for those voices to emerge. We need not avoid disagreement, or conflict, just the disparagement of others, and the silencing of some. We need to differentiate constructive from destructive processes. Reflecting on feminist process is a good place to start.

Maureen C. McHugh, PhD
I have a secret. I have carried the weight of this secret for most of my life. On those rare occasions when I share my secret with others, it is almost universally met with surprise, shock, and a subtle distancing between me and them, which never seems to resolve, until they quietly disappear from the sphere of my life. I carry this secret for myself, my parents, my grandparents, my great-grandparents, my entire family tree, and my genetic ancestry. I am a Jew. Like millions of other Jews, I choose to keep my religion close, quiet, and secret, necessitated by the enduring prevalence of anti-Semitism, and fear.

The history of anti-Semitism is almost as old as the history of Judaism (Mohl, 2011). Anti-Semitism exists all over the world (Simon & Schaler, 2007), even in places with almost no Jewish population. Perhaps the most disturbing phenomenon of anti-Semitism is its universality and enduring intensity (Morrock, 2012), dovetailed together with the inescapable reality that anti-Semitism is so ubiquitous among society and ingrained within our social lexicon that most people believe it no longer exists. Jews have endured the manifestations of anti-Semitism for so long that it is feared that they, too, may have become desensitized to its existence (Leets, 2002).

As a graduate student in psychology with a specialty in religion, religious privilege, and anti-Semitism I am always amazed at how much ignorance, inaccurate assumptions, and erroneous information exists among academics, clinicians, and students surrounding Judaic beliefs and culture, beginning with the definition of anti-Semitism, the manifestations of anti-Semitism, the prevalence of anti-Semitism, anti-Semitic microaggressions, and the inescapable fact that we may all harbor biases and prejudices toward Jews based upon our religious upbringing (Pargament, Trevino, Mahoney, & Silberman, 2007), societal norms (Kressel, 1981), parenteral or familial modeling, or ignorance (Linsley, 2000). My first course in graduate school was multiculturalism, where, in response to a paper I had written on anti-Semitism, my professor kindly and patiently explained to me that Judaism was "just a religion," but not an ethnicity, and certainly not marginalized, and I actually received a lower score on my cultural genogram because, by her explanation, it was not "diverse enough." Another professor of mine only allowed me one additional day's grace period in response to my request to have additional time to turn in a large paper, because its due date fell during the most sacred holiday for my religion. Even when I explained that I would be attending religious services for three straight days, rendering the additional single day allotted to me completely valueless, the professor would not make an exception. Interestingly, and perhaps coincidentally, almost every one of my papers received lower scores and contradictory comments after my request for the additional time, even though the scope, quality, and style of my writing had not changed. If I had asked this professor about the possibility of any latent or repressed anti-Semitic beliefs I feel it very likely that it would of been denied vehemently, as is the case when I ask anyone. No one wants to admit to being anti-Semitic (LaBouff, Rowatt, Johnson, & Finkle, 2012; Pargament et al., 2007), especially if you believe it no longer exists (Grossman, 2014), or that the Jews are making a big fuss over nothing (Kisela, 2003; Gold, 1996), or if you enjoy the benefits of religious privilege and all that it affords (Schlosser, 2003).

I recently read an article about our willingness as a society to engage in the use of euphemisms. When
we use words like "underserved," "oppressed," or "multiple shootings" it seems to grant us some separation between reality and emotion, a mental buffer to numb the truth (Adams, 2015). However, Adams (2015) argues that euphemistic language allows us to metaphorically distance ourselves from those difficult words like "poor," "prejudice," or the brutal taking of innocent lives. She may have a point. Maybe instead of using the term anti-Semitism, which might be interpreted in a myriad of different ways by those who have experienced it and those who have not, we should just call it Jewish-hatred. It sounds a lot more harsh, and raw, and real (Burstin, 1999). And it sounds like something we should be focusing on as a community of helping professionals, educators, and students.

Denying or diminishing the scope and impact of anti-Semitism is actually a form of anti-Semitism (Sue & Sue, 2013). Prejudice in any form is untenable. Marginalization, subjugation, bias, and prejudice all find themselves encapsulated within anti-Semitism (Langman, 1995). How do we, as educators, clinicians, students, and feminists process the reality of a religious, cultural, ideological, and ethnic hatred which has flourished for over 3000 years? While we continue to make important forward strides toward the recognition of other forms of untenable hatred-based prejudices, I keep wondering when anti-Semitism will be included in the dialogue. Anti-Semitism is not more important or more valid than any other form of hatred-based prejudice, but it is almost entirely ignored within the psychological community (Sue & Sue, 2013). I stand in unwavering support and unification with all people who, for any reason, have been stigmatized (Dovidio, Major, & Crocker, 2003), stereotyped, discriminated against, marginalized, suppressed, dehumanized, oppressed, or victimized by ignorance, apathy, prejudice, hatred, or complacency (Adams et al., 2013). Who will stand with me in recognizing that anti-Semitism is not a resolved footnote in our collective past, but a very prominent part of our present, and our future? Its effects cannot be minimized toward those who have suffered from it and those who continue to embrace or deny it (Sue, 2010).

When I am asked what my area of specialty is I get several responses, ranging from eye-rolling to dismissiveness, to those earnest suggestions that I should pick another area of specialty that is not so combustible; however, I get the most aggressive pushback from those who hold strong religious beliefs (Brambilla, Manzi, Regalia, & Verkuyten, 2013). They are the ones who patiently try to explain to me that anti-Semitism disappeared after World War II, and they worry that Jews may be imagining or projecting anti-Semitism where it no longer exists (Friedman, 2007; Rebhun, 2014).

An ethical obligation exists for all educators, clinicians, and students to carefully monitor our own levels of religious bias and prejudice so that we do not unwittingly or unconsciously affirm or support anti-Semitism through religious marginalization or religious microaggressions, recognizing the inevitable truth that it is impossible to eliminate anti-Semitism in others unless we are able to confront it within ourselves (Kiselica, 2003). Confronting prejudice within ourselves is often challenging, uncomfortable, and upsetting; however, the opportunity to accurately and honestly identify any potential issues within ourselves or among our industry will allow us to work toward the true eradication of anti-Semitism, in all of its forms. It is not enough to take a passive stance against anti-Semitism. Anti-Semitism is not a Jewish problem (Prager & Telushkin, 2003). It serves as a litmus test for prejudice against all peoples. Anti-Semitism is on the rise, manifesting in terrifying examples of overt hatred, and evolving more dangerously through the covert employment of modern communication pathways like the Internet and social media (Grossman, 2014). As feminists, as educators, as clinicians, and as students we have the opportunity and the obligation to recognize that the only real danger inherent with anti-Semitism is dismissing or ignoring its existence.
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Transgender Day of Remembrance: A Call to Arms
by Shana M. Davis

To raise awareness and honor the lives of transgender people who were lost to acts of hate, Slippery Rock University’s President’s Commission on Gender Identity and Sexual Orientation and The Pride Center held an event as part of Transgender Awareness Week in anticipation of the Transgender Day of Remembrance. Transgender Day of Remembrance (November 20th) was started in 1998 to honor Rita Hester, a transgender woman, who was murdered ("International Trans Day of Remembrance", 2007). As part of the event, Laverne Cox Presents: The T Word was shown. This documentary film followed the lives of seven transgender youth discussing their daily struggles and highlighting the threat of violence that transgender men and women face on a daily basis. One of the goals of the program was to raise awareness about the disproportionate number of transgender people of color who are homicide victims. The statistics are shocking. For example, did you know that in the first six months of 2015, more transgender people were killed than the total amount of transgender people killed in 2014 (Human Rights Campaign, 2015)? And did you know that 19 of the 21 transgender women killed so far in 2015 identified as either Black or Latina and all but 1 of the 13 of victims from 2014 were transgender women of color (HRC, 2015; National Coalition of Anti-Violence Programs, 2014)? As staggering as these numbers are, the total number of deadly hate crimes committed against people who are transgender may never be known. Due to data collection errors and the vast disrespect held for transgender people in the judiciary system, the full extent of the violence may never be known (HRC, 2015).

What can be done?

• Change the transphobic culture that fuels violence (NCAVP, 2014)
• Support the Equality Act that gives explicit protections against acts of sexual orientation or gender identity discrimination in various contexts including housing, occupation, education, and jury service (HRC, 2015).
• Support emergency housing initiatives (HRC, 2015). Have health care that is Transgender inclusive (HRC, 2015; NCAVP, 2014).
• Improve educational environments for Transgender youth (HRC, 2015).
• End police profiling.
• Collect data on Transgender individuals that examines their daily lives overall.

According to HRC (2015) there were at least 21 transgender victims of deadly violence so far this year:

• Papi Edwards. 20 year old Black Transgender woman from Louisville Kentucky. Fatally shot
• Lamia Beard. 30 year old Black Transgender woman from Norfolk, Virginia. Fatally shot.
• Ty Underwood. 24 year old Black Transgender woman from Tyler, Texas. Fatally shot.
• Yazmin Vash Payne. 33 year old Black Transgender woman from Los Angeles. Fatally stabbed.
• Taja Gabrielle DeJesus. 33 year old Latina Transgender woman from San Francisco. Fatally stabbed.
• Penny Proud. 21 year old Black Transgender woman from New Orleans. Fatally shot.
• Kristina Gomez Reinwald (aka Kristina Grant Infiniti). 46 year old Latina Transgender woman from Miami. Fatally stabbed.
• Keyshia Blige. 33 year old Black Transgender woman from Aurora, Illinois. Fatally shot while driving a car.
Transgender Day of Remembrance, cont.

• London Kiki Chanel. 21 year old Black Transgender woman from Philadelphia. Fatally stabbed.
• Mercedes Williamson. 17 year old White Transgender woman found dead in George County Alabama after having been fatally stabbed.
• Jasmine Collins. 32 year old Black Transgender woman from Kansas City, Missouri. Fatally stabbed.
• Ashton O’Hara. 25 year old Black Transgender woman from Detroit. Fatally stabbed and run over by a car.
• India Clarke. 25 year old Black Transgender woman from Tampa, Florida. Fatally beaten and shot.
• K.C. Haggard. 66 year old White Transgender woman from Fresno, California. Fatally stabbed.
• Shade Schuler. 22 year old Black Transgender woman from Dallas. Found dead from a gunshot wound.
• Amber Monroe. 20 year old Black Transgender woman from Detroit. Fatally shot.
• Kandis Capri. 35 year old Black Transgender woman from Phoenix. Fatally shot in front of an apartment complex.
• Elisha Walker. 20 year old Black Transgender woman from Salisbury, North Carolina. Found dead from blunt force trauma.
• Tamara Dominguez. 36 year old Latina Transgender woman from Kansas City, Missouri. Killed when she was hit by a car and run over repeatedly.
• Keisha Jenkins. 22 year old Black Transgender woman from Philadelphia. Fatally shot.
• Zelia Ziona. 21 year old Transgender woman of color from Gaithersburg, Maryland. Fatally shot.

References


Using your Voice: What is Feminist Process?

Feminists are served by democratic structures that equalize opportunity for participation. A feminist leader seeks out those whose internalized oppression may lead them to not take advantage of the structure that gives them voice. She insures the structure works. Feminist process takes a serious look at who is invited into the discussion and considers inclusivity not only based on race, ethnicity, ability and sexual orientation but also based on length of time in the group, history, and personality. Feminist process critically looks at nepotism and the privileging of history over new voices. While honoring foremothers and historical contributions, feminist process reconfigures structures that keep in power the same people through decades. In practice, feminist groups should always begin with introductions, never assuming that people know one another or one another’s names, and end with an exercise in solidarity that reminds everyone of their shared goals. Feminists also check out that they understand what the other says before debating it. Feminist process also welcomes conflict, anger, and disagreement with the understanding that gender socialization has led to women worrying about any behavior that could be seen as unfeminine or uncaring. We understand that the most caring response can sometimes be the angriest objection.

Sharon Lamb, Ed.D., Ph.D., ABPP
Playing ostrich doesn't make it go away: Sexual assault and rape culture on college campuses

by Tiffany Marcantonio & Jill Swirsky

Sexual assault (an umbrella term that encompasses unwanted touching, verbal coercion, and attempted and completed rape) is a pervasive problem in America. Approximately 20-25% of college attending women will experience an assault (Fisher, Cullen & Turner, 2000) and freshmen year of college has become known as a “red zone” because women are at the highest risk of being victimized during their first year. Given the high numbers of assault, the United States government has stepped in with initiatives such as “It’s on us”, to stop sexual assault. Furthermore, a new documentary called The Hunting Ground explored the way sexual assault is treated on college campuses. The documentary shows several prestigious institutions blaming victims for their assault (i.e., what were you wearing? Were you intoxicated?) and protecting perpetrators to avoid “bad press.” It also sheds light on how rape culture has become ingrained in the American college environment.

As researchers in the field of sexuality and feminism, we were not surprised by these numbers or the cover ups, but were a bit taken aback at how people still do not understand the severity of this problem. For decades researchers have found consistent evidence that attending college is a risk factor for sexual victimization, and that sexual victimization is a precursor to many negative outcomes (i.e., post-traumatic stress disorder, substance use, future victimization). However, we decided to empirically study this problem by designing a project aimed at assessing university policy and procedure for addressing sexual violence that occurs to students who study abroad.

With sexual assault being a pressing, national concern, we thought that International Studies departments would welcome the opportunity to evaluate the resources in place for their study abroad students. We were mistaken: only 56 of the 385 schools we contacted responded to our survey. Of those 56, several responses indicated that the schools would not be interested in taking part in our research. The declines were all polite, professional, and worded in a manner resembling an ostrich whose head is buried in the sand. For example, a mid-size university in the southwest responded saying:

“Thank you for your e-mail but we will decline participation at this time.”

Another school, this one a small, public university in the Northeast, responded saying:

“At this time, I regret the answer is no. They’ve [the international studies department] decided that the issues explored by the study are not ones which the university wishes to engage at this moment.”

The statement that the issues are not ones the university wishes to engage demonstrates a clear understanding of the issues, as well as a blatant desire to remain ignorant. As researchers, feminists, and human beings, we struggled to understand how the violation of students is an issue that a university would “choose not to engage.”

As for the 327 other universities who never responded, we can only wonder the why they chose not to respond. We have begun to see a shift in university culture where dialogue about sexual assault is more open and policies are more comprehensive. However, there is still a disconnect between identifying the needs of victims and acting on them. In all fairness, the lack of responses could have been due to trivial things like getting sent to a spam folder, the e-mail being forgotten amidst hundreds of other e-mails, etc. However, it is also likely that administrators and International Studies Departments fear what our investigation might reveal. They shudder at the thought of negative press associated with reports of mishandled sexual violence, and worry about the reputation of their universities.
Sexual assault and rape culture on college campuses, cont.

To this we say: hiding an issue does not make it go away. Rape culture is alive and well on university campuses. Protecting the school and perpetrator is unjust and unethical. As researchers in the field of psychology, we try to understand human behavior and offer ways to mitigate negative effects. We try to empower victims to speak up, to advocate for research, and to ensure that students are safe on campus, off campus, and traveling the world. Our goal is not to damage the reputations of colleges and universities; rather, to raise awareness, protect our college students, and end rape culture.

This will not be an easy process, and there will be many steps involved. One of the first steps is to encourage universities to discuss rape on college campuses; if students do not know about or understand the risk, they cannot make informed decisions about their safety. International programs should add discussions about sexual assault to orientation programs, informing students that sexual assault is another risk they may encounter while abroad, just like robbery and human trafficking (both commonly noted during study abroad orientation programs). Students should be taught about resources abroad and where they can go should an incident occur. Lastly, there are a variety of factors that increase the likelihood of experiencing sexual assault (e.g. alcohol consumption, previous victimization history), and International Programs should work with researchers to understand what experiences their students have had to better prepare them for their travels abroad. In order to make change, we have to work together. We’ve seen some institutions embrace this mindset and we hope to see more in the coming years.
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Dr. Mom

Perfection in Parenting may be the Downfall of the Supermom
by Sara Martino

It is no secret in the field of Psychology that women are bombarded with media images of body perfection. Studies (e.g. Grabe, Ward, and Hyde, 2008; Yamamiya, et.al., 2005) show that the more exposure to the body ideal, the more that women feel self-conscious about their bodies. There has been less research on the Superwoman Ideal in the media and its impact on women. The Superwoman Ideal in part includes body image, but also includes the concepts of masculine identity and perfectionism. A recent study showed that women who were exposed to “superwomen” in the media indicated higher levels of the Superwoman Ideal, including masculine identity (pressure for success) and perfectionism (Everett and Martino, 2014). The construct of perfectionism within the Superwomen Ideal extends beyond just the women, to include their children as well.

The study of the Superwoman Ideal has been my research area over the past several years. It was not lost on me that I strive for perfectionism as a Feminist and as a Psychologist. I also feel that there is pressure within the Feminist community for perfection. What type of perfection? Perfection as it relates to our children growing up with a strong female role model. Perfection as it relates to our kids defying gender roles. Add that pressure for perfectionism to the fact that it is difficult to acknowledge the need for support among women and it can be a very lonely place for moms to be. I think that
we all can benefit from taking a look at our parenting and how the things we choose to focus on (and perfect) may also have their downfalls.

My now almost ten year old daughter is the person who made me a mother. I was fearful having a daughter. I know the struggles for young girls in our culture. I wanted my daughter to feel empowered, to defy the self-consciousness I have always felt about my own body, and for her to feel as though she could achieve anything in life. I envisioned my daughter as a feminist. I also envisioned in my role as the perfect mother that I would be there to guide her and show her the way. That vision of the perfect mother meant trying to do all of the things that I felt a mother should do for their children.

Part of my struggle to be the “perfect” mom while also being a successful career woman has been centered on striking a balance between work and home life. I try to have meals ready for my kids to eat on nights that I will be teaching late. I try to be at as many school events as I can, and try to have at least some days when I can get them off the bus now that they are at school. What that takes is working late nights on some days and also working from home on various occasions out of the view of my children. I also have a supportive partner who works as a high school teacher and can be home after school when I cannot. He respects my role as the breadwinner and tries to do what he can to fill in the gaps of what I feel are “my” duties as a mother.

The unintended consequence of trying to be involved and physically present as possible is that my kids have gotten the message that I am a traditional mom. Gasp. My daughter famously said when she was about four or five that daddy made the “paper money” so his job was very important. She got that notion based on the amount of time that daddy spent outside the home as compared to me. My children both saw me at one point or another as the “part-time worker” for the same reason. I have to acknowledge now that I did not make a big fuss about it at the time. I felt it was more important for my kids to feel that I was there for them. I was so thankful that I was there to guide them and support them, that insisting that I was the family breadwinner or that I worked full time all year round was not important. Perhaps I did not give myself enough credit. I also did not want to minimize what my husband did for a living based on the money he earned versus what I earned. I would tell my kids that mommy and daddy both work very hard together to provide for the family and to be there for their children. What I may have believed is that part of my quest for perfection was in being the mom who was “doing it all” for the kids on my own, and that meant that they felt that daddy was the worker in the family.

The saving grace for me in my struggle for balance and perfection as a mother has been in the realization that I am not alone. My research on the Superwoman has led me to acknowledge my shortcomings and seek out support from other women. They help me to realize that I am doing better than I think I am. Other feminist women help me realize that perfection is unattainable and perhaps, overrated. The message here is that we are all striving to be the best parents that we can be, and that is enough.
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It is well understood in the field of psychology that in the training of future supervisors and current supervisees, diversity competence is essential. However, despite this, topics relating to diversity competence are still not salient in supervision training and in supervision research (Falender & Shafranske, 2004). It is important to acknowledge this gap in multicultural competency training because “trainees report greater multicultural competence when multiculturally competent supervision occurs” (Toporek, Ortega-Villabos, & Pope-Davis, 2004). If we want multiculturally competent trainees, we need multiculturally competent supervisors. Multicultural supervision addresses the content and the competency areas necessary to ethically supervise students working with a diverse population. Feminist supervision is geared toward a more open, collaborative, and mutually empowering process. A multicultural supervision framework with a feminist supervision process creates a structure for supervision that fosters multicultural competence in the supervisee.

Psychology has a long history of Eurocentric bias, with little integration of culture and diversity into the dominant pedagogy and popular paradigms. It is time that we start working harder as a profession to change the patriarchal patterns of our profession’s history. Multicultural and feminist frameworks for supervision are two approaches that help to foster an understanding regarding prejudice, cultural attitudes, cultural identity, and power dynamics within the supervisory relationship. Traditional training of the supervisor does not require that they are competent to discuss issues of diversity with their supervisee, supporting the idea that student training in diversity issues often reflects “mediocre efforts in training on counseling ethnic minorities, and a lack of cultural infusion into training in general” (Falender & Shafranske, 2004, pp. 115).

For supervisees to be prepared to work with diverse client populations in different contexts, the training they receive must address cultural issues (Hird, Tao, & Gloria, 2004). Multicultural supervision involves facilitating clinical growth in supervisees so that they are better able to utilize culture-centered interventions with diverse groups of clients. In multicultural supervision, a large part of the process requires modeling self-reflection and an openness to growth and learning, particularly around issues of culture. There is an emphasis on sociopolitical context that is not necessarily present in traditional supervision, and there is also an emphasis on engaging in supervisory practices related to social justice, community engagement, and advocacy (Porter, 2010).

It has been found that supervisors do not often initiate discussions of gender, sexual orientation, and ethnicity, despite evidence that supervisees are more multiculturally competent when these discussions are a part of supervision (Gatmon, Jackson, Koshkarian, Martos-Perry, Molina, Patel, & Rodolfa, 2001). “Invariably, when conversations about culture are an integral part of the supervision process, supervisees are able to better understand how culture influences their clinical practice, their perceptions of culturally different clients, and culturally different clients’ perceptions of them” (Hird, Tao, & Gloria, 2004).

Feminist supervision “strives to empower and avoid abuses of power, is informed by social context and social constructivist perspectives, is collaborative and reflexive while maintaining standards of ethics and quality, fits the unique developmental needs of each supervisee, and promotes organizational advocacy and community activism on behalf of clients and emerging therapists (Porter, 2010, pp. 2-3). Regardless of the topic of supervision, supervision has “a primary mission to facilitate thoughtful, systematic reflection about the contextual and multicultural factors affecting the clinical and supervisory relationship” (Porter, 2014, p. 60).

Falender and Shafranske call for a “complete contextual change that encompasses not only a commitment to multicultural issues, but also the creation and maintenance of a positive environment in which to nurture them”, which is necessary to create a supervisory process that is appropriate for a multicultural population (2004, pp. 121). A part of this includes Hird et al.’s (2001) recommendation that “academic and clinical training programs integrate multiculturalism throughout their curriculum and training, in particular into theories of supervision and supervision practica classes”. Many supervisors have not had formal supervision or training in culturally competent supervision, and even in culturally competent practice (Hird, Cavaliere, Dulko, Felice, & Ho, 2001). Culturally competent supervision exists, it is just a matter of integrating this type of supervisory practice into everyday practice to help promote multicultural competency in future generations of psychologists.
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Feature Article

**Socio-Cultural Challenges for Latinas Pursuing a College Degree**

By Ashley Tirado, Lisa Costas, & Marilyn Parada

Latina students possess cultural characteristics that make them both resilient and vulnerable educationally. Although Latinos are the largest minority group across college campuses, they are highly underrepresented at every level (Sanmartaria Graff et al., 2013). Bachelor degree attainment was 11.3% for Latinas and 9.4% for Latinos compared to 21.7% degree attainment for white females and 22.3% for white males in 2012 (Aguinaga & Gloria, 2015).

Latino college students face challenges such as stereotypical depictions, conflicting role obligations, others’ low expectations, financial limitations, discrimination, and marginalization (Peralta, Caspary, & Boothe, 2013). For Latinas, additional challenges seem to increase the difficulty in attaining a college degree. Only 14% of Latina students in the United States have completed 4 years of college or more when compared to White (29.3%), Black (20.6%), and Asian and Pacific Islander (49.3%) females (U.S. Census Bureau, 2011). Further exploration of these socio-cultural challenges is needed in order to best support Latinas’ pursuit of education.

**Socio-cultural Challenges**

Latina students’ cultural backgrounds emphasize family interdependence. They are often expected to fulfill various familial obligations that can conflict with time and energy needed for academic responsibilities (Dennis, Phinney, & Chuateco, 2005). Often, Latina students contend with balancing traditional role obligations within their families and the role responsibilities of a college student (Sanmartaria Graff et al., 2013). Often caught in a cultural bind between meeting the demands of an individualistic-oriented university culture and a collectivist-oriented family culture, Latinas’ academic success can be negatively impacted (Reece & Gallimore, 2010). In addition, Latino cultures’ value of marianismo, may stress expectations that women need to prioritize family needs above their own needs, increasing the stress experienced by Latina students (Sy & Romero, 2004).

Educationally, first generation Latina college students may be poorly prepared in high school, resulting in being less
equipped to succeed in college (Dennis et al., 2005). Latina students may also have limited family support during the college entrance process, as many parents of first-generation Latino college students lack knowledge of this process (Dennis et al., 2005). Additionally, these students often need outside employment to finance their education, prolonging degree completion (Dennis et al., 2005). Many Latinas wishing to pursue a college education contend with immigration status and financial strains related to family obligations.

McWhirter et al. (2013) reported that Latinas who anticipated immigration status problems and planned to attend college were more likely to plan to pursue a 2-year degree. Young immigrant Latinas appear to have financial commitments that limit their ability to pursue more education since most send remittances to their families in their native countries (Pew Research Center, 2009).

The Transition to College

Transitioning to college can be exceptionally demanding for Latinas in navigating through structural and cultural barriers to education. Latinas may experience microaggressions and societal stereotypes in the campus environment (Yosso et al., 2009). Latina students seem to strive towards achieving cultural congruity by trying to fit into the university environment while still maintaining their own cultural identity (Aguinaga & Gloria, 2015). They may experience a process of acculturation in this transition as they attempt to integrate beliefs and values of universities’ predominantly Caucasian student bodies (Aguinaga & Gloria, 2015).

Many Latina students experience physical distance from family and increased personal responsibility for obtaining success during college (Sy & Romero, 2008). First generation college students place greater importance on bringing honor to their families and helping them financially (Olive, 2008). In addition, Latina students are likely to have unrealistic expectations about college, creating a greater risk for negative psychological outcomes (Dennis et al., 2005). Lastly, family demands tend to increase distress during the transition to college, as well as decrease initial academic performance for Latina students (Sy & Romero, 2004).

Resiliency Factors

Despite these challenges, many Latinas demonstrate resilience in achieving their educational goals. For instance, Latinas’ collectivistic orientation may motivate them to achieve in order to meet expectations of those around them, including their families (Dennis et al., 2005). As such, the supportive and familial community networks Latinas create can serve to enhance and motivate them in pursuing a successful college education (Aguinaga & Gloria, 2015; Mireles-Rios & Romo, 2014).

Although faced with racial microaggressions at educational institutions, Latinas find motivation in the accumulation of subtle and overt racial incidents as they strive to counteract the racialized and gendered assumptions (Yosso et al., 2009). In addition, the cultural value of marianismo may facilitate self-advocacy and resiliency as it emphasizes sacrifice and perseverance. The research implies that first-generation Latinas have the potential to succeed in higher education but need adequate support in obtaining a college degree.

Professional Implications

To improve Latinas’ success rate in college, there has been a significant increase in college access programs in high schools (Saunders & Serna, 2004) and early exposure to higher education institutions (Santamaria Graff et al., 2013). Furthermore, providing resources on basic organizational, time management, communication, and computer skills can better prepare Latina students to be successful. It is recommended that professionals working with Latina students help them develop strategies to assist them in navigating the academic system while fulfilling collectivistic family obligations and individualistic-oriented college responsibilities in a way that effectively balances their time and minimizes distress (Sy & Romero, 2004). Colleges are encouraged to offer resources that support Latinas’ family responsibilities, such as on-site day care and family-friendly housing for Latinas who are mothers or have family caretaking obligations. Additionally, outreach services connecting Latinas with supportive campus organizations, educators, mentors, and peers can support their adjustment (Santamaria Graff et al., 2013).

Perhaps most importantly, culturally informed practices on campuses are crucial to increase rapport between students, faculty, and other professionals that come into contact with Latina students. Thus, Latinas should be encouraged to foster professional relationships with culturally sensitive faculty, staff, and advisors and sustain social networks to positively influence their college experience (Saunders & Serna, 2004). With cultural awareness and sensitivity to the unique challenges Latinas face, professionals in contact with these students support their success in higher education.
Heritage Column

Spoken Life: The life of feminist psychologist and historian Elizabeth Scarborough
by Jenna MacKay, MA

Reflecting upon what drew her to psychology, and more particularly to the history of psychology, Scarborough noted that she just “fell into it”. She had completed a bachelor's degree in psychology years earlier, and when her husband was offered a job in New Hampshire she decided to enroll in the Psychology Department’s Master’s program. She felt that being a married woman placed her at both an advantage and disadvantage in academia. In terms of benefits, she felt that one of the reasons she was offered a PhD placement in New Hampshire’s new doctoral program in the history of psychology was due not only to her performance as a Master’s student, but because she was seen as ‘place-bound’. Her husband was a faculty member in the Dept. of Home Economics, so it was deemed unlikely that she would relocate before completing her training. In terms of drawbacks, the school declined to offer her any financial support. Because she was married, she was seen as “taken care of”, so that despite her excellent academic record she was routinely passed over for awards or scholarships. She also regretted that as a busy wife and mother she was unable to experience and participate in the informal student gatherings and discussions that made graduate school come alive.

Scarborough recalled finding it difficult to choose a supervisor in the PhD program because of her status as both an older student and a faculty wife: "[M]y husband was an associate professor, he was older. I was as old as many of the professors in the Psychology Department. In terms of academic status, I was a spouse, I kind of outranked them. It was very awkward." Fortunately the department hired Robert Watson, who was a well-known figure in the field of the History of Psychology. While she did not know anything at the time about history, let alone the history of psychology, Scarborough felt Watson would be the perfect supervisor. She dreaded committing to a specific theoretical orientation and felt that historical research would allow her to avoid such constraints. In the summer of 1968, Watson and colleague Josef Brozek secured National Science Foundation funding for a summer institute on teaching the history of psychology. Scarborough participated in the institute, the success of which would lead to the founding of a new society to promote scholarship in the area. It was christened Cheiron, after the wise centaur of Greek mythology. Thereafter, Scarborough never missed a meeting.

Upon completing her PhD in 1972, Scarborough accompanied her husband to his new position at Northern Illinois University. Unfortunately although this new job offered him career advancement, Scarborough was offered only occasional part-time teaching. She kept busy through her continued involvement in the brand new Cheiron society (now Cheiron, the International Society for the History of the Social and Behavioral Sciences), and she taught part-time whenever she could. During this time, Scarborough was asked to write a paper on the history of women in psychology, a topic that had barely been touched by historians. At the time there were only three known figures: Christine Ladd-Franklin, Mary Whiton Calkins, and Margaret Floy Washburn. But along with her collaborator Laurel Furumoto, she discovered that there were many other forgotten women in the first generation of American women psychologists. The result of 10 years of research on the topic was their now-classic book, Untold Lives: The First Generation of American Women Psychologists, published in 1987. It provides rich contextual analyses of the lives and struggles of the group of early women who comprised the first generation of American female psychologists.

As a graduate student, Scarborough could relate to the struggles of the women she wrote about in Untold Lives. At the time she felt pulled in two directions - towards academia and career on the one hand, and family on the other. She and her husband wanted academic work, but it was not feasible for him to leave his tenured position in order to find work for both of them. Soon, it became clear to Scarborough that she needed not only a job, but also a divorce. With this in mind, she interviewed for several jobs in various locations. When she was offered a position at Fredonia University she filed for divorce. Six weeks after her job interview she was moving to New York State. Her children stayed behind, as her son did not want to move and her daughter was 18 and starting
college. Scarborough remembers, "[M]y daughter and I joked that we both went away to college at the same time."

Although at the time Scarborough felt she was functioning well, in hindsight she feels that in her first year at Fredonia she was a "zombie". She loved it, but her first year of teaching was "disastrous". She was 42 at the time, and while she was a new faculty member, she had the advantage of maturity. Also, she had learned a great deal about university administration during her marriage, which proved to be very helpful in her own career. She was quickly offered a chair position in her department and enjoyed the administrative work immensely.

Scarborough went on to become the Dean of Liberal Arts and Sciences at Indiana University South Bend and has devoted her research career to the history of women in psychology. From 1973-1980 she was the Executive Officer of Cheiron, the Society she helped found, and in 1990-1991 she was President of the Society for the History of Psychology. She was a fellow of the American Psychological Association, the Association for Psychological Science, and a member of the advisory board of the Cummings Center for the History of Psychology. In honor of her significant contributions to the history of psychology, Cheiron named its annual keynote address the Scarborough Memorial Lecture.

Ever committed even during a long illness, she attended her last Cheiron conference with the help of palliative care in Lawrence, Kansas in June 2015. Elizabeth Scarborough passed away in South Bend, Indiana, August 2015 following a long battle with colon cancer.

---

**Celebrating the Moments!**

**Hyde Grant Winner and Honorable Mentions**

---

**Carey Pulverman, M.A.**, of the University of Texas at Austin is the winner of this Fall’s Hyde Graduate Student Research Award. Her project is entitled: "The Relationship between Affective Appraisal of Physiological Sexual Arousal and Sexual Dysfunction among Women with a History of Childhood Sexual Abuse." She is in her fifth year in the clinical graduate program and has been very productive, having co-authored six peer-reviewed articles and two book chapters, amongst other professional undertakings.

Honorable mentions were awarded to Jennifer Brady from the University of Maryland for a proposed research project entitled "Body image experiences among Asian American women: An intersectionality framework"; and to Elizabeth Neilson from the University of Washington for a proposed research project entitled "The Roles of Acute Intoxication, Emotional Arousal, and Emotion Regulation on Men’s Sexual Aggression Intentions".

---

**Using your Voice: What is Feminist Process?**

Feminist process is inclusive. That means we don't silence dissenters. Feminist process is disruptive. It refuses to placate patriarchy and power. This makes it uncomfortable. Feminist process does not make niceness a priority, but it listens respectfully before responding. Feminist process is needed when we are afraid to speak, because as Audre Lorde has said "when we are silent, we are still afraid." Feminist process is designed to question authority and to shine the light of truth on distortion. Feminist process honors intersections of identities and is patient with those who need to tend to family and their own people before jumping into action. I don't think feminists are necessarily in solidarity. We have individual priorities because we are situated in different places in the culture. Expecting solidarity gets women into trouble. Some feminists are on the "up side" of power, and they/we fear losing it. They/we fall back in the struggle and tend to the acquired patriarchal blessings, but we go on. Falling into manipulation by patriarchy is humiliating and humbling. But feminist process allows us to find our way back to integrity.

Mary Pelton Cooper, PsyD
Obituary

In Memory of Naomi Weisstein (1939-2015)
By Jeanne Marecek

I write with a great sadness to tell you that Naomi Weisstein, a pioneer feminist activist in psychology, passed away in March of this year. A full obituary, written by Laura Ball and Alexandra Rutherford, will soon appear in the American Psychologist. Here I share some informal reminiscences about this remarkable woman.

Naomi Weisstein’s academic interests were what we now term cognitive neuroscience; her specialty was vision research. SPW members, however, know her better for her trenchant article “Psychology Constructs the Female,” originally published in 1968. That article was like a shot fired round the world -- a rallying cry to feminists in psychology. Over the years, it was reprinted over forty times and found its way into six languages. In 1989, Mary Crawford and I used it as a springboard for an assessment of how feminist psychologists (re)constructed the female (Crawford & Marecek, 1989). Naomi Weisstein pulled no punches in her article. “Psychology,” she stated baldly, “has nothing to say about what women are really like, what they need and what they want, especially because psychology does not know” (1968/1993a, p. 197). And further: “I do not know what immutable differences exist between men and women apart from differences in their genitals; perhaps there are some other unchangeable differences; probably there are a number of irrelevant differences. But it is clear that until social expectations for men and women are equal, until we provide equal respect for both men and women, our answers to this question will simply reflect our prejudices” (p. 208).

Naomi Weisstein is profiled in the archive of Psychology’s Feminist Voices (Ball, 2010/2015). You can also find a fascinating intellectual biography of her in a 2010 article by Alexandra Rutherford, Kelli Vaughn-Blount, and Laura Ball. Suffice it to say here that Weisstein completed her PhD at Harvard in record time in 1964, and then she moved to the University of Chicago to take a postdoctoral fellowship. In Chicago she dived headlong into the maelstrom of New Left politics – SNCC, protest against the war in Vietnam, and the New University Conference. My first glimpse of Naomi was during a campus demonstration; she was standing on the roof of a Volkswagen, shouting anti-war chants into a bullhorn. Naomi also played a lead role in the emerging feminist movement. She was a co-founder of the Chicago Westside Group in 1967 and of the Chicago Women’s Liberation Union in 1969. With her abundance of talent and boundless energy, Naomi seemed able to do most anything. In addition to her work in the Chicago Westside Group and the Chicago Women’s Liberation Union, she was a founder of the Women’s Liberation Rock Band and its keyboardist. The band, which was active from 1970 to 1973, produced an album called Mountain Moving Day. Weisstein wrote two of the songs: the title track and Papa, Don’t Lay That Shit On Me.1 Reviewing the album, Holly Near wrote that the music “screams, ‘Come on!’ ...The laughter makes us brave. The music helps us to stop holding our breath. .... The voices challenge everything we have ever been taught about ourselves.” Take a moment right now to listen to the soundtrack of “Papa...”:

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-Tbm7C1sEXk .

Weisstein also performed as a stand-up comedian and contributed cartoons to feminist publications. At the same time, she was working her way up the academic ladder, moving easily from assistant professor to associate professor at Loyola University. In 1973, she was invited to the psychology department at SUNY-Buffalo.

In the 1960s, many women in academic psychology faced overt sexism, no matter what their specialty area. Weisstein may well have come in for especially harsh treatment because she ventured beyond the “appropriate” domains of child psychology and clinical/counseling psychology—fields for which women were thought to be naturally better suited. She has recounted how she was forbidden to use the equipment necessary for her dissertation research. Being a woman, she might break it. Her essay “How can a little girl like
you teach a great big class of men?” recounted the sexism that ran unchecked in those days (Weisstein, 1977). Are you breathing a sigh of relief that women (at least cisgendered white women) no longer must endure such blatant sexism? Know that it was the activism and courage of Naomi Weisstein and her cohort of feminists that forced our field to treat women with more fairness and respect. As Naomi put it:

I am a feminist because I have seen my life and the lives of women I know harassed, dismissed, damaged, destroyed. I am a feminist because without others I can do little to stop the outrage. Without a political and social movement of which I am a part – without feminism – my determination and persistence, my clever retorts, my hours of patient explanation, my years of exhortation amount to little (Weisstein, 1977, p. 250).

In 1983, Naomi Weisstein fell ill with a virulent case of Chronic Fatigue & Immune Dysfunction Syndrome. Within a short time, she was bedridden and soon required 24-hour nursing care (Lemisch & Weisstein, 1997). Despite her illness, she remained engaged with feminism and with psychology. Rhoda Unger recounts a gala party held to celebrate Naomi’s 50th birthday. Because of her compromised immune system, Naomi was sequestered in her bedroom away from the guests. An elaborate system of walkie-talkies enabled her to converse with them. Naomi was able to work, albeit sporadically. She never regained her health and died in March 2015.

In 1993, Feminism & Psychology published a 25-year retrospective on “Psychology Constructs the Female” (Kitzinger, 1993). In the afterword that Weisstein wrote for the festschrift, she issued a challenge to feminist psychologists that is well worth repeating: “Let us return to an activist, challenging, badass feminist psychology.”

References


Weisstein, N. (11993a). Psychology constructs the female: Or, the fantasy life of the male psychologist (with some attention to the fantasies of his friends, the male biologist and the male anthropologist). Feminism and Psychology, 3, 194-210. (First published as Kinder, kuche, kirche as scientific law: Psychology constructs the female. Boston, MA: New England Free Press.)


Note

1. The album was re-released by Rounder in 2005 under the title “Papa, don’t lay that shit on me.”

-----Jeanne Marecek
Swarthmore College
Call for Papers: Feminisms and Social Media

A Special Issue of Feminism & Psychology

Special Issue Editors: Abigail Locke, Rebecca Lawthom & Antonia Lyons

This special issue will consider issues around women’s movements, everyday sexism and the ‘blurred lines’ of social media. Social media are highly interactive digital platforms that use mobile and web-based technologies to allow users to generate, share, discuss, and modify content (e.g., YouTube, Facebook, Twitter, Instagram). Whilst feminisms and social media are transdisciplinary spaces, this issue will contribute to a body of psychological theory and will be of interest to psychologists as well as other social scientists. Taking as the backdrop the claims that a ‘new’ feminism and a ‘new’ misogyny are both rife over social media the proposed special issue brings together papers to consider a number of contemporary issues that are coming to the fore around gender and social media. Social media provides different challenges to issues such as what it means to be a feminist in the 21st century and the new concerns facing women in an era marked by technological advances. Indeed, whilst social media platforms can be a social force for activism (e.g. the Arab 'spring') they also raises questions about how discussions of gender through social media 'evoke' public censure and commentary.

Possible topics and questions include:

--What is the relationship between digital and social media engagement and the wider social movement of feminism? What are the implications for feminism and activism in the future?

--Intersectionality debates, social media and relevance to contemporary feminisms.

--How do social media and feminisms operate in different locales?

--Does it make sense to speak of 'post-feminism', empowerment and sexual autonomy in the current context of commodification of sex and pornification of culture that is increasingly apparent on social media?

We welcome papers from academics, activists, and practitioners at different stages of their careers. Submissions may be theoretical, empirical, or methodological, and/or focus on research and practice, and should be no longer than 8000 words, as well as commentaries and brief reports (see https://au.sagepub.com/en-gb/oce/journal/feminism-psychology

#submission-guidelines for manuscript guidelines). All submissions will undergo anonymous peer review.

Feminism & Psychology is hosted on SAGE Track, a web based online submission and peer review system powered by ScholarOne Manuscripts. Visit http://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/fap to login and submit your article online.

If you have questions, please contact the Corresponding Guest Editor: Abigail Locke - drabigaillocke@gmail.com putting 'Special Issue' in the subject line. Deadline for submissions is April 30th 2016. We anticipate a publication date in 2017.

Geis Memorial Award

This award offers $15,000 for the 2016-2017 academic year to fund dissertation research in the Psychology of Women by an advanced doctoral candidate. Sponsored by Div. 35.

Annual Deadline: April 15

Eligible research will demonstrate:

1. Methodological soundness and sophistication
2. Contribution to the field of feminist psychology
3. Sophisticated research design in the social psychology tradition

History and Purpose of Award:

Florence L. Geis was a Social Psychologist with a strong commitment to research on the Psychology of Women and to the mentoring of women graduate students. In her will, she left an endowment to fund doctoral students conducting dissertation research in feminist psychology. To qualify for funding, the research must be 1) feminist, 2) address a feminist/womanist issue, 3) use social psychology research methods and 4) make a significant contribution to social psychology theory and research. Proposals will be judged on suitability, feasibility, merit of the research and the potential of the student to have a career as a feminist researcher in social psychology. Funding need not be used solely to fund the research project.
On August 24th, 2015, we had the opportunity to meet with Dr. Kimberlyn Leary, a psychologist and advisor to the White House Council on Women and Girls, in Washington DC. We learned about the Council’s initiatives to advocate for the health, well-being, and affirmative visibility of women and girls of color. One of their projects, in partnership with the Smithsonian, is to sponsor a special edition of the annual Museum Day Live! event, held every September, in which participating museums offer free admission and special programs to encourage the public to visit and learn from their cultural institutions. This special edition of Museum Day will take place on March 12, 2016, during Women’s History Month.

The goal is to engage diverse communities, especially girls of color, in the museum experience. To this end, The Cummings Center for the History of Psychology, a Smithsonian affiliate, was invited, along with the APA Women’s Programs Office and the Psychology’s Feminist Voices Oral History and Digital Archive project, to develop an exhibit and event that will use the history of psychology to engage girls of color in the museum experience, inspire their interest in psychology, and demonstrate how psychology can be used to improve their daily lives and for social change. We are psyched!!

The Project

The project – called “I am psyched!”: Inspiring girls of color with psychology’s past and present – consists of two major components: a museum exhibit that highlights the history of women of color in psychology and their contributions to science and society, and an event that will be held on Museum Day itself. Museum Day 2016 activities will be presented in the APA Capitol View Conference Center in Washington DC and will include:

- the debut of a curated interactive exhibit that will immerse museum-goers in the histories of women of color in psychology and their legacies for contemporary psychology;
- a live-streamed interactive discussion with eminent women of color psychologists from all career stages representing diverse areas of psychology;
- fun skills-building activities for girls from 7th to 12th grade who will be invited to participate in the Museum Day event.

Recognizing that March 12, 2016 is also National Girl Scout Day, we will design activities that allow participating girl scouts to earn their own Museum Day-related merit badge by interacting with the exhibits in various ways.

Beyond Museum Day

This initiative will extend beyond Museum Day itself. We hope to make the exhibit and activities available to local community and student groups after its debut on March 12th; we will invite high school psychology teachers and community college professors to bring their classes to APA to experience the interactive exhibit. We also hope to establish an ongoing digital presence by creating a digital version of the exhibit, augmented with additional on-line content, and to develop and disseminate curricular materials based on the digital exhibit to middle, high school, and college teachers, and girls’ empowerment group leaders all over the country.

We are excited to be able to highlight the rich history and path-breaking contributions of women of color to psychology to inspire the next generation of psychologists.

How can you help? We need:

- Details about significant accomplishments, meetings, etc. (especially for listing in the interactive timeline)
- Still Images, such as photographs, slides, and negatives
- Moving images and audio recordings, such as film reels, DVDs, VHS, cassettes, reel-to-reel tapes
- Personal papers, including personal and professional correspondence, memoranda, unpublished manuscripts, course notes, presentation drafts, etc.
- Records of an organization (e.g., Society for Industrial Organizational Psychology, Psi Chi, etc.).

If you have any comments, suggestions, or materials that you would like to share with us, please don’t hesitate to let us know by emailing Shari Miles-Cohen at smiles@apa.org.
CALL FOR PAPERS
Psychology of Women Section
ANNUAL CONFERENCE, 2016
6th – 8th July, Cumberland Lodge, Windsor

Themes
- Feminism & Class
- Reimagining development across the lifespan
- Feminist Methods

Keynote Speakers
- Dr. Virginia Braun & Dr. Victoria Clarke,
  University of Auckland; University of the West of England
- Dr. Carl Walker,
  University of Brighton
- Dr. Lindsay O’Dell,
  Open University

The POWS annual three-day conference covers a wide range of issues including: gender, mental health, women’s health, feminist theory, masculinities, sexualities, qualitative methodologies, disability, ethnicity and racism. Contributions include papers, symposia, posters and workshops. This is an excellent opportunity for feminist researchers, teachers and practitioners in and around psychology to meet and exchange ideas, as well as for students to present their work for the first time in a supportive and friendly environment.

SUBMISSIONS OPEN: 1st DECEMBER, 2015
First submission deadline: 29th February, 2016
Late deadline: 28th March, 2016

For more information VISIT OUR WEBSITE at http://pows.bps.org.uk (and click on Annual Conference), or contact Bijal Vaghela at the BPS conference office
Tel: +44 (0) 116 252 9555 Email: powsconference@bps.org.uk

Join POWS: http://pows.bps.org.uk/pows/join.cfm
Follow POWS on Twitter: @POWS_BPS
Visit the POWS blog: http://powsbps.wordpress.com
Forty-nine members of the Extended-Executive Committee (EC) attended the APA EC meeting of APA’s Division 35, The Society for the Psychology of Women (SPW) in Toronto, ON. The following individuals attended the meeting: Amanda Almond, Asuncion (Siony) Mitera Austria, Nancy Baker, Martha Banks, Susan Basow, Lula Beatty, Martha Bergen, Mary Brabeck, Nicole Buchanan, Silvia Canetto, Erika Carr, Kim Case, Donna Castanado, Jean Lau Chin, Ellen Cole, Joan Chrisler, Monique Clinton-Sherrod, Lynn Collins, Khanh Dinh, Mindy Erchull, Yvette Flores, BraVada Garrett-Akinsanya, Julii Green, Iva Greywolf, Debra Kawahara, Emily Keener, Sharon Lamb, Phi Li Loan, Maureen McHugh, Clare Mehta, Shari Miles-Cohen, Lauren Mizock, Debra Mollen, Olivia Moorehead-Slaughter (partial by phone), Mimi Ormerod, Wendy Peters, Natalie Porter, Lucia Puchalski, Pam Remer, Joy Rice, Suzanna Rose, Rakhshanda Saleem, Inga Schowengerolt, Charlene Senn, Isis Settles, Margaret (Peggy) Signorella, Jennifer Vencill, Wendi Williams, Diane Willis, Jennifer Wisdom, Leilana Crane.

Additional guest during some or all of the meeting included APA Division Services representative Keith Cook and Division 35 (non-EC) members Kathryn Anderson, Lucia Puchalski and Sarah Uttman. President Maureen McHugh called the meeting to order at 6:20 pm and welcomed the members. Secretary Monique Clinton-Sherrod stated that some slight modifications were made to the agenda to shift priority for topics involving invited guests. Monique Clinton-Sherrod requested any changes for the Midwinter 2015 minutes. The Midwinter 2015 meeting minutes were approved.

President’s Report: President Maureen McHugh directed attendees to her full report in the agenda book which describes accomplishments with APA Programming, the NMCS, Committees and Taskforces during her Presidency. She also noted a few highlights and additional comments:

- She reported on a very successful Transnational Summit and thanked the planning committee for a job well done.
- She noted that there is an exciting APA Program with thanks to the dedication of Mindy Erchull and Nicole Buchanan.
- She noted the exciting series of meetings and discussions scheduled for the AWP/SPW suite and encouraged members to attend some of these discussions.
- President McHugh discussed that in the Newsletter she wrote about the Even the Score Campaign which successfully lobbied to have Flibanserin, a Medical Treatment for Hypoactive Sexual Desire Disorder in Premenopausal Women, recommended for approval. This involved a recent decision by an advisory committee to the Food and Drug Administration to approve the drug, even though it had not been approved by the FDA. The FDA will meet on this in August to make a final decision on this. She would like to pass a resolution regarding this issue and President McHugh shared sample language that was included in the Newsletter. It was noted that this may need to be run through the full membership and President McHugh noted that this was included in the Newsletter for full membership review. Suggestion that what is decided during the meeting should be shared on the Announce list and have a deadline for responding. It was also suggested that this could possibly be a resolution endorsed by the EC. Strong support for doing something b/c of the seriousness of the issue. A question was raised about how this could put forth as a resolution for APA as well. It was noted that we may need to start with speaking to the policy person.

Motion: Moved for the EC to adopt the resolution: We support women’s right to sexual fulfillment. In pursuit of sexual fulfillment, we believe that women want safe and effective options, not unsafe and ineffective medications. Therefore, we urge the U.S. Food and Drug Administration to override the Advisory Committees' (Division of Bone, Reproductive and Urologica Products) recommendation, and reject Flibanserin.

Motion passed with all in favor.

President-Elect Report: President-Elect BraVada Garrett-Akinsanya noted that her campaign is Expanding Feminist Presence. She shared her plans for expanding this presence which includes the following themes:
• **Goal 1: Expanding Feminist Spaces: Where Practice and Research Meet.** Pam Remer established a Task Force on Feminist Evidence-Based Practice and President-Elect Garrett-Akinsanya will expand upon this work by initiating a Research-to-Practice Task Force to explore ways in which shared knowledge, grant making and collaborative partnerships can be formed. Dr. Edna Esnil in conjunction with a representative from Division 42, Dr. Josephine Johnson, will be leading this thrust.

• **Goal 2: Expanding Feminist Spaces for Collaboration Among SPW Sections.** This 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 and will be assisted by Dr. Beryl Wingate.

• **Goal 3: Expanding Feminist Spaces: For Strategic Alliances in Social Justice.** This will involve creation of a Taskforce on Strategic Alliances for Social Justice to identify the ongoing threats and opportunities for our Division members to actively collaborate within and outside of our Division to address disparities in health and wellness. Dr. Barbara Streets and Dr. Natalie Porter will lead this initiative with assistance from former Student Representative Jessica Joseph.

• **Goal 4: Expanding Feminist Spaces for Feminist Economic Advancement and Entrepreneurial Leadership (aka--Sistahs need to get paid!).** The purpose of this initiative will be to assemble a Taskforce on Feminist Economic Advancement and Entrepreneurial Leadership. This will be led by Jean Lau Chin and Peggy Signorella.

• **Goal 5: Expanding Feminist Spaces that promote an Opportunity for SPW Members to be seen, heard and involved.** Through the continued use of media and technology, this initiative will provide our members with innovative platforms that will facilitate collaboration and provide a means by which they can communicate their needs, challenges and successes. It will be led by Drs. Allie Minieri, Clara Mehta, Emily Keener, and Marlene Maheu.

**Past President Report: Past President Lynn Collins** noted Feminism.org is still online (Taskforce Chaired by Wendy Peters) and there is a proposal for a Web Maven to maintain the site. She highlighted the goal of the Transnational Summit was to facilitate a paradigm shift from an International towards a Transnational Psychology of Women and noted that there was an international array of speakers. It was well attended with 77 participants and very exciting to see the great work accomplished. She also provided an update that Erica Carr is continuing work on book about Serious Mental Illness. Past President Collins is also working on incorporating bylaws changes into the Division’s bylaws and handbook with the help of Joy Rice and Karen Wyche.

**APA Offices**

**Division Services: Keith Cooke** from Division Services provided an overview of the services that they provide and invited Division 35 members to work with them for upcoming activities. He also invited members to stop by to speak with them at the Convention. He discussed the event planning staff that are available to address whatever questions we may have.

**APA Women’s Programs Office: Shari Miles-Cohen** thanked the Division for the continued support with the office’s programming. They have selected their next class for the APA Leadership Institute for Women in Psychology. She reminded us that there are several service awards that members can apply for. She will be sharing this info with the sections during their meeting tomorrow. The office is continuing to work on human trafficking, women in leadership, diversity in education, and other activities with additional details available on their website. Full report forthcoming. **Committee on Women in Psychology (CWP): Jennifer Wisdom,** Chair of CWP, provided an update on activities since the last meeting. She provided information on current leadership (Chair Wisdom, Vice Chair Edna Esnil) and upcoming leadership (Chair-elect Erlise Ward and Vice Chair-elect Cheryl Travis). First year members have been great. They will have call for nominations is opening this fall in several areas and due September 1, 2015—they welcome self-nominations. Resident Scholar is working on the updates to the Changing Gender Composition of Psychology. Identified Campus Sexual Assault as a key issue and Dr. Cheryl Travis is leading this to have discussion meetings for this to look at Campus Climate Survey options. Continue to revising policy statement on substance abuse by pregnant women. —Trafficking of Women and Girls report is continuing to be utilized and a resolution is being drafted for APA to make an official statement. LIWP is continuing as mentioned by in the WPO report. Continuing social media and outreach efforts. CWP networking meeting is Saturday 8-9:50, as well as NIH funder meeting. CWP reviews a list of women for nomination for APA awards and will be announcing their own leadership awards winners on Saturday.
Committee/Task Force Reports

Program Committee: Committee Chair Mindy Erchull thanked folks for their support with the program activities submission and review process. The program is in the agenda book. It was a good year, but for the 2nd year submissions were down. She noted that we need to continue to monitor this and encourage people to submit to effectively use our programming hours. It was noted that innovation and collaboration was key to getting submissions accepted and some key highlights of programming for this year were discussed. Wendy introduced Lucia Puchalski, the graduate assistant to the Program Chair for next year. Wendy has some topics of interest from other Divisions and she will be putting out an email blast to the listserv about next year’s conference submissions and current topics and themes. Members should let her know of interest in topics and also let her know of other topics of interest. Submissions that get submitted and accepted saves our program hours. Those not accepted for collaborative programming go back to the Divisions for review. For this year, collaborative programs that were accepted overwhelmingly connected very explicitly to the themes—have to market these in this way.

Violence Against Women and Girls: Secretary Monique Clinton-Sherrod reported on behalf of Committee Chairs Jackie White and Pearl Berman. The full report can be found in the agenda book but a couple of requests were noted. 1) With regard to the National Plan to End Interpersonal Violence, there are remaining gaps in in the plan the committee needs help to make the plan more representative of LGBTQ populations, male victims, and offenders of nonsexual abuse, and minority populations; there has been a relative lack of help from most stakeholders in these areas; therefore, “if you want it in the plan, help with the plan.” There is some urgency to this. If you can assist, please contact Pearl Berman. 2) With regard to the work on developing researcher-administrator collaborations around campus climate surveys and sexual assault, anyone who has personal experiences on their own campuses should contact Jackie White. The committee would like to hear about those experiences. The committee is hoping to identify some “lessons learned” along with suggested best practices.

Task Force on Gender Inclusion: Chair Inga Schowengerott trying to work on breaking down barriers to gender inclusivity in APA and Division 35. Requesting help from anyone interested and you can reach out to Inga. They will have a roundtable tomorrow to discuss on various gender inclusivity issues. Committee on Academic Feminist Psychology: Committee member Isis Settles noted that this special committee has 3 key goals outlined in their report. She reported on their activities including meeting at Association for Psychological Science (APS) where they had an excellent panel. They are planning for 2nd Institute for Academic Feminist Psychologist and this will be in conjunction with AWP. They are hoping to get some of the AWP folks, especially more early career faculty. They will be continuing to work to identify funding sources for the Institute. They also have chapters for the book, Gender beyond Difference: Best Practices in Feminist Psychological Science coming in and expect revisions to happen throughout the fall and the final book to be sent to the publisher for early next year. Thank you to Nicola Curtin who’s done a great job as chair.

Feminism.org Website: Chair Lynn Collins is still functional and stable and can accept money for CEUs. They would like to diversify the type of programming that is provided on the site and also, anticipate hiring a web maven via a proposal through the Finance Committee. Please let Lynn know if you know of any good feminist candidates for this position.

Financial Reports

Finance Committee: Peggy Signorella reported on several proposals that have been approved and presented funding proposals for EC vote (see report for list of approved proposals). Proposals Requiring EC approval:

- Renewal of the Institute for The SPW/AWP Featured Feminist Science Symposia Series submitted by Richmond and Erchull for $3000.
  - Discussion: Mindy Erchull provided background of the participation in the Institute to increase presence of feminist psychology and that it was previously approved for a 3-year cycle. It would be financed at the same level for the symposium series at AWP which typically covers registration costs. FC requested for an extended report with information such as ratings for the session, number of attendees, etc. (This was approved by the FC with requested information.)
  - Motion: It was moved that this proposal be funded. V
  - Voting Results: Motion passed with all in favor.
- Institute for Academic Feminist Psychologists (Nicola Curtin, Kate Richmond, Isis Settles, and Stephanie Shields) request for an additional $5000 ($10,000 total), given these factors and the benefits to SPW.

  • **Discussion:** Comment that we need to continue to provide strong support for building the capacity of feminist psychologists. Need for stronger support, including financial support. Important for consideration to be given for varying needs and barriers of those who may need support. Additional information was shared regarding the way funds have been distributed previously to a diverse group of attendees and efforts to continue to find additional sources of funding. The financial issues are a major barrier that need to be considered. (This was approved by the FC.)
  
  • **Motion**—It was moved that the proposal be funded.
  
  • **Voting Results:** Motion passed with all in favor.

- Proposal of additional funding for the Transnational Psychology of Women Summit in the amount of $3900 to account for additional speakers and the symposium series that was added (Joy Rice, Lynn Collins, and Sayaka Machizawa)

  • **Discussion:** Lynn provided a brief overview of the need here. Original funding cost was $25,000 with $5700 contributed by SPW previously and this would be up to $3900 increase for SPW contribution to cover speaker costs. There were 12 countries represented with approximately 79 attendees. (This was approved by the FC.)
  
  • **Motion**—It was moved that the proposal be funded. V
  
  • **Voting Results:** Motion passed with all in favor.

- **Section 5 2020 Fundraising Campaign**—Section 5 would like to request that the Division matches dollar-for-dollar, up to $1000 per year, for every donation dollar they receive each year in the next five years (Catherine Hsieh). This will fund 2 travel awards (1 for a student member and 1 for an early career member) and also a legacy fund that could be a good way to sustain the Section and support members. Total funding request is $5000. (This was approved by the FC.)

  • **Discussion:** Khan provided additional information on the proposal and intended purpose to facilitate membership among students and early career members and sustainability of the Section.
  
  • **Motion:** It was moved that this proposal be funded.
  
  • **Voting Results:** Motion passed with all in favor. Finance Committee will be setting a regular schedule for FC meetings and there will be a deadline for submitting proposals to the FC. FC is also looking into a secure way for posting proposals to allow better access by the EC of the proposals for reviewing.

- Announcement was made for an early career activity that was supported and will occur at APA.

  • Finance information was not in the agenda book due to some challenges with APA accounting which causes delays with producing financial reports.

**Treasurer Report:** Peggy Signorella distributed the Treasurer Report and provided an overview of current financials. She noted that we are quite stable with current standing and no major changes with the financial outlook of the Division. Income from PWQ and dues and largest costs from midwinter meeting. Provided a rough estimate in the investment account but there are still challenges with getting this information from APA.

**Investment Report:** Jean Lau Chin reported that Investments are robust with about $2 million in assets across 3 accounts. Some issues with having various financial institutions handling investment accounts as opposed to a one centralized account, but we continue to be robust.

**Discussion Item**

**APA Presidential Elect:** Various members made comments around the upcoming APA Presidential Elect Candidacy, including brief comments by Dr. Jessica Henderson Daniel. Members were asked to give a vote of number 1 on the slate to Dr. Henderson Daniel.

**Issues around President-Elect and Hoffman Report:** President-Elect Olivia Morehead-Slaughter made comments via phone in regards to the Hoffman Report. She made a prepared statement regarding her appointment as chair of the PENS task force. This was followed by a question and answer phase and then a group discussion that did not
include President-Elect Morehead-Slaughter. The notes below capture as closely as possible the Statement and question and answer session that followed the statement. This is followed by a summary of key issues raised from the group discussion that did not include President-Elect Morehead-Slaughter.

**Statement:**

Thank you for granting me time on the EC agenda to share my response to the Hoffman investigation report. As all of you are aware, in 2005 I was appointed Chair of the Presidential Task Force for Psychological Ethics and National Security (PENS) by then APA President Dr. Ron Levant. The charge of the Task Force was to respond to military psychologists working in national security who had approached the APA seeking guidance about their role when working in the area of interrogation. Did the Ethics Code apply to the work that they were doing and if so, did the ethics code provide guidance for their role? This was our charge. My initial response when approached about this role was to explain that I had no expertise or experience in the area of National Security and no background or experience with the military. I am a child trained clinical psychologist who spent the majority of my professional time in a pre-k through 9th grade independent school setting. In September I will begin my 18th year as a psychologist at the Park School and as a primary supervisor and faculty at an APA accredited pre-doctoral internship program. In September, I’ll begin my 11th year at the Center for Multicultural Studies in Psychology at the Boston University Medical school campus. It was explained to me that I was being asked to chair this Taskforce for several reasons:

- I was a former chair of the MA Board of Licensure;
- A former Associate Member of the APA Ethics Committee at the time;
- I was the current Vice Chair of the APA Ethics Committee and the incoming Chair of the APA Ethics Committee;
- The respect and credibility that I garnered within APA across a broad range of colleagues; and
- The ethnic diversity that I would bring to the Taskforce

It was important that members of the Taskforce would be selected to ensure that the content area expertise was present. I found this reassuring and appropriate so that we could accomplish the work that we were charged with completing during our 2 ½ days of meetings. By the close of the weekend, we were asked to produce a report that addressed the charge of the Taskforce. With the above stated information, I accepted the appointment to Chair the Taskforce. I remained more or less engaged around PENS and the work around APA for 2 to 3 years, but then returned to my work with children, schools, and interns. I feel relief with the Hoffman investigation report. I thought that the PENS process from my selection of chair to selection of Taskforce members to the discussion during the Taskforce meeting to the drafting of the PENS report in its entirety was an honest and fair one. Because I believed this, I spoke confidently to colleagues, including during the presentation to the Council of Representatives about the integrity of the process. The PENS Report, APA’s investment in supporting colleagues in practicing ethically in their roles with National Security, and the importance of us remaining engaged in dialogue about how to move forward. All of this was with the understanding that torture is never committed under any circumstances. Clearly I did not know what I did not know. Upon reading the report, I am now devastated, deeply saddened, and down right angry and outraged. In the investigation report, I am portrayed as having been manipulated, used as an agent, being uniformed, and exhibiting weak leadership; but the investigation does not conclude that I was aware of or was complicit in the collusion between APA and the DOD at any time. Indeed I was clueless that any collusion was occurring. So given that I now understand from reading of the Hoffman Report, where does this leave me? I must accept that I am unwittingly participated in a process that produced a report that in 2005 until the retraction in 2013 likely facilitated harmful treatment and even torture to detainees by the DOD. For this, I am very, very sorry. I must also accept that many of you were likely influenced by my endorsement of the credibility of the process and report. So again, I extend a heartfelt apology for leading you down a path that was less than credible. I can assure you I only said what I genuinely believed to be true. Again, I didn’t know what I didn’t know. In hindsight, there are likely questions that I might have asked but that did not occur at the time. I am making this statement b/c I feel that it is important that you hear my response to this investigation from me in my voice. I know that I will continue to process the entirety of what has transpired for a long time. Though it was not my intent to participate in a process that lacked integrity, I accept that I unwittingly didn’t know. Had I known what I know now I would never have accepted the appointment of Chair of the PENS Taskforce. Hindsight truly is 20/20. As we all move forward, I assure you that I remain the person that you thought you knew. I take the responsibility of leadership very seriously. I continue to value deep engagement, the inclusion of diverse opinions, respectful and meaningful dialogue even when it is difficult, and an abiding respect for the feminist process for open communication and decision making. I thank you for electing as President-Elect of Division 35. I consider the opportunity to serve and lead this Division a privilege and
honor. Leadership always matters. The work of this Division is critically important and we have a responsibility to future generations of feminist psychologist to do it well. The good of the Division proceeds any one individual including me. How we move forward is a critical decision that the Division has to make. Now we must lean into the feminist process and trust that we will emerge wiser and stronger. Thank you.

END OF STATEMENT AS CAPTURED

Questions to Olivia and Responses

President-Elect Olivia Morehead-Slaughter agreed to take questions from the group. Question 1: There will be a lot of debate on Council and there are some tough questions. I would precede these by saying that there is a part of me that feels like I could have easily been in almost any of the roles that occurred. In your role, in some of the APA staff’s role, or in other APA Governance roles. The people who were mentioned—there are so many ways that this can occur without people’s awareness and with a certain kind of drift. So, I’m asking these questions but I want you to understand that context. These are questions that I think we’d all need to soul search to answer, but that said. I think one of the issues is that you talk about how you are portrayed and the support that you gave in the position of not knowing. I think there are people who are saying that they raised issues and we raised issues and it was incumbent upon the Chair to hear us out more and to entertain our concerns and we felt that rubberstamping was going on and their position wasn’t being heard or fairly aired. It’s a position that needs to be addressed.

President-Elect Olivia Morehead-Slaughter Response Question 1: Olivia noted that she has heard those comments and in ensuing years heard feedback from the Taskforce. When thinking back on that weekend and those meetings, she personally <statement not fully captured> She acknowledged that not everyone’s perceptions are hers—she can only speak for herself. She personally recollects that the discussion and discord (although not remembered verbatim) 10 years ago was that people were not silenced at the table and they could and did express varying opinions and take-aways even at the original meeting. They were not on one accord, but in terms of being silenced at those meetings that was not her experience.

Question 1 Follow up: Even subsequent years when folks made comments years late around the PENS Report—that’s when people started to resign from the committee later. Did you ever feel like it would be helpful to go back and review some of the decisions or relationships? President-Elect Olivia Morehead-Slaughter Response Question 1: In hindsight she would potentially do many things differently, ask different questions. At this point, it’s very difficult to say. In the same circumstances with the same amount of information, it’s hard to say if anything would have been done different. But different information was not available—she only knew what she knew and it was not what was in the Hoffman report. Now in hindsight things would be different, but that’s not what was known then. There was lots of activity post PENs and some she was more involved in than others, but she like many of others was at many tables with lots of debates, lots of dialogue. There have been discussion over many years about these issues. She understands that lots of folks have spoken out strongly and she understands the passion around this. She felt like the most adamant statements were being made about not supporting torture. She personally felt like the things that she was involved in didn’t support any of that whatsoever. EC Comments on Question 1 OMS Responses: Hoffman came to the Council Meeting today and while he said that his investigation supports his findings of collusion between the Ethics Office and the DOD. He said explicitly that he had no evidence that it lead to the torture of anyone or that any military psychologists were in fact involved in torture as a result of the issues in the PENS report. He made that very explicit, but he noted that he potentially could not know that b/c it could be confidential information but that is what Hoffman noted.

Hoffman also said that there are levels of involvement. While he talked about collusion, it was not collusion to support torture. That is an important distinction. Secondly, there were varying levels of participation of individuals who were noted in the report and distinguishing between what the report says and what individuals actually did is important. People have not fully read the report but are trying to interpret it which has resulted in demonization of many people probably beyond the point of culpability. The pain that you are experiencing is shared by some in the room stemming from when the PENS report was passed. Council Members also didn’t know and thought what was done was not supporting torture and there are mutually shared feeling of betrayal. Additional comments were made about the supplemental materials provided in Council and the process for recruiting people to do activities when they do not necessarily realize what they are doing and how insidious this is. Someone can start the process and get sucked in further and further and not fully understand the process that they are in. Question 2: We are all happy to hear that there may not have been as direct a link between the PENS report and actual torture. We have to still deal with the idea that the actions of the APA didn’t eliminate torture but they helped to perpetuate it in
some ways. But I wanted to speak to the other victims not just the potential detainees that were water boarded but the other victims in this process some of whom where members of our Division. People who stood up and challenged the PENS Report and other processes for the next 6 or 7 years have felt traumatized, battered and disrespected. I don’t think we can leave them out of this equation. It’s not just about detainees on some island far from us. It’s about our own members who have been battered and hurt by this whole process. People who recognized the manipulation early on and stood up and called it for what it was. They were beaten down by people in APA. That’s the other part of the process and we can’t just smooth it over saying people were caught up in it or didn’t understand. People who tried to make them understand were not listened to. Many of those members have been in contact and they are still impacted by that experience and their connection with APA the Division are still impacted by that. Now when you’re talking about in hindsight—in hindsight or where you are now, what can you say about that part of the process and those people?

**President-Elect Olivia Morehead-Slaughter Response Question 2:** In hindsight she can say that they clearly knew something that she didn’t know. They were clearly voicing concerns. It is not that she didn’t hear them or disregarded them. She believes that dialogue and engagement is good and they didn’t have to be on the same page but she never felt that she was disregarding them. She was not necessarily in agreement with them at the time b/c she felt the process for developing the Report was a good one and fair at the time, but that doesn’t mean she was disregarding them. In hindsight, she can absolutely see how those individuals would say they spoke and they weren’t heard, but she was never disrespectful to any of those who she did not agree with at the time. That’s not her way of interacting with others. That may have not been case for everyone, but she can only speak for herself. With the release of this report, there is clear support for some of those things that they were really worried about. She understands the concerns here.

**Question/Comment 3:** I feel for you and grieve with you b/c I know it hurts your soul and spirit to see what happened with these bad decisions. One of the biggest things that was observed with Council was a challenge with the way that it does business. There was a considerable amount of time talking about the infrastructural ways that decisions are made, the way Taskforces are developed, how the good old boy network continues to function, how volunteers like us who are not on payroll rely on APA staff, and how power is not shared. A large portion of time was spent on how to reconstitute how business is done at APA. You and many people are victims of a system that is already rigged and we as feminist can’t sit down anymore. We have to stand up and shout in not a lone voice but together. There has to be more attention to the process not just the content. Feminist process does not function in that way. I have hope that change will occur but they can’t keep doing business as they’ve been doing it. We have to step back to assess how these things happen and what we can do to prevent it. I don’t know that you can do it at this moment, but the road that you have traveled yields very important information about the systemic issues at APA which are a part of the core problems with things like this happening. **EC Follow-on COMMENT to 3:** We are APA and as we take on leadership roles it’s our responsibility too in how we operate in those roles. There are varying degrees about how people operate in those roles and we’re not all victims.

**EC Follow-on COMMENT to 3:** In Governance we are volunteers but we’re temporary. The experts are the people they hire who are on staff. We lean very heavily on those experts.

**Comment to redirect group:** We need to take questions directly to Olivia. We need to have a discussion about a lot of these other dynamics and really we should have them among ourselves without Olivia. **Question 4:** Having chaired an APA committee, as I read the Hoffman report, I had a very strong sense of there but by the grace of God go I. So I can appreciate the difficult decision that you feel yourself in. What do you see as the road forward for the Division in terms of healing the pain for members who tried to stand up but felt they were not heard or respected? How do you see yourself being able to play a role in bridging the Division’s loss of respect for our silence compared to other Divisions with whom we share values?

**President-Elect Olivia Morehead-Slaughter Response Question 4:** I see those questions as related. I think if I were those individuals I would be looking for acknowledgment that what they said was important and that we didn’t pause long enough to hear them fully and in a way they were hoping that we would have or should have. In the going forward, it will be difficult without first acknowledging. It will be difficult for us to figure out how we as one Division move forward. One Division made up of people who don’t necessarily agree or have the same opinions. It shouldn’t be expected that we will all think alike. We have to continue to be respectful of the diversity of opinions and to be inclusive of the diversity of opinions. We can’t let certain opinions trump others. We have to really engage these folks and utilize a feminist process. This begins with acknowledging the silence that you noted. Our
Division may not have been as forthcoming in the ways that others were in acknowledging these issues and things that were going on. Going forward we don’t want to see that continue and we have to be more cognizant and more intentional about our voice. This goes back to the feminist process and using it at every turn. We need to think about how we intentionally focus on the process and the people. That’s how we begin the healing and doing our part.

**Question 5:** You are incoming President-Elect of Division 35. Have you considered what you will do regarding this position? What are your plans with this position in our Society?

**President-Elect Olivia Morehead-Slaughter Response Question 5:** She has given a lot of thought to the fact that she is the incoming President-Elect of Division 35. She thought about this almost the entire time since the Hoffman Report came out and really thinking about it not just in terms of herself because the Division is bigger than just any one of its members, but in regards to the broader Division. The health of the Division is important and that it remain strong and a body that matters. Entrusting the leadership of the Division to her is a privilege and an honor and not an entitlement. She would want nothing more than to be an effective President-Elect and an effective President of Division 35. That will be her absolute intention and endeavor. She would have never taken it on if she thought that she couldn’t be an effective President. If she couldn’t put forth initiatives that she’s excited about. Thinking this through and dialoguing with all of us that she knows are invested in the well-being of the Division, she knows this will be a process. She is excited about the work of the next year but at the same time she knows that this is a process that APA is going through and that she is going through. It is going to be a part of whoever is in Division leadership for these next several years. It’s not going to be quick. So she think it’s important for not only her to be thinking about her role as a leader and in this process, but also the Division. There is no divorcing herself from the PENS issue. This will be a process and important for her and all future leaders to consider. She is not defensive about her role as the Chair and it’s irrefutable. It’s not something we avoid talking and thinking about and the EC needs to think about whether we effectively move forward given the fact of her relationship with the Taskforce. She doesn’t think this is a question that she can answer for the group. She will respectfully accept the EC’s decision about that and she thinks it has to ultimately be about what’s best for the Division. **President-Elect Olivia Morehead-Slaughter** was thanked for her statement and response to questions and it was noted that the EC discussion would continue without her. She was not on the call for the remainder of the EC discussion about these issues. **Extended EC Discussion**

**Extended EC Discussion**

**President Maureen McHugh** facilitated the discussion around the Hoffman Report and the Divisions Statement. She noted that there were 2 issues for discussion 1) the response from Division 35 regarding the Hoffman Report and 2) decisions around the President-elect situation. She posed the question of which item to discuss first and it was determined that the President-Elect issue should be discussed first.

**President-Elect Leadership.** Several key issues were noted during this discussion. Notes from the recording of discussions during that meeting were loaded into ATLAS.ti qualitative software for coding. A coding scheme was developed based on the verbatim notes and all information was coded by individual statements with that coding scheme by 2 raters. The quotations and their individual codes were compared for accuracy of codes associated with each statement made, discrepancies between raters, and other changes that are needed to determine and address interrater reliability issues. The information below provides **major themes and synthesis of key issues/comments** included. Appendix A also includes a table with major themes identified, subcategories within the themes and summary information covered within each.

**Key Themes:** A theme could be repeated at different times throughout this discussion regardless of ordering. The themes are currently grouped by the logical flow of overarching themes, e.g. approach to the discussion/concerns with process; Leadership issues and what’s best for Division; historical issues such as the social justice piece and views on torture; and direct statements of decision and vote.

**Feedback on voting approach and/or role of the EC**

- Views that it is not the role of the EC (or in the Bylaws) to remove an elected officer
- Discussion of the type of vote desired (e.g. vote of no confidence vs vote of concern, anonymous ballot or typical voting procedures)
- Concern with those voting not being fully informed in terms of prior notification about voting and reading of the Hoffman Report
• Views of pros and cons with urgency in need to vote—pro in terms of allowing for stability with leadership and not showing inaction and con in terms of need for more time for processing this critical issue
• Given the amount of time devoted to the discussion, a need to move forward with a vote

Concern with Lack of Feminist/systematic Process During the Meeting
• Perception that lack of inclusion of President-Elect in the discussion was not in line with feminist process
• Concern that approach was hasty without adequate time for full discussion, EC being fully informed, and processing for information for decision

Concern with President-Elect’s Ability for Effective Leadership
• Likelihood of President-Elect’s need deal with PENS report issues as a distraction to ability to lead and uncertainty of President-Elect’s understanding of the extent of such impact
• Potential conflicts of interest with President-Elect needing to explain PENS report but serving as Division head
• Concern with views of lack of transparency and accountability shown by President-Elect with actions following Hoffman Report release and statement and responses.
• Concern with lack of direction/visions for next steps from President-Elect.
• Concern with feedback from others who felt concerns raised following the PENS Report release were ignored or not acted upon by President-Elect and impacts on those members support for President-Elect as a Division leader.

Concern with What is Best for the Division
• Concern with the Division maintaining credibility if President-Elect stays in office given context of the Hoffman Report and need for informed decisions around this issue with focus on what’s best for the Division.
• Concern with potential loss of membership if President-Elect stays in office with questions of how sizeable this impact would be given potential limited knowledge by the full membership.

Concern Related to Social Justice Divisions
• Perception that Division 35 is not credible with other social justice divisions because of 2012 decisions and need to repair this
• Clarification of occurrences in 2012 with summary of the process that led to Division 35 making an independent statement against torture and clarification that President-Elect was not on EC at that time.
• Perception that 2012 statement was the same as the PENS Report and Division needed to support international rules and other Divisions.
• Suggestions that the President-Elect make her decision to stay in role based on the Division’s stance/response regarding the Hoffman Report and surrounding issues with other Divisions and her ability to facilitate the process/agenda determined by the Division.

Comments on Issue of Torture
• Concern that torture, the issue central to PENS, is getting lost in political management of this scandal within and outside of the Division
• Comments on agreement that torture is wrong and concern with excuses for such behavior
• Clarification that Division did make a statement against torture in 2012
• Comment on the distinction between President-Elect discussion and Division’s perspective on torture (which was stated in 2012 as against)

Statements on President-Elect Resignation
• Some views that President-Elect should resign given context but be a part of the Division’s healing process
• Comments on listserv communications calling for resignation.

Comment on Supporting the President-Elect
• View that the President-Elect can play an integral role in mending fences and aiding the Division in working through this process
• View that President-Elect shouldn’t be a scapegoat for accountability of Division and others or “thrown under the bus.”
Verbatim Statement for anonymous vote of all present at EC meeting: I have serious concerns about Olivia assuming leadership of Division 35 at this time.

Voting options: Yes, No or Abstain

Secretary Monique Clinton-Sherrod and Nominating Chair Susan Basow tallied votes: 30/41 indicated yes serious concerns, 5/41 no concerns, and 6/41 abstained. President McHugh: we are not going to take up the written response of Division 35 to the Hoffman Report. Does anyone have ideas with how the handle that?

- SPSSI did a good thing where there is an EC response. Suggestion of Survey Monkey to voting members of the EC to assess agreement with the Hoffman Report Response. Question of whether edits will be taken and suggestion of putting a deadline on the receipt of feedback. Noted that this is really important but there were concerns with the time limit. President McHugh will put the statement out again and request feedback back in 1 week.
- It is important that it is a joint effort between President McHugh and Incoming President Garrett-Akinsanya to finalize given the transition in leadership. Due to the extent of earlier discussion, additional agenda items were not covered. Additional Section, Committee, and Task Force reports can be found in the agenda book. President McHugh adjourned the meeting at 10:50.
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Email: santiagom@moravian.edu

**Stephanie Wong**
Student Representative, 8/15-8/17
Work Phone: 510-676-7911
Email: xnw233@nyu.edu

---

Section Presidents

**Martha E. Banks**
*Council Representative, Effective 1/2013-12/2015
Work Phone: (330) 836-7261
Email: Banks@abackans.com

**Natalie Porter**
*Council Representative, Effective 1/2013-12/2015
Work Phone: 415-955-2137
Email: nporter@alliant.edu

**Debra Kawahara**
*Council Representative, Effective 1/2016-12/2018
Work phone: 858-635-4613
Email: dkawahara@alliant.edu

TBA, Parliamentarian

**Wendi Williams**
*President, Section 1: Psychology of Black Women, 2014-2016, FC
Work Phone: 718-780-4369
Email: wendi.williams@liu.edu

**Yvette Flores**
*President, Section 3: Concerns of Hispanic Women/Latinas, 2014-2016, FC
Work Phone: 510-229-8284
Email: ygflorosortiz@ucdavis.edu

**Jennifer Vencil, 2014-2016**
*President, Section 4: Lesbian, Bisexual, and Transgender Concerns, FC
Work Phone: 612-625-1500
Email: jvencil@umn.edu

**Khanh Dinh**
*President, Section 5: Psychology of Asian Pacific American Women, 2015-2017, FC
Work Phone: 805-493-3577
Email: khanh_dinh@um.edu

**Julii Green**
*President, Section 6: Alaska Native/American Indian/Indigenous Women, 2015-2017, FC
Work Phone: 858-635-4847
Email: jgree@alliant.edu
Email (2): dr.juliigreen@gmail.com
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: mcoughm@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: juligreen@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” Mietzta 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: 858-635-6613  
Email: dkawahara@alliant.edu

Phii 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: 516-877-6185  
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

TBD  
Membership and Recruitment Committee, Co-chair, 9/15-8/17

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

Awards Standing Committees

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

Joan Christopher  
Chair, Florence L. Denmark Award for Contributions to Women and Aging  
Work Phone: 860-439-2336  
Email: jcchr@conncoll.edu
Kim Case, 10/2014
Chair, Mary Roth Walsh Award Chair, 10/2011
Phone: 281-285-3338
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: nbuchana@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: 414-410-6471
Fax: 414-410-4239
Email: amaustria@stritch.edu

Linda Forrest
Chair, Strickland-Daniel Mentoring Award Committee, 10/2014
Work Phone: 541-729-7440
Email: forrestrl@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
Co-Chair, Committee on Academic Feminist Psychology
Work Phone: 484-664-3423
Email: krichmond@muhlenberg.edu

Nicola Curtin
Co-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: Mehtac@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 Bookwala
Women and Aging, 8/14-8/15
Work Phone: 610-330-5285
Email: bookwalj@lafayette.edu
**Task Forces**

**BraVada Garrett-Akinsanya, President**

**Edna Esnil**  
Chair: Research to Practice Task Force  
Work Phone: 650-255-2679  
Email: edna@doctoresnil.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.julligreen@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-Diaz**  
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
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: 519-253-3000 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

Janet Sigal  
United Nations  
Work Phone: 201-692-2314  
Email: Janet2822@aol.com

Rosalie J. Ackerman  
Division 22  
Work Phone: 330-861-0049  
Email: Ackerman@abackans.com

Helen L. Coons  
Division 38  
Work Phone: 215-732-5590  
Email: hcoons@verizon.net

Gwendolyn L. Gerber  
Division 39  
Work Phone: 212-237-8796  
Email: GwGerber@aol.com
Additional Roles Cont...

Nathalie Mizelle  
Division 45, 12/07  
Work Phone: 252-744-6294  
Cell phone: 650-296-7599  
Email: mizellen@ecu.edu

Leilani S. Crane  
Liaison to SPW from Division 39  
Phone: 610-308-9666  
Email: leilanicrane@icloud.com

Holly Sweet  
Division 51  
Work Phone: 617-253-7786  
Email: hbsweet@mit.edu

Sharon Brennan  
Liaison to SPW from Division 52  
Phone: 917-353-8076  
Email: drsharonbrennan@earthlink.net

Join Now!
Division 35: Society for the Psychology of Women

Society for the Psychology of Women

Division 35: Society for the Psychology of Women provides an organizational base for all feminists, women and men of all national origins, who are interested in teaching, research, or practice in the psychology of women. The division recognizes a diversity of women's experiences which result from a variety of factors, including ethnicity, culture, language, socioeconomic status, age and sexual orientation. The division promotes feminist research, theories, education, and practice toward understanding and improving the lives of girls and women in all their diversities; encourages scholarship on the social construction of gender relations across multicultural contexts; applies its scholarship to transforming the knowledge base of psychology; advocates action toward public policies that advance equality and social justice; and seeks to empower women in community, national and global leadership. We welcome student members and affiliates. Members are provided two publications: Psychology of Women Quarterly, which is a journal of research, theory and reviews, and the Feminist Psychologist.

Visit the website for Division 35: Society for the Psychology of Women.

The Feminist Psychologist
Newsletter of the Society for the Psychology of Women
Division 35 of the American Psychological Association
750 First Street, N.E.
Washington, DC 20002-4242

Editors
Emily Keener, PhD
Emily.Keener@sr.edu
724-738-2529

Clare Mehta, PhD
mehtac@emmanuel.edu
617-975-9362

Printing & Mailing Coordinator
Stevie Wilson, APA

To receive the electronic* or paper copies of the newsletter, join the Society for the Psychology of Women (SPW; Division 35 of the American Psychological Association). Details inside back cover.

SPW members, send address corrections/changes in writing to: APA Membership Office, 750 First Street, NE, Washington, DC 20002-4242.

SPW Associate and Affiliate Members, send address corrections/changes in writing to: Division 35 Central Office APA, 750 First St. NE, Washington DC 20002-4242, ph: 202-336-6013, FAX: 202-218-3599, email: div35apa@apa.org

*Access through apacommunities.org

Submitting Newsletter Copy
The newsletter is produced on a PC-compatible computer. Submit copy in the following formats (listed in order of preference):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Format</th>
<th>Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full Page</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Half Page</td>
<td>$150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarter Page</td>
<td>$100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position Announcements</td>
<td>$75 (up to 250 words)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Via electronic mail. If an attachment is used Word format (.doc) or rich-text format (.rtf) is preferred.

Fall Issue: September 1
Winter Issue: November 15
Spring Issue: February 15
Summer Issue: June 1

Deadlines
The newsletter is published quarterly and reaches readers approximately six to eight weeks following each deadline.

Send submissions to:
empsychnews@gmail.com