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The SBNCP has worked hard over many years and with the efforts of many dedicated members to build connections and strength within the society. The society provides members with opportunities to collaborate and share their work, voices, and concerns. There is a full range of topics and issues that members contribute to, including those about science and education, but also practices and public policy that affect scientists, students, and research.

In addition to “reaching in” – SBNCP has also “reached out” – working to recruit and welcome new members, particularly students, whose membership is free and who are actively encouraged to take part in the society’s committees and work. As one of the “single-digit” divisions of APA’s 50+ divisions, ours has a rich history that dates formally to 1944 and includes many founders in the areas of biological and comparative psychology. Continuing the division depends on maintaining our current membership while also continuing to grow in new members and a more diverse membership. I, along with our Membership Chair, Cynthia Crawford, urge you to encourage colleagues, students, and others to consider joining our SBNCP community.

Another part of SBNCP’s “reaching out” is found in its connection and collaboration with other APA divisions, boards, journals, committees, and conferences—many of which are highlighted in this and previous newsletters. APA Convention is one of the places where members connect, share their findings, listen and learn from the broad array of psychologists represented at APA, and provide the larger APA membership with a view of our science and perspectives. This year’s program chair, Douglas Wallace, put together an excellent and exciting program for APA Convention including talks, posters, and symposia that spanned topics in behavioral neuroscience and comparative psychology. SCNCP members greatly appreciated Doug’s work, as well as those of 2016-17 President Mary Cain and our Secretary Nicolle Carr and Treasurer Lisa Savage, among others, whose leadership and tireless efforts continue to be invaluable to the society’s work. Highlights from convention include Mary Cain’s SBNCP Presidential Address and lectures by SBNCP Award winners. The division appreciates the efforts of the 2017 Awards Committee, chaired by Wayne Pratt, in the difficult job of selecting outstanding scientists to honor with these awards.

Planning for next year’s APA Convention is also well underway, led by 2018 program co-chairs Amanda Dettmer and Nancy Dess. The chairs have spearheaded several exciting collaborative proposals to provide SBNCP members with opportunities for interaction across areas of study and interest. We also anticipate increasing opportunities and participation by student and Early Career Psychologists (ECP). I encourage you to look at the call for abstracts and not only consider attending convention, but also share the call with your students and colleagues. The deadline for abstracts and more information about 2018 APA Convention can be found in this issue of the newsletter.

APA Council of Representatives is another place where SBNCP voices are heard. As our council representative. Mark Krause’s report in this issue demonstrates, APA Council remains a strong source of support for scientific research. The recent council resolution reaffirming APA’s support for research with nonhuman animals provides one example. The Board of Scientific Affairs (BSA), many APA committees, including the long-standing Committee on Animal Research and Ethics (CARE),
and others all provide our division and its members with a bridge to collaboration with a diverse community of psychologists. The APA boards and committees, along with dedicated and expert APA leadership and staff also provide SBNCP with additional avenues by which a relatively small society can advocate effectively on a range of issues and topics that affect our science, students, scientists, and society.

Over the next year, I hope that SBNCP can continue to provide its members with valuable opportunities to connect within the society and to reach out to build an even stronger and more diverse community that continues and builds effective collaborations within SBNCP, APA, and beyond. The society depends upon continuing dedication by its current members and we welcome you to contact any member of the executive committee with ideas, concerns, or questions. The committee list is in this newsletter. We are excited to welcome (or welcome back) several new members to the executive committee, including: Graduate Student Representative, Erin Aldersen; Early Career Psychologist Representative, Jeremy Bailoo; Awards Chair, George Michel; Program Co-chairs Amanda Dettmer and Nancy Dess, and President-Elect, Michael Beran. We are fortunate that David Washburn will serve as Historian, following Gary Greenberg’s many years of outstanding service as SBNCP’s Historian and that Suzanne MacDonald will continue as Fellows Chair; Alan Daniel will continue as the Newsletter Chair. Over the year, the newsletter will feature the work of these committees and the many other members working to advance SBNCP objectives. If you are interested in joining any of these committees or proposing new efforts for SBNCP please contact us.

One final note to update members on SBNCP’s efforts in support of diversity and inclusivity in science and society. SBNCP has written in support of APA Council’s Diversity Working Group. In the face of recent events related to immigration policy in the US, we have also issued a statement that is included in this newsletter and that addresses ongoing challenges. I realize that there are a range of views about the role of scientists and scientific organizations in efforts to address policy and larger societal issues. In fact, there can be questions about whether such issues are “matters within our field.” I and others believe, however, that scientists are matters within our field. That is, the lives and the well-being of individual scientists – persons who are affected by sexism, racism, homophobia, xenophobia, immigration policy, among other issues – are a serious matter within our field. The richness of our science and our ability to identify and address a full range of questions of importance all depend upon diversity and inclusivity. Further, the pipeline of future scientists depends on the extent to which our field and our community both values and acts to promote diversity and inclusivity. So yes, given that policies, practices, and behaviors related to discrimination and prejudice affect individuals – some of them scientists—they are absolutely a matter for our field. APA and its divisions provide many resources to address, educate, and cope with discrimination and threats to individuals and groups. Among them are those at these sites: http://www.apa.org/pi/index.aspx; http://www.apa.org/helpcenter/discrimination.aspx; http://www.apa.org/pi/res/.

I encourage you to look at these and share them with others.

We encourage anyone with concerns on these topics to reach out to us and to other members for additional information, for support, or for ways to join in continuing collaborative efforts to address these issues.

“The society depends upon continuing dedication by its current members.”
The **D. O. Hebb Distinguished Scientific Contribution Award** honors a psychologist who has made distinguished theoretical and/or empirical contributions to basic research in behavioral neuroscience and/or comparative psychology. The recipient is expected to present a D. O. Hebb Distinguished Scientific Contribution Award Lecture at the APA Convention. The awards committee received three nominees for the Hebb Award and selected **Stephen Maren** at Texas A&M University as the recipient. Dr. Maren was nominated by Michael Fanselow. As written in the nomination letter, Dr. Maren’s research “has been foundational to understanding the synaptic and circuit mechanisms underlying learning and memory”. Dr. Maren continues to be an active, prolific researcher. He earns this award during the prime of his career.

The **Brenda A. Milner Award** recognizes the author of an outstanding paper in the field of behavioral neuroscience or comparative psychology. The paper must be published or in press and the nominee must be a member of Division 6 and have received his/her Ph.D. within five years of the deadline for award nominations. The paper may be co-authored, but the nominee must be the senior author and the paper must represent original work of the nominee. Two nominations were received for this award. This year’s winner was, for his paper entitled “Density triggers maternal hormones that increase adaptive offspring growth in a wild mammal”, which appeared in Science in 2013 and has already garnered 81 citations, making it a “highly cited paper” according to the Web of Science.

The **Clifford T. Morgan Distinguished Service to Division 6 Award** recognizes members of Division 6 who have made sustained and exceptional contributions to the Division in both scholarly work and service. The winner of the Clifford T. Morgan Award was **Charles T. Snowdon**. Dr. Snowdon was selected for the award due to his numerous service contributions to the field, including many years of service as editor of the Journal of Comparative Psychology.

The **Clever Systems Early Career Investigator Award** honors an early career psychologist (within 10 years of the Ph.D.) who has made a substantial contribution to the fields of comparative psychology and/or behavioral neuroscience. The Awards Committee received two nominations for this award and selected **Jennifer Murray** to be the awardee. Dr. Murray is a research assistant professor in the Department of Psychology at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln and was nominated by Rick Bevins.

The **Frank A. Beach Comparative Psychology Award** is given each year to recognize the best paper published in the *Journal of Comparative Psychology* – as selected by the Editor and Consulting Editors of the Journal. The Editor of the journal was invited on December 19th, 2006 to submit the name of an awardee by March 1, 2017. The editors nominated the following manuscript for the award:

Cordoni, G., Nicotra, V. & Palagi, E. (2016). Unveiling the “secret” of play in dogs (*Canis lupus famil-

The **D. G. Marquis Behavioral Neuroscience Award**
is given each year to recognize the best paper pub-
lished in *Behavioral Neuroscience* – as selected by
the Editor and Consulting Editors of the Journal.
The Editor of the journal was invited on December
19th, 2006 to submit the name of an awardee by
March 1, 2017. The editors nominated the follow-
ing manuscript for the award:


Congratulations to this year’s award winners —
keep up the good work!
What you might not know about applying to PhD Programs

There are many websites that offer solid advice on applying to PhD programs, but they can’t cover everything. There will always be something that you did not consider, missed, and have to rush to finish before the application deadline. You cannot avoid application stress, by being proactive, but it helps.

Do your homework! Read the program website, as well as the program handbook. Some schools have multiple programs, and different requirements for essentially the same degree. Make sure you are aware of the differences, so you apply to the one that is the best fit for your qualifications. Make sure to contact the graduate coordinator early, because they can offer a lot of assistance and information about the program, but they will be busiest right before the application deadline. Additionally, avoid asking questions that are already answered on the website, and be succinct and organized in the questions that you do ask.

Applications usually open September 1st, and you should fill in as much information as you can in September, because sometimes there are layers that are not apparent until you have partially completed the application. Discovering that you need to write more essays, when you are already close to the deadline, means they will be rushed, and not well thought out. Give yourself the time needed to carefully read application instructions, to avoid making mistakes on your application, and ensure that the information you provided is correct.

Writing about yourself is difficult, especially if you have not done it before. You want to make yourself look good, do not want to come across as conceited, and will initially include extraneous details that should be removed during revision. Even writing a general statement that can be modified to fit the application requirements will probably take longer than you think. Optimaly, you should have three statements ready, and reviewed by your mentor, before starting applications. This should include a statement of intent, a statement of personal history, and a combined statement of intent and personal history, which can be revised to fit the prompts for each application. Do not ignore the prompts or the character count if they have one, because part of the application process is how well you follow instructions.

Be prepared to be patient. There will be long periods of time when you will probably not hear anything. It is okay to verify receipt of documents, if you have not already received confirmation, but otherwise wait for them to contact you. Some schools invite quickly to interviews, while others take more time, but most recruitment weekends occur between January and March. It depends on the school, but most offers will be received within two weeks of the recruitment weekend. However, you may also receive one after April 15th, which is usually the deadline for acceptance of initial offers.

Transcripts are easily forgotten, and the rush fees can be pretty outrageous. Unless a school specifically requests electronic copies, order physical copies early, and have them sent to your residence. That way, they can be mailed together if you have multiple schools, and there will only be one tracking number to check for each school. It is also a good idea to have a set of transcripts for personal use, both for filling out application information, or for scanning if the application requests uploading of unofficial transcripts.

Letters of recommendation are important, and should be from tenured professors with recent publications. Give careful consideration to your choices, and be prepared to ask early if they are willing and able to write you a strong letter. Your best choices are usually the busiest people, and you do not want them to feel rushed while writing your letter. Be prepared to provide them with a copy of your CV, personal statements, and a list of schools with any information necessary for them to submit the recommendation at least a month or more before the deadline. Not only is this respectful, but they are sometimes asked to fill out additional documents, or may be directly interviewed regarding your qualifications. Remember that they are doing you a huge favor by writing you a letter, and do what you can to make it an easy process.

Check the website before contacting potential mentors. Some schools encourage contact, but some do not. For initial contact, keep it short, provide basic information about yourself, and ask if they hope to take students next fall. Do not rely on faculty webpages for research information, because they are often outdated, and their current research may have shifted focus. Instead, look up recent publications, and ask about their research plans, because someone who was previously a wonderful research match for you, may not fit anymore. If possible, arrange to meet them at conference, or visit their lab, so you both have a chance to meet each other in person. You are planning on entering a working relationship with your mentor, which will last for years, so finding one that is a good personality fit is important.
DACA:

Why this issue is important to Psychologists and the SBNCP

George F. Michel
It began with an email greeting “Hello all” to the members of the Executive Committee of Division 6 from one of the members of Division 6. The writer expressed the “horror, sadness, and anger” experienced when watching Trump scrap the DACA act. The email called for some sort of opposition to this decision (which, according to later news reports, the President poorly understood the act and did not consider the consequences of the decision).

Although an immigrant, the email writer noted, tens of thousands in legal fees for self and spouse achieved permanent residency via a National Interest Waiver. “I consider myself fortunate and I consider myself an American” the email writer wrote. “Many immigrants do not have these resources, nor may they have an opportunity to achieve more, to be more, that golden promise that America offers – and something we should never take for granted”. America provides no easy path for immigration but “we set the moral precedent by which much of the world follows - and I think we need to do better. We should talk about what it means for these immigrants who have a face, a story and a history in America, for some the only home they have ever known. We should talk about what it means for all subsequent generations of immigrants who come out of the shadows under to promise of protection to then have that brutally revoked – and what a terrible precedent this decision has set. And finally, we should talk to these immigrants so that we may understand better what this means for them and their psychological well-being”.

The email galvanized response from the committee. We must do something.

Former President of Division 6, Nancy Dess, replied immediately and with great insight. “We all know that APA weighs in heavily on policy, and its sponsorship of the March for Science did not compromise its tax status. We can speak up. Criticizing key policymakers for the policies they make (or don’t make or reverse) is not necessarily partisan...I think Division 6 members and scientists working in the field it represents (whether they are members or not) should be extremely concerned about many of this Administration’s policies, including those that create barriers to fostering and keeping talent and (re)creating a democratic society in which science is valued and aspiring scientists are...
not afraid”.

Current Division 6 President, Allyson Bennett, observed that “we do not think twice about whether political attacks on animal research, funding, regulation are appropriate topics for us [Div 6] to address. But we’ve not done as well when it comes to systematic bias, harassment, and political attacks that are broad societal problems and that also affect our community and its members”. She proposed that perhaps each issue of the Division Newsletter could include articles on “broad world issues that impact science, scientists, and society... [these] could range from historical (our discipline and founders include many immigrants to the US, many who fought back during the McCarthy era, etc.) to contemporary (including Charlottesville, DACA, and a full range of discrimination that affects many, including scientists and students). We could also consider how scientific illiteracy and attacks on education undermine society, the environment, and science”. As Nancy Dess stated “In these circumstances, silence is a signal, too, not neutrality”. The consensus sentiment was that a succinct statement should express our concern about this DACA decision.

To that end, I have drafted the following statement:

“At Division 6 of APA, we recognize the valuable contributions DACA students make to APA and to our nation. We see this sentiment being shared across the country and indeed across scientific disciplines. DACA participants are essential to the fabric of our community and the character and quality of our science. DACA recipients are our students, friends and colleagues (about 50% of DACA recipients are in school and of these, 71% are pursuing a bachelor degree or higher; moreover, over 90% are gainfully employed and contributing members of society).

Although many details are not yet finalized, we urge the Congress to make decisions that recognize and respect the positive affect and meaningful contributions that DACA recipients have across our nation. We hope these recipients will be allowed to continue pursuing their dreams. We also urge that Congress undertake the difficult process of immigration reform in a manner that recognizes that we are a nation of immigrants.

During this period of uncertainty, the members of Division 6 of APA will support to the best of our ability DACA recipients, their families, and our friends and colleagues who have been affected by the recent changes. We will be guided by the values of equity, diversity and inclusion. We remain committed to serving the best interests of all of the members of APA, our discipline, community, and country”.

We recognize that Division 6 is a democratically run organization and we are using our list-serve and newsletter to present this account and our response. Often those in leadership positions need to take action without necessarily knowing the consensus of the constituents but it is important that transparency be preserved. In the spirit of transparency, we offer this account. Votes can change leadership, policy and programs. We sometimes forget how important a privilege that is.

George F. Michel
I recently read an editorial in Science magazine that highlighted various aspects of academia that should be considered for incoming PhDs. I found it extremely helpful, and so I decided to recapitulate some of it here and to add a few additional aspects based on my own experience as a PhD student as well as reflecting on how that has shaped the way I now mentor my own students. I think that these “lessons” are worth reflecting on, as it is here that most of our careers are launched and where some may fail.

**Lesson 1: There are no stupid questions.**  
I remember hearing this axiom repeatedly throughout my graduate career – at brown bags, departmental symposium, conferences and even during causal lunches. Even now, as a post graduate, I hear it and perhaps more interestingly I tend to say it myself. Successfully navigating the PhD program is a daunting challenge. Previously, you were top of your class, and now, you are surrounded by equally gifted individuals. One unfortunate consequence of this is sometimes to remain quiet, for fear of “looking stupid”. This fear, in my opinion, hampers personal growth. Based on my experience, it is the ones who ask questions, because of ignorance or merely because of intellectual curiosity, are the ones who manage to actually learn and improve the most. Moreover, the ones who ask questions will most likely be remembered for future opportunities when they arise.

**Lesson 2: Never underestimate the importance of good experimental design and conduct.**  
My PhD supervisor drilled into me; “execution is everything”. To this day, these words still ring true. There are always aspects that need to be considered, weighed, and ultimately decided on when designing and conducting an experiment. One way of doing this is simply to ask, if I had unlimited resources how would I do this? Here, the broad picture is outlined and the concept to be measured is highlighted. Once that is out of the way, you have to weigh feasibility – I have a limited amount of time and money to conduct this experiment and given these constraints – what is the best designed
Getting Through Your PhD Successfully (cont.)

study that I can execute? Here questions of re-
duction of bias, for example, random allocation
and blinding to experimental treatments, are rele-
vant. Other questions such as the appropriate
budgeting of time become crucial. I have seen,
too often, students budgeting time in a literal
way. For example, an open-field test takes 10
minutes, so if I test 6 animals, I need 1 hour. This
is a poor planning strategy as it does not take in-
to account, time to clean the apparatus, to get
the animal and most importantly experimenter
fatigue. A general rule of thumb is to double your
estimate as, in the end, the quality of the data
you collect will reflect how well you have planned.
Moreover, as reproducibility of experimental re-
sults are now much in the spotlight – with in-
creasing scrutiny of methods – it is better to take
the time to get things correct during the planning
phase rather than to deal with explaining why cer-
tain things were not done during peer-review.

Lesson 3: Ask for help.
This seems easy enough, but I have seen stu-
dents who wait far too long before going to a su-
ervisor/mentor with an issue. Generally, in these
cases the self-perception of being a poor scientist
often prevents students from coming forward un-
til it is too late to intervene. When the student
does eventually come forward, and asks for help,
it is too late to correct anything, and there may be
repercussions for waiting too long to come for-
ward. And so, a vicious cycle ensues, where the
student is stuck between a rock and a hard place.
So ask for help – and do it early.

Lesson 4: Write grants.
I don’t think that this can be emphasized enough.
Grant writing is a skill that incorporates selling
one’s ideas, while balancing relevance, applicabil-
ity, and suitability. It is not an easily mastered
skill, nor is it expected to be. However, all that
this means is that it should be tackled early in a
career. Here, I am not talking about R01 or R03
proposals, but starting with something as small
or as simple as a travel grant or a workshop
grant. Also, get involved with your supervisor’s
grant writing, even if it is something as simple as
checking for grammar and references. You can
learn a lot simply by reading through someone’s
proposal. Eventually you’ll work your way up to
those R01 proposals – but you will be ahead of
the curve when you do.

Lesson 5: Engage in peer review.
Most PhD students do not have many opportu-
nities for peer review but I can guarantee you that
your supervisor/mentor does. Ghost peer-review
is a long standing tradition in academia, where a
student does the review on behalf of a professor.
Some journals even give credit to the student by
asking whether a paper was ghost peer-reviewed.
You will learn a lot from doing this, both in terms
of what is “hot” and what is relevant for your area
of research. You will also learn a lot about writing
a manuscript, and key aspects of evaluation for
experimental design and conduct.

Lesson 6: Engage in public outreach.
Everyone in Division 6 works with animals/has
worked with animals. With increasing scrutiny
about animal research, as well as increasing
oversight, it is important that you understand not
only what you are doing, but why you are doing
what you are doing and with which animal. I have
found that the best way to do this is by public out-
reach. More often than not, animal researchers
find it quite difficult to communicate their science
to the lay public. There is even sometimes a
sense of fear about what someone may think if
you describe that you are working with, for exam-
ple, primates. My simple response to this is to
accept the challenge, both for yourself and for the
animals you are working with. You will be sur-
prised by how interested the public is in what you
do. More importantly, you will help to build a com-
munity of openness, transparency, and advocacy.
It is your duty.

Lesson 7: Find a balance.
Sure, science is a calling, arguably more than
a job, your passion, if you will. But there is more
to life outside of work. With a limited number of
hours in the day, and increasing workloads, we
often are stuck wondering how we will ever find
the time to do it all. Generally, I like to think about this in terms of the law of diminishing returns. Consider Joe. Joe gets up, has his coffee, and then fluffs around for a few hours before getting down to work. He then starts something, gets distracted and moves on to something else. At the end of the day, Joe has been in work for 14 hours, but has accomplished close to nothing. He stays in work because somehow there is a perceived correlation between number of hours in work and overall productivity. Mary, on the other hand, gets up, has her coffee and plans an outline for her day. She gets on with the tasks on her list, sometimes managing to cross off some things while other times not managing to. After a work week of eight hour days, Mary goes home feeling reassured that she is making progress while Joe, after his work week of 14 hour days accomplishes far less than Mary and has to work weekends to catch up. I have seen both of these kinds of people and variants in between – but ultimately – the key is to be honest with yourself. One of my colleagues challenged me to an efficiency challenge when I was a graduate student, where I enumerated the amount of time I spent doing various tasks. By doing this, I was able to identify where I could be more efficient and then able to increase my overall productivity. I was also able to leave work earlier, have more time to spend with my spouse and with friends, and to have some down time. I think it cannot be emphasized enough the value of having time in which you turn off from work – particularly when it comes to your own mental well-being. But again, this can only be achieved if you are honest with yourself with respect to how your time is actually spent.

---

Division 6 is home to APA's 2017-18 Executive Branch Science Policy Fellow!

Dr. Amanda M. Dettmer started her Fellowship in September and will be working over the next year at the Institute of Education Sciences within the U.S. Department of Education. Over the next year, Dr. Dettmer aims to bridge education research and policy with psychological science. She will rely upon her comparative psychology and behavioral neuroscience expertise, which includes over 15 years studying macaque models of child development, to expose education researchers and practitioners to cognitive science and research surrounding early brain development and early life experiences.

Amanda M. Dettmer, Ph.D.  
Executive Branch Science Policy Fellow, American Psychological Association  
Institute of Education Sciences  
Department of Education  
Washington, DC
As I wind down my first term representing Division 6 on Council (and begin a second term), I will say it is a relief that our discussions and work are almost exclusively focused on matters unrelated to the Hoffman Report and independent review. May this continue. We met in Washington DC during the APA convention August 2nd and 4th. Our new APA CEO Arthur Evans addressed Council. He charged us with changing our focus from internal issues that consume us, and to direct our energies instead at the populations and people we serve. Dr Evans described a vision for increasing the visibility of psychology and its scientific base. I hope actions at the level of the CEO, board, council, divisions and membership follow through on this vision. More about Dr Evan’s appointment as APA CEO can be found here.

Highly relevant to SBNCP members was the Council vote to reaffirm the APA’s support of animal research. The previous resolution was passed in 1990 and had since been archived. Council voted overwhelmingly in support of the motion [93.6%, (160) YES, 2.9% (5) NO. 3.5% (6) Abstain]. A Council member had moved to remove this item from the consent agenda, which raised the possibility of the motion being discussed on the Council floor. Items are removed from the consent agenda on a regular basis and for many reasons, ranging from simple requests for clarification to substantive questioning if not disapproval of the motion or item. I have witnessed moves to remove items from the consent agenda consume huge amounts of Council time and energy. Some nimble work by members of the Science Directorate, CARES, and our president Allyson Bennett helped us avoid this possibility. It was a pleasure to see such resounding support from Council for the ethical and hu-
mane research we do with animal subjects. The importance of the reaffirmation cannot be overstated. Threats and attacks on scientists who conduct humane, ethical, and approved research on animals have become all too common. The vote sends a clear message on behalf of Council. However, efforts to support animal research and our scientists will be ongoing and require our sustained energy, efforts to educate, and assistance from Division 6 and our colleagues.

Treasurer Jean Carter provided a general overview on the APA budget. Dr. Carter stated that membership numbers are leveling (rather than continuing to decline), revenue from journals and real estate continues to be strong, and generally speaking our finances are in good shape. (This is not to suggest that there is nothing to see here and that we move on. If you feel so inclined please review the financial report that will be out in an upcoming American Psychologist.) President Tony Puente chimed in that our drop in membership around and following the publication of the IR was due to changes in how members were counted, and not because of fallout related to negative publicity and image of the APA. Although I would like to believe this, our plural anecdotes about colleagues who refuse to be involved with the APA because of what was revealed in the Hoffman report cannot be ignored, regardless of how one feels about its conclusions, imperfections, and any misgivings.

A major issue we discussed concerned whether the APA should support and engage in accreditation, training and licensure for Masters level graduates in psychology. The Board asked Council to engage in group discussions and brainstorm pros and cons of this, and to provide feedback during a two-hour work session. The overall sense is that Council approves of the Board continuing to pursue this possibility. There are huge implications, as you can imagine. Mental health services are currently provided by Masters level graduates of accredited mental health counseling and social work programs (for more information see the workgroup report). We shall see how serious the APA is about pursuing this major undertaking. It has been under consideration for decades. I welcome input from any Division 6 members, especially those who are in private practice.

In August I sent out a brief survey to the Division 6 listserv about a possible upcoming motion to allow Council representatives to vote on bylaw changes, rather than APA members. The intent was to streamline the process and save costs. Voter turnout tends to be very low. Thank you for those who completed the survey (n=43) and for providing some written comments. Twenty-four (55.81%) respondents voted YES, 16 (37.21%) voted NO, and 3 (6.98%) were UNSURE. Based on a simple majority it appears that those who responded (thank you!) favor the move. However, I did not see passionate pleas for me to vote YES should the measure come to the floor for vote, but did find some passionate pleas to vote NO. Generally, it sounds like those in the latter category disagree that member driven organizations like the APA should relinquish their right to vote on organizational bylaws. I will take all this into consideration should this come up for vote this coming winter.

Membership numbers are an ongoing concern with APA, as well as diversity representation within our divisions and on Council. This came up in Council as well as within Division 6 business discussions at the meeting. I think there will be great value in combining our efforts to bring in new members with broadening diversity with our Division. This of course includes age-related diversity (e.g., reduce our median member age), and diversity in other forms. I hope to have more to share on this, and recommendations to make, after the Winter 2018 meeting. In the meantime I believe we will be seeing more discussion of the critical role of diversity within APA and our Division.

I am a member-at-large for the CASAP caucus and attended the meeting held in DC. A few notes relevant to our division:

The APA is partnering with the Center for Open Science and journal editors will have the option to invite study preregistration and data and materials sharing. Those who support this will likely be thrilled to
hear this, and might respond with “...it's about time”. Many of course have objections or reservations to how preregistration and data sharing are implemented. I welcome more discussion of this on the Division 6 listserv. I think it is a conversation we should be having with each other.

Dr Kurtzman also spoke regarding proposed NIH revision to the definition of clinical trials, and the proposal to categorize most basic animal research as constituting clinical trials. Strong objections to this have been voiced by many, including from those of us in Division 6. Dr Kurtzman stated that the APA in conjunction with the Federation of Associations in Behavioral and Brain Sciences have communicated their concerns to the NIH leadership.

This past winter Council voted to approve the new clinical practice guidelines for PTSD, and the new proposed clinical guidelines for obesity in childhood/adolescence and on depression across the lifespan will be available for comment this fall, and will go up for vote during the winter Council meeting.

Please do not hesitate to get in touch if you have questions about Council, would like to offer input regarding my representation of our division, or have any items you would like to see come before Council.

Best regards,

Mark Krause

---

**John LaMuth: New Book Chapter on Conflict Resolution**

*John LaMuth* has a newly-published invited book chapter release on conflict resolution contained within the compendium volume *Approaches to Conflict: Theoretical, Interpersonal, and Discursive Dynamics.*

Edited by Barbara Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk; Paul A. Wilson and Stephen M. Croucher
Contributions by Olga L. Antineskul; Alberto M. Albuquerque; François Bogacz; Ewa Bogdanowska-Jakubowska; Piotr Cap; Kara Chan; Zhijuan Chen; Michał Chmielecki; Stephen M. Croucher; Maria Holubowicz; Olga M. Klimecki; John E. LaMuth; Barbara Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk; Yu Leung Ng; Tatiana M. Permyakova; Diyako Rahmani; Łukasz Sułkowski; Paul A. Wilson and Jingjie Zhang
[https://rowman.com/isbn/9781498535465](https://rowman.com/isbn/9781498535465)

A complete text version of LaMuth's chapter is can be found [HERE](https://rowman.com/isbn/9781498535465).
Editor’s Page
And... that’s a wrap! On a personal note, it’s been an exciting semester for me as I have changed institutions. The worst part about it is losing my beloved custom license plates! I hope that no matter where you are, you can take opportunities for renewal as they arise—pick up a different class, take on a tangential project, or otherwise step outside of the routine or monotony. Sometimes a change can be refreshing.

Yours truly,
-Alan

We are in constant need of news and articles, so I hope you’ll consider contributing. We count on our members to create high quality content for the enjoyment of the SBNCP community.

Contribute any time by sending content to: editorialandaniel@gmail.com.

Alan M. Daniel
BNCP Editor
Assistant Professor of Psychology
Texas A&M University—San Antonio
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DON’T FORGET

DRINK WATER.
GET SUNLIGHT.
YOU’RE BASICALLY A HOUSE PLANT WITH MORE COMPLICATED EMOTIONS.
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