The meeting was called to order at 8:02 a.m.

I. Attending: Eve Brank, Jennifer Groscup, Patricia Zapf, Dave DeMatteo, Daniel Krauss, Matthew Huss, Lora Levett, Margaret Kovera, Mark Costanzo, Marc Fondacaro, Kento Yasuhara, Nick Schweitzer, Gianni Pirelli, Jennifer Woolard, Monica Miller, Megan Galloway, Kathleen Kemp, Derek Hess, Jennifer Hunt, Alana Cook, Lindsay Malloy, Meredith Allison, Joel Lieberman, Sarah Miller, Amanda Zelechowski, Jorge Varela, Tracy Fass, Curt Carlson, Vanessa Edkins, Sara Appleby, Twila Wingrove, Tom Grisso, Rachel Kalbeitzer, Emily Haney-Caron, Lauren Reba-Harrelson, Angela Crossman, Chris Slobogin, Tess Neal

II. Introductory (DeMatteo): DeMatteo called the meeting to order at 8:02am. DeMatteo thanked Kathy Gaskey and the Conference Co-Chairs for their hard work planning the Conference. He noted that several members were unable to attend because of a snow storm on the east coast. DeMatteo reminded the Committee of the members who can vote.

III. Minutes (Groscup): Minutes from the August 6, 2016 meeting were presented for corrections. There were no comments on the minutes. DeMatteo moved to approve. All voted in favor of approval.

IV. Treasurer’s Report (Edkins): Edkins reported that the organization is in good financial standing. APA just sent 4th quarter numbers not presented in the Treasurer’s Report, which is based on 3rd quarter. The Treasurer’s Report is available in the appendices to the agenda. Edkins raised several issues for discussion. The first issue for discussion was the Research Committee Grant. Edkins did not receive full budgets for Research Committee and Interdisciplinary Grant Committee proposals. These Committee’s grants together were budgeted $52,000 based on the average interest earned by the Division for the previous 3 years, but the ultimate request based on the proposals was more than $52,000. Edkins reported that last year’s interest was around $60,000, which should cover the difference. It was suggested that the Research Committee could request more clarity in budget from the large proposal that is nominated for approval, which might bring the request down to $52,000. However, they are requesting a budget increase just in case. Edkins would like EC to consider increasing the Research Committee’s budget, including the Interdisciplinary Grants Committee, for the grants to $57,000. Discussion about the proposal occurred. Brank moved to approve the $5000 increase, if needed. No additional discussion occurred. All voted in favor. Motion approved.

Budget requests from the Committee Chairs will be due May 1, 2017. The Finance Committee will consider the requests over the summer and present them to the EC at the APA meeting.

Edkins proposed a change to the structure of conference travel reimbursements for EC members from the Division covering four nights at APA and two nights at AP-LS to three nights at each conference. Historically members were given two nights at AP-LS, assuming that everyone would be attending the conference anyway, and members were given four for APA because there
was so much time between EC meeting and Business Meeting, requiring extra days to stay. Edkins argued that at AP-LS, the EC needs to be here Wednesday night to attend the meeting, so three nights for AP-LS might make more sense. Edkins suggested that we determine how many nights EC members will be reimbursed at APA based on the scheduling of the Business Meeting, which can vary year to year. We can presume three nights will be reimbursed at APA, but we can add on a fourth night on a year by year basis depending on the schedule for each year. Edkins moved to change the reimbursement for the EC Meeting to three nights at AP-LS and three nights at APA, subject to increase depending on the scheduling of the Business Meeting and also allowing for more nights to be covered for individuals who have longer commitments at the Convention for the Division. No discussion occurred. All voted in favor. Motion approved. The change will begin immediately. DeMatteo thanked Edkins for her work as Treasurer so far.

V. Update APA Council of Representatives (Lieberman and Grisso): Lieberman and Grisso reported on business discussed by APA Council. First, they reviewed issues related to the Hoffman Report, including the allegations that APA leadership engaged in supporting torture. The Hoffman Report itself was the subject of an investigation, and that investigation generated a second report, which has not been disseminated. APA has been sued by a number of people named in the original Report. Some members of AP-LS were mentioned in the complaint. The Division will need to pay attention to this situation. DeMatteo will send around a copy of the complaint for the EC to review. Council went into executive session to discuss the lawsuits, which remains confidential. Council discussed the stability of the organization overall, and decided it was stable. Council discussed the apportionment of votes on Council. This year the Virgin Islands were not represented. Going forward all states and territories will be represented. Finally, there was a motion to prevent the GRE from being the sole determination of admission for graduate school. Council voted to have multiple indicators for graduate school admission.

Related to Council business, DeMatteo reported that Division 19 wrote a letter of opposition to the Trump Executive Order loosening restrictions on torture which could allow for enhanced interrogations. 44 Divisions signed on to the letter, including Division 41. No response to the letter has been received.

VI. Social Media Committee (Yasuhara and Appleby): Yasuhara and Appleby raised the question for EC consideration of developing a policy for live streaming at the conference. Questions for consideration include if we want to allow live streaming, what the policy for it would be, and what we would do about participants who do it without permission. Kemp raised issue of plenary sessions for which our contract with the speaker prohibits it. Yasuhara reported that APA has no policy preventing or allowing live streaming at the Convention. Additional issues that were raised included videotaping some talks to offer online later for CEs or for people who could not attend, consent of the party being taped, differences between audio and videotaping, taping people discussing preliminary research results, making power point presentations for talks available online, and monetary concerns for the Division if online availability of talks reduces conference attendance. DeMatteo requested that the Conference Advisory Committee and Social Media Committee get together and draft a policy to be presented for a vote at APA. Plenaries will be recorded this year if videotaping them is not prohibited by contract.
VII. Legal Scholars Committee (Slobogin): Slobogin reported that the Committee currently has five members, and their goal is to increase law professors’ and legal professionals’ participation in the Division and at the conference. As part of this initiative, they try to have one conference panel of legal scholars each year. This year’s Friday panel has four people on it, and three of the four presenters are law school professors. Slobogin reported that the conference is still not increasing in popularity for law professors. Slobogin has been advertising the conference on several law school listserves, and he is planning to advertise on additional listserves. He reported that the timing of conference could be a problem for legal professionals to attend. Slobogin proposed that more law professors should be added to the Editorial Boards of Law and Human Behavior and Psychology, Public Policy, and Law, which might increase interest in and publications by legal scholars in these journals.

DeMatteo provided an update on his Presidential Initiative to increase the presence of legal professionals in the Division. First, the Division is offering CLEs for the conference. Many sessions are eligible for both CE and CLE credits. Second, case law updates, which are intended to disseminate quarterly summaries of legal developments, will be sent out for the first time in the next E-Blast. Third, law school campus representatives for the Division have been working to encourage law students to apply for $500 grants to come to the conference. So far, four have been funded for travel to this year’s conference. Two of those four were unable to attend, and the other two will be here, coming from Vanderbilt and George Washington. Finally, Slobogin did a workshop yesterday for CLEs. The CE committee marketed the session to the Washington Bar Association, but only two lawyers attended. The Committee will reconsider whether the low attendance was a scheduling or a topic issue. Discussion of the issue included comparative pricing for CLEs in the area, offering special rates for public interest attorneys, contacting local law firms to ask what kind of CLEs would be useful, contacting large law firms about their interest in sponsoring events at the conference, recruiting local speakers, and working on our “branding” in general. Zelechoski reported that our CEs are very well priced, but the CE Committee will look into comparative prices for CLEs. It was suggested that the Conference Advisory Committee should look into the issues of local contacts and branding. Appleby reported that they can share anything that would be useful to the Initiative on Facebook.

VIII. 2017 APA Convention Programming (Miller and Wingrove): Miller reported that programming for the 2017 APA Convention was underway. Division 41 was allotted twenty-one hours of programming, including one hour of the EC meeting but no hours for the Business Meeting or Social Hour. That is the same number of hours the Division was allotted last year. Our twenty-one allotted hours is good compared to the minimum of thirteen. Normally we are allotted two poster hours, and this year we were awarded one of three extra poster hours by APA. We only had six hours of paper sessions, so some presentations were changed from papers to posters when they were accepted. A few presenters dropped out because of that. We had nine symposia, for nine hours of programming. The remaining hours were used for other programming related to AP-LS, such as Student Section, AAFP, and other programming. Division 41 has collaborative programming with other Divisions to boost our hours on the program, if APA approves those as additional hours. Last year we had one collaborative proposal and it was best attended session. The Division took the lead on one collaborative proposal. We participated in twenty-two collaborative proposals all together – seven were accepted, which is fourteen free hours of programming that does not count against our normal, twenty-one allotted
hours. Fifteen collaborative proposals were rejected by APA, so we found co-listing divisions to sponsor them. AP-LS can also cross-list programming with other divisions so that other divisions advertise it for us, and we also can increase hours by combining hours with other divisions, for example in a plenary. This year we had a total of fifty-three co-listed proposals. Dematteo thanked them for hard work making the most of our division hours.

IX. CE Certification Issue (Zelechoski): Zelechoski reported that the notification for certification for CEs was never sent. The Division’s certification will lapse as of April. The Division is able to offer CEs at this conference. Zelechoski will be submitting a new application for certification, which will be effective again by October. If there are any CEs the Division wants to offer between April and October, we can get a co-sponsor.

X. Research/Interdisciplinary Committee Grants (Levett and Schweitzer): Levett reported on the Research Committee’s large grant proposals. Twenty-eight proposals were submitted for the large grant. The majority did not fit the call for grant proposals because they were not innovative in terms of topic. Six of the proposals were ranked highly in innovation, and of that six, four were rated as high in scientific merit. A panel reviewed the proposals and was composed of the Research Committee members and Schweitzer, the Chair of the Interdisciplinary Research Grant Committee. This panel recommends a proposal to create a law enforcement human subjects pool and is a collaboration between the PI’s university and the local police department. The PI will act as an educator for police on science based practice during the time of the grant period and will conduct evaluations of officers in the pool as compared to those not participating to assess differences in beliefs about science based police practice. The panel felt this was a collaborative effort that could serve as a model for other programs. The Committee has requested information about several deliverables from the PI, including 1) a plan for providing open source materials to Division members so it has the potential to act as a resource for people thinking of developing similar programs, 2) a plan to ensure Division members have access to the participant pool, and 3) increased budget specificity.

Levett reported that the Committee has several recommendations for changes to the submission process for next year: 1) creating a two-part submission process in which a one page summary of the topic would be submitted and approved before the full grant proposal is submitted, decreasing the burden on the Committee of conducting a full review of proposals that do not meet the criteria for innovative topics, 2) requiring PIs to only suggest reviewers that do not have conflicts, 3) requiring PIs to disclose any significant financial implications for the researchers, 4) requiring the PI to have a terminal degree and allowing students to be Co-PIs, and 5) limit the maximum number of submissions per person. The EC supported the institution of the two-part process to eliminate proposals that do not meet the criteria in the request for proposals. Levett reported that recognition will be given to research presented at the conference that results from these grants. Levett proposed adding a committee member for reviewing proposals.

Schweitzer reported that the Committee received thirty small grant submissions, which were reviewed by the members of the Interdisciplinary Grant Committee. Many did not fit the criteria in the request for proposals. Two proposals received highest ratings. One is a mixed methods study of the legal experiences of women who conceive a child as a result of rape. The other is a
study of reducing cultural polarization to increase perceived fairness of judicial court rulings. The Committee is recommending both for funding.

DeMatteo thanked Levett, Schweitzer, and the Committee for their hard work. Wollard moved that we fund the projects recommended by the Committee. No discussion. All voted in favor. Motion approved.

The relationship between the small and large grant committees was discussed. The Research Committee and the Interdisciplinary Grant Committee were officially combined, but questions remain about membership, Chairs, and budgets. Levett and Schweitzer will discuss and propose structural changes for the Committees with budget proposals at the APA meeting in August.

XI. EC Approval for Changes to Committee Terms of Reference (DeMatteo): DeMatteo raised question of whether we need full EC approval for changes to Committee Terms of Reference. The process for approving changes to the Terms of Reference is not in the bylaws, but the EC has historically done it to make sure the Committees were following bylaws in terms of succession and selection of Chairs. DeMatteo proposed that the committee asks the President for change, the President brings the proposed change to the attention of the EC for comments over email. Anything that requires a vote after the email discussion can be brought to the EC for a full vote and discussion at a meeting. DeMatteo asked for any discussion on the proposal. No additional discussion. The EC agreed on the new proposed practice.

DeMatteo noted that some committees have a process specified in their terms of reference that has been approved by the EC for the selection of Committee Chairs. Committees without a process should get one put into terms and get approved by the EC.

Recruiting of new committee members was discussed. It was noted by several members that we used to recruit new committee members at the Business Meeting at the annual conference, directing interested members to a sign-up form available on the on website. Information was available on the website about terms for committee members so potential new members can see when vacancies are coming up and how long terms of service would be for each committee. There was EC support to put that information back on the website where people seeking to participate in the organization could learn how to join a committee because there was more interest expressed by members in committee service when that was our system. It also was suggested that the start date for all committee service should be August. Yasuhara and Neal will work on getting the information and the sign-up form back online. Committee vacancies will be announced at the Business Meeting.

XII. Brank Presidential Initiative Update (Brank): Brank reported that her Presidential Initiative will be focused on the “Society” part of AP-LS. Her plan has a two-pronged focus: 1) an outward focus on the potential for having a positive impact in the places we go as part of our conferences, and 2) an inward focus on the peaceful and efficient transfer of power and on maintaining institutional memory within the Division. For the outward focus of the Initiative, Brank would like to develop programs that allow us to contribute to the communities we visit as a Division by capitalizing on the special set of skills our members have. For example, we could go into all high schools in the area and talk about psychology and law, or we could do similar
outreach to local law enforcement, judges, etc. Participating in these programs also could equip members to go home and run similar programs locally. This is important because the next generation of scholars is interested in impacting the world positively, and it may be more difficult in the future to get people to come to the conference and listen to talks similar to what they can see online. For the inward focus of the Initiative, Brank would like to focus on the passing down responsibility and knowledge within the Division. For example, we could fund incoming and outgoing Committee Chairs to attend APA so they can transition like the officers do, and we could develop “guidebooks” for the committees. A transition plan could be included in the budget proposal/committee report each year so that it becomes part of the Division culture. The idea of a Division “historian” or “executive director” to oversee transitions was suggested. Brank is looking into I/O psychology for ideas to develop transition plans. Brank would like to establish task forces for both aspects of the Initiative. Please approach her with ideas, suggestions, and interest in helping. The EC was supportive of the idea for the Initiative.

XIII. 2017 AP-LS Conference Update (Hess and Kemp): Hess and Kemp renewed suggestions from the past that we should institutionalize and increase support for the conference Co-Chairs by the Conference Advisory Committee. The CAC should be populated as it was intended by past Co-Chairs and members of committees with special knowledge that can assist with conference planning. It also would be helpful to have the support of a standing group of students from the Student Section who are accessible to the Co-Chairs during the conference planning who could be helpful in doing conference tasks. Not all Co-Chairs have the same home institution resources, so involving the Student Section would be one way to assist with the workload. Hess and Kemp also suggested that the CAC and the EC consider staggering Co-Chair appointments for the annual conference, as we do for the APA Convention Co-Chairs.

Hess and Kemp also reported on their experience with the conference submission system this year. This year we again used Cadmium as the conference submission site. We did not use the add-on that was tried last year and was not helpful. The basic package of Cadmium worked fine, but it could be better. They are still investigating alternatives and trying to work with Cadmium to better fit our needs. At this point, Hess and Kemp suggest upgrading to the premium program package for next year’s conference. Edkins asked about the price difference and added features. Kemp reported it is about double the current price but allows people to “check in” to talks, which would give us a sense of what sessions will be most popular in terms of room sizes and scheduling. Zelechoski suggested having student volunteers count actual attendance in rooms because the App might be helpful for that but not everyone checks in. Edkins noted that the extra cost might be offset if we have people opt-in to getting a paper program at registration. Sponsors through the App also might offset the cost. DeMatteo reported that Division 42 offers various levels of sponsorships, which is something for us to consider. Kemp noted that various celebrities are getting more involved in social justice and might be interested in sponsoring some of our events. Kovera noted that we should check with APA about legal issues involved with our non-profit status and sponsorships. Gaskey noted that getting exhibitors and advertisers is difficult. DeMatteo asked if we need to vote on upgrade in the App now. Kemp reported no, it could be voted on in August. The EC recommended we keep the Cadmium basic plan for one more year until new Conference Advisory Committee has the opportunity to investigate some of the issues that were raised in the discussion.
XIV. Update on Dissemination and Maintenance Plan of the Psychology Law Evidence Database (Cook): Cook provided an update on the progress of the Psychology Law Evidence Database, a publicly available free database of psycholegal research for which the EC approved funding at the August, 2016 EC meeting. A database coordinator has been hired. They are trying to cultivate interest in the database by lawyers and policy makers. The website dissemination plan was completed and is available for review in the agenda appendices. Based on the dissemination plan, the website has been disseminated to many programs. Volunteers reviewing articles for the database have increased from 5 or 10 to over 50 reviewers. Cook reported that they will be submitting the same funding request for next year. Brank asked if there is information available about the database users. Cook will report on that at APA.

XV. E-Blast Update and Tasks for the Members-at-Large (Neal): Neal reported on the progress of the E-Blasts – monthly emails the EC agreed to send out with Division-related links and updates. Neal tracked the usage of the E-Blasts. As an example, the January email was sent to over 4000 people. Around 50% opened the email, and 10% clicked on content within the email. Only a few recipients clicked on the social media links. The biggest percentage of clicks was for the PDF of the Newsletter. Only 1-2 people unsubscribed.

Neal requested that the responsibilities for putting together the E-Blasts should be spread out over the Members-At-Large positions. She reported that writing the E-Blasts was a lot of work, and Yasuhara confirmed that it is a large amount of work. There was discussion of the future relationship between the E-Blasts and the Newsletter, the future of the Newsletter, and whether they should be overseen by one person, such as the Newsletter Editor, or multiple people. A replacement must be nominated for Huss as Newsletter Editor. Huss will bring up the open position at the Business Meeting. The EC will vote by email on any potential appointees.

XVI. Professional Development of Women Child Care Survey (Crossman): Crossman reported that the PDW completed their child care survey. Of the five hundred and ninety total respondents, sixty members responded that they bring their children to the conference, one hundred and sixty responded that child care affected their ability to participate, and one hundred and ten responded that child care would have helped with that situation. When asked what type of child care would be helpful, the least popular was child care recommended by the hotel, and the most popular were grants for care at home or for care at the conference. Crossman reported that grants would likely be the most expensive (estimated at $15,000), and the next most expensive was to subsidize child care through an external provider at the conference (estimated at $1,700). The external provider option could be riskier financially because the Division would be paying for the external provider, and the costs would only be offset if parents pay to use it. Gaskey reported that she always makes available a room for nursing mothers, but it should be advertised that this is available. Crossman requested EC input on what next action should be. Crossman plans to further investigate external providers and small grants, and the Committee will submit proposal and budget in August. Issues raised in the discussion included the limited access to the grants and how the criteria for awarding of grants would be determined. It was suggested that the process, budget, and proposal for a pilot program for the grant option should be included in the August proposal. It also was suggested that proposals for several options/resources should be included in the proposal for EC consideration. Crossman will
consult with Edkins and the Finance Committee on a reasonable range of cost for the program and report in August.

XVII. Nominations Committee Update (Wollard): Wollard reported that final nominations have been made for open EC positions. They include President-Elect (Kevin Douglas and Ira Packer), Secretary (Lora Levett and Chris King), Division Representative to APA (Jason Cantone and Matthew Huss), and Member-at-Large (Brian Bornstein and Melissa Russano). APA will post candidate statements on their website. Wollard thanked the Nominations Committee for their hard work and the people who agreed to be nominated. Wollard suggested sending out an email over the Listserv and in an E-Blast about voting being open so people can check to make sure they can vote.

XVIII. 2018 Conference Co-Chair Nominations (Dematteo): The Conference Advisory Committee reported to DeMatteo that they have approached some people about Co-Chairing the 2018 Annual Conference. Lindsay Wylie expressed interest in Co-Chairing and sent the Committee a detailed statement of interest. Nick Druhn expressed interest in Co-Chairing, but is concerned about not having graduate students to help. Haney-Caron reported that incoming Student Section Co-Chair and Secretary could help. Brank noted that we should get 2019 Co-Chairs in place. Kovera noted that there have been issues of representation in the past few years, in terms of the Co-Chairs being in the same area when we used to require a clinical and an experimental person to serve together. The CAC and the EC should consider that model in our selection process. People spoke in favor of both suggested candidates, and the EC feedback was to proceed. Brank suggested advertising 2019 at business meeting. Neal will add separate forms to the website for expressing interest in Co-Chairing for APA and APLS. Wingrove reported that she had not heard anything from the CAC about nominations for the open APA 2018 Co-Chair position, and she would like to nominate Evelyn Maeder. DeMatteo will contact the CAC to see if they can generate more names for 2018 and 2019.

XIX. LHB Contract Update (Kovera): Kovera provided an update on the negotiation progress for the new Law and Human Behavior publishing contract. She has been talking with two publishers that have expressed interest in making a bid for our next contract. She discussed the relative benefits of each of these publishers and her discussions with Jesse Raben, counsel at APA, regarding strategy for moving forward with negotiations. Kovera recommended asking our current publisher, APA, for a proposal for a new contract, letting them know that if we are pleased with the offer we could decide not to issue a broader RFP. Jesse Raben at APA is going to wall off himself and LHB’s former Managing Editor at APA, Rose Sokol-Chang, so that we have a legal and publication advice on the proposal we receive. Kovera reported that this plan will put us in good status timing-wise to have a completed contact before the deadline to notify APA of any intention to terminate our relationship, which is December 31, 2017.

XX. Adjournment (DeMatteo): Meeting adjourned 11:05am.

XXI. LHB Editor Position (Wollard): Entered into executive session for EC voting and non-voting members on the Publication Committee at 11:06am to discuss LHB Editor Position. Brad McAuliff was appointed to be the next Law and Human Behavior Editor.