The meeting was called to order at 8:05 am


II. Welcome - Douglas

Douglas called the meeting to order at 8:05 am. Douglas welcomed everyone to the meeting and thanked the conference co-chairs and Kathy Gaskey for all their hard work in organizing and running the conference. Douglas also informed the EC that DeMatteo was not attending the meeting due to travel complications, and Neal would be attending by phone, also because of travel complications. [Secretary note: Malloy was not attending the meeting due to illness].

III. Early New Business: Aronson (Guilford Publishing) – Proposal for a Book Series

Sarah Aronson (Guilford publishing) presented a verbal pitch to create a book series through AP-LS. The series would be new and separate from our current book series, and would be based on the pre-conference workshops. These would be far more practical in nature than the scholarly works of the AP-LS series, aimed chiefly at practitioners, and priced and profiled accordingly (lower price, paperback format, etc.) Similar series already published by OUP incorporate a CE component, with tests located at the back of each book that are administered by the society; this is one feature that may be attractive as it represents a service to the field as well as a potential revenue stream for the society, depending on volume. The EC thanked Aronson for bringing us the proposal, and the CE Committee and the book series Editor will discuss for further exploration.

IV. Keesey’s Modern Parliamentary Procedures.
Douglas reminded the EC of the members who are eligible to vote based on the bylaws but encouraged discussion among the entire committee. Douglas also reminded members of Keesey’s Modern Parliamentary Procedures.

V. Minutes - Douglas

Minutes from the August 8, 2018 meeting were presented for corrections. Huss moved to approve the minutes. All voted in favor and the motion passed.

VI. Consent items – Douglas

Huss moved to adopt the consent agenda items, which included progress reports from committees on actions taken to date. All formal action items were included in the formal agenda. There was no discussion. All were in favor, the motion passed.

VII. Old Business Items:

1) Yasuhara – Policy regarding AP-LS endorsement of studies:

Yasuhara is currently working on a policy regarding endorsement of studies for presentation at the August APA meeting.

2) Kemp - Conference Advisory Committee (CAC):

Kemp and the CAD are working on a policy regarding room rate limits for AP-LS conference hotels that will not need to be revisited in the future. They are meeting at AP-LS and will present the proposal after the conference is concluded.

3) PLED – Douglas:

The EC had requested more information about the timeline for the third year of funding and a plan about how to overcome past issues. This timeline was presented to the EC. The update included the completed tasks for the third year (making changes to the navigation and searchability of the PLED site), ongoing tasks (working with AP-LS EC to implement the marketing plan, launching paid advertising on LinkedIn, Facebook, and Policy Opinions, and using free advertising as well), and future efforts (following up with advertising and marketing, etc.). Discussion ensued.

Neal inquired about increasing the budget given the scope of the advertisement. Zapf recommended that we stay with the three year test, but we could possibly increase funding after that when we ask PLED to renew the budget. Neal suggested doing internal advertising (on our website, newsletter, social media) prior to more allocating more advertising money.
Discussion also ensued about a contingent fourth year of funding, as the results from the three year pilot will not be available prior to the time the request would work with PLED for the fourth year of funding. Edkins said that the Finance Committee would work with PLED to ask for funding for the 4th year that looks similar to the 3rd year of funding.

Edkins motioned to approve the 3rd year of funding as requested, noting that PLED should request a 4th year of funding at roughly the same as the 3rd year. All were in favor of the motion and it passed.

VIII. New Business Items:

1) Division 41 Leadership Nomination Process – Neal:

Neal initiated a discussion of our leadership nomination process, in an effort to increase transparency and the path to leadership for our membership. Discussion ensued, and the EC discussed that we should continue to solicit nominations for leadership positions (including self nominations) through the newsletter, website, and email blasts to the membership.

2) Student Committee Change in Bylaws - Hazen:

Hazen proposed that the Student Committee add a position to the Student Committee, which requires a change in the bylaws. Specifically, she proposed that the position ‘Diversity Liaison’ should be added to Article III, Sec 4 Officers, Sub g “Members-at-Large/Liaisons”. The Diversity Liaison serves as the Student Committee representative for Student Affiliates that identify with any historically underrepresented group (including race, ethnicity, gender, religion, sexual orientation, first generation, ability, and any other such group as may be identified), providing a voice to those students in programming, activities, and resource allocations decisions by the Student Committee. The Diversity Liaison will be entrusted with a responsibility to promote a process of self-reflection and critique, continuous analysis of power dynamics, and developing mutually respectful relationships amongst the Student Affiliates. The Diversity Liaison also coordinates with the Minority Affairs Committee, as needed.

Levett motioned to approve the amendment to the Student Committee Bylaws; all were in favor and the motion passed.

3) Proposal to revisit the Bylaws – Levett:

Levett proposed to create a temporary task force to work with the Governance Committee to update our Bylaws to account for recent changes in our operating
procedures and definitions (including new minute distribution procedures, member definitions, committee member selection and rotation procedures, etc.). The task force will begin work between March 2019 and August 2019 to present changes to the EC in August, to be voted on by the membership in March of 2020.

Edkins motioned to approve this temporary task force. All were in favor and the motion passed.

4) Proposal Modify Communication of EC and Committees with AP-LS Membership – Levett and Neal:

Levett and Neal proposed to change the way we distribute meeting minutes and communicate committee activities to the membership. Specifically, Levett and Neal proposed that the full minutes of the meeting will be circulated to the EC for comment by the Secretary no later than a month following the EC meeting. After amending the minutes, the EC will vote via email to approve the minutes. Further, abbreviated minutes will be created and published by the secretary so that members may skim a briefer version of these minutes. The process for creating the abbreviated minutes is proposed as follows:

i. Prior to the AP-LS meeting, those including agenda items will include a brief (2-3 sentence) summary of the issue they are proposing to discuss or for the consent agenda for the summary minutes.

ii. During the meeting, the Secretary will note any major changes to the proposal, action items for committees or members, motions made by the EC, and votes.

iii. Discussions will not be recorded in the abbreviated minutes; instead, the Secretary will indicate that discussion took place if that is the case.

iv. After the AP-LS meeting, the Secretary will compile the abbreviated minutes and will circulate among the EC for comment (one week) and an approval vote. After the abbreviated minutes are approved, the Secretary will submit them to the Newsletter Editor for publication at the next available opportunity.

Levett would also like to propose to include the ‘previous year’s accomplishments’ section of the AP-LS Committee reports in the AP-LS E-Newsletter throughout the year. Further, in considering new initiatives from committees and members, Levett and Neal wanted to propose that the EC should specifically consider adding a communication component for those initiatives that do not clearly articulate how the results of the initiative will be communicated to members.
In discussing the proposal, Brank noted that we could add to the template for committee reports that the reports will be distributed to the membership in the newsletter. Levett motioned to approve the communication modifications as proposed, all approved and the motion passed.

5) **Scientific Review Paper – Costanzo (presented by Huss):**

Huss presented on behalf of Mark Costanzo. The Scientific Review Paper (SRP) Committee informed the EC that at the March meeting, the EC needs to either vote to approve a short list of reviewers for the updated SRP on eyewitness identification, OR vote to let the SRP committee select three reviewers. If the EC would like to recommend reviewers, we would like a short list of 3 names and 2 alternates in case one or two of the people on the list is unable to write a review. The Committee also presented a list of possible reviewers. Discussion ensued about whether it would be better to select the short list of reviewers or let the SRP Committee select the reviewers for this round. The EC also discussed procedure that after the review through the SRP Committee, the paper would undergo another round of peer review at *Law and Human Behavior.*

Huss motioned to let the committee choose the reviewers. All voted in favor and the motion passed.

After the motion passed, the EC briefly discussed whether we should reveal who reviewed the paper after the review process. Zapf pointed out that she was not comfortable with revealing the names of the reviewers; others agreed.

6) **Website Editor Update – Wylie and Yasuhara**

Wylie and Yasuhara have been working together to tackle some of the bigger website issues and will be proposing a budget for updating the website. Wylie has been updating and working with the wildapricot site. In addition, she has contacted the committees about the possibility of using RhythmQ for submitting grants and awards, rating grants, and other possible functions of RhythmQ in assisting committees.

Brank commented that as a part of the Governance Committee and Past President, using RhythmQ in this manner would be a huge help in centralizing these types of activities. Wylie also commented that another project they have been working on with the website is to create an intranet for committees to keep documents, bylaws, and other committee resources. Neal commented that she appreciated the initiative to increase the professionalism of our website and that doing so would increase the professionalism of our outward appearance.
7) Proposed Undergraduate Grant in Aid Award – Conradt, Kois

Conradt and Kois presented a proposal to develop an undergraduate grant in aid award. Undergraduate students are currently ineligible for our grant in aid, however, there is interest in the award from undergraduate researchers. The Grants in Aid Committee provided a rationale for creating such an award, including many campus’s increased emphasis on undergraduate research, possibility for increasing a pipeline of undergraduate students who will be come graduate students in psychology and law, many faculty members at primarily undergraduate institutions who mentor undergraduate students, etc.

Conradt and Kois presented a rough outline of the proposed structure, budget, and submission cycle, including the creation of a separate committee to evaluate these awards. Discussion ensued.

Groscup was enthusiastic for the award given that undergraduate students often struggle to find funding to do their own research. Edkins pointed out that the committee was proposing a new committee; Neal suggested making a sub committee/having two sub committees as part of the student grants in aid committee (one for undergraduate and the other for graduate awards). Levett commented that she is enthusiastic about the proposal, and would like the Grants in Aid Committee to work with the Governance committee to establish how the committee structure would change and to work out the details of administering the grant. Edkins noted that it would be really helpful to have an office of sponsored research or a grants officer at AP-LS to help administer grants given that we have so many different mechanisms for doing so in our current systems. Brank commented that the Governance Committee is working with her on building the system as part of her presidential initiative.

Levett motioned to move forward with the creation of an undergraduate research grant in aid, and that the Grants in Aid Committee would work with the Governance Committee and Members at Large to create a proposal and figure out the change in the committee structure. All voted in favor and the motion passed.

8) ECP Report – Cantone and Clomax:

Cantone and Clomax presented a report containing results of a survey of ECPs in AP-LS created by the ECP Committee. The report was created for review at this meeting with the intention of coming to the decision makers in AP-LS and asking for feedback about the report in the time after the meeting.

Some highlights from the report include that the self-identified demographics of respondents were mostly white and mostly female. Beyond demographics,
respondents indicated extreme interest for more training and sessions on diversity. In addition, ECPs generally indicated that AP-LS was meeting the needs to ECPs ‘moderately well’, with few respondents indicated great or terrible on this measure, indicating that AP-LS is doing okay here but there is room for growth.

When asked how AP-LS could grow or what ECPs would like to see in our programming, they indicated they would like more information/education about how to go on the job market, including especially the non-academic job market. They indicated a need for peer networking/professional networking, help establishing collaborations outside of academia, addressing debt load, and would like to gain policy experience to see research translated into the real world. ECPs also indicated a great deal of variation on the content of graduate programs. This information could be used to create programming in the future. Discussion about the report ensued, including a discussion about the intent of the report, which Cantone clarified was to help other committees consider what programming to offer AP-LS members.

Cantone specified that he would send the draft report to the EC for comments, and would ask for a 4 week turnaround time. Cantone also specified that the data will be shared with the EC, and that committees are allowed to discuss the report.

At this point, the EC motioned to break at 9:34am. The EC was called back to order at 9:52am.

After the break, Grisso commented that the contents/tables of the ECP report should not be released until the comments from the EC are in and the document becomes an official ECP document. There was general agreement from the EC about this.

9) **Professional Development of Women Email List Access and Speaker Honoraria – Crossman and Gottfried:**

Crossman reported that the listserv for the Professional Development of Women Committee is currently managed through University of Texas at El Paso, and she requested that we move it to gmail to allow access to the chairs of the committee. Discussion ensued about listservs; Yasuhara pointed out that we do not own the listserv. Crossman pointed out that a more informal mechanism may be more appropriate; the committee wanted to maintain a listserv to encourage dialogue in the committee and with members. Yasuhara said that we could send out emails to subsets of people through wild apricot. Groscup opined that we might want to think about using the other sources of communication in addition to the list to inform people of opportunities, etc. (e.g., facebook, newsletter, etc.).
Crossman also inquired about the honoraria for speakers at conferences and the possibility of increasing honoraria. Kemp (Conference Advisory Committee Chair) stated that we have allocated $6,000 across all committee sponsored sessions for speakers at AP-LS, and that the cap is part of the larger EC conversation about having enough content spots for research at the conference. However, given that honoraria are generally allocated through the CAC, the CAC is flexible and would consider going over the $6,000 in exceptional circumstances. She also pointed out that committees have been encouraged to choose speakers from the membership to help reduce costs. Kemp encouraged committees with questions to reach out to the CAC.

Miller (Corrections Committee Chair) pointed out that their goal in bringing in speakers has been to reach out to non-AP-LS members to bring perspectives to our membership that are not traditionally represented and/or make relationships with folks in other, related fields. Douglas pointed out that the best speakers will depend on the nature/purpose/objectives of the panel.

Edkins inquired if there were other areas in which we did not need as much funding as we allotted, and Kemp pointed out that it was difficult to project out given the way that panels came together for the last conference, but she understands the point that we need to bring in speakers from the outside. Edkins pointed out that this is a new process, and that it has probably affected Corrections or similar committees more than other committees given they are used to bringing in speakers from outside of AP-LS. Douglas seconded this by pointing out that the Corrections Committee was actually originally formed to promote more connection between AP-LS and outside groups.

Crossman asked the CAC if they identified individuals who are willing and able to come to AP-LS, and committees asked for more money than they received, can the committees come back to the CAC and ask for more money when they actually make decisions? Kemp answered yes.

10) **Division Liaisons – Douglas:**

Douglas reported on an email to the EC from Kathy Pezdek. Pezdek was appointed to be the AP-LS representative to the APA Board of Scientific Affairs, and her term ended in 2014. She brought the question to the EC of whether we want to continue having a liaison to this board, which brought up the larger question of how AP-LS is involved with APA through these types of roles. Discussion ensued.

Brank commented that there are several instances in which APA would ask for a liaison for various committees or boards, and so this is not uncommon. Cantone commented that AP-LS is not well represented in APA and he would argue we
should attempt to increase our presence there. Neal stated that liaison work is APA’s mechanism for getting our science out to the broader APA membership, and if we don’t participate as an organization we don’t have our voices represented in APA. Cantone opined that we need to get more people to run for APA boards and positions, and Levett stated that this should be added to the volunteer drive we do at AP-LS.

Douglas summarized the issue by stating that this is a larger governance issue, and that to move forward we could either continue doing what we’re doing or assemble the information or a task force to try and make a transparent way of doing this. Grisso and Cantone volunteered to create a list of APA liaisons and possible ways for AP-LS members to get involved in APA for August.

11) **Corrections Committee – Miller:**

Miller reported that last AP-LS, the conference programming in the hospitality suite was not in the AP-LS program. This year, the issue was resolved and she thanked the co-chairs. King reported that it was easier to deal with these types of issues this year because of the transition to the electronic program. Miller also reported that the Corrections Committee needs access to the google doc containing potential member information; Brank reported that she will discuss this in her report.

12) **Dissertation Awards Committee – Evans:**

Evans inquired whether the Dissertation Awards Committee could request money for printing the posters of the winners, especially for those who cannot attend. Douglas responded that yes, this is possible, and that the rationale should go in the budget request for August 2019.

13) **Grants in Aid Committee Name Change – Golding and Conradt:**

The Grants in Aid Committee requested to change the name of the Grants in Aid Committee to the Student Grants in Aid Committee. The request was made due to the large number of “Grants in Aid” AP-LS currently offers, and this is to distinguish which award this committee administers. Neal commented that this is covered in the governance structure issues in AP-LS more generally, and the member-at-large working on this issue will come back with a proposal to reconcile all these things.

14) **Nominations and Awards Committee, Book Series Editor – Brank:**
Brank reported that the term of our current Book Series Editor is finished in August, and the Publications and Nominations and Awards Committees met to discuss the nominations for a new Book Series Editor. They nominated Brian Cutler for the position. Brank motioned to appoint Brian Cutler as the Book Series Editor with the term beginning in August. All were in favor and the motion passed.

15) **Past Presidential Initiative Update – Brank:**

a) For Brank’s externally focused initiative, the EC decided in August that she would continue in 2019 to organize volunteer outreach efforts in the local school system. She secured six classrooms at Benson Polytechnical High School approximately 2.5 miles from the conference hotel. The high school has approximately 60% non-white students. The classes are psychology and government and were all on Thursday morning before the official start of our conference. Within only a few days, almost all the slots she had were filled by AP-LS volunteers. The only financial cost incurred is an Uber group code to pay for the volunteers’ travel to and from the school. Both the Conference Advisory and the Continuing Education Committees expressed interest in continuing these outreach efforts past the current year. Brank will work with those chairs to relay the processes she has used and help them establish systems to continue these efforts in future conference cities.

b) Second, for Brank’s internally focused initiative, she has been working with the Governance Committee (the three members-at-large, Wendy Heath, and Brian Bornstein) to continue the work the internally focused task force started last year with the organizational consultant. At our meeting in August, the EC discussed whether we needed to think about hiring an Executive Director for the organization. Before making the decision about the Executive Director, we decided to have the Governance Committee work through as many of our committee issues as we could and present at the next August EC meeting whether we recommend hiring an Executive Director. As such, the Governance Committee has tackled several organizational issues. The big question is whether there are ways that we can build systems that will help us be better managers of our own systems. The goal of the initiative and the Governance Committee is to have a formal proposal in time for the budget. In addition, the Governance Committee proposed a new way of making committee appointments.

Currently, the President makes all committee appointments. Given our number of committees, appointments, and volunteers, this creates a bottleneck. Given our embarrassment of riches in volunteers, the google form is not idea for this, and a system like RhythmQ would be better. So, the committee proposed the following changes:
1) **Remove ‘involvement’ button from membership page.** Issue: The membership application call for volunteers would be useful if AP-LS was having a difficult time getting people interested in volunteering. Fortunately, AP-LS does not have that problem. The very low investment of clicking “yes” and the year-round nature of people updating their membership status, makes this a not useful practice. Suggested solution: Remove this option on our membership applications.

2) **Task the Governance Committee with the Volunteer Drive at AP-LS.** Issue: No one is responsible for the volunteer drive at and around AP-LS and this falls onto the president who has many other responsibilities at AP-LS. Suggested solution: The Governance Committee, with input from the president, should oversee and monitor the committee member volunteer drive. This will include advertising it in the newsletter leading up to and immediately after the March conference. The newsletter column should clearly explain how the committee appointments work.

3) **Work out quirks in volunteer application.** Issues: The current volunteer application has several quirks and issues. For example, the application asks an open-ended question about which committee would be the volunteer’s preferred committee. Many volunteers indicate that they will serve “wherever most needed.” This creates a confusing database of individuals willing to serve on any committee and it makes it difficult to share the volunteer information with the committee chairs because two (or more) different committee chairs could decide they want the same individual on their committees. Also, the application also does not separate student opportunities from non-student opportunities. Finally, the application does not require the volunteer to submit a CV or a reason why they want to serve on a committee (i.e., it is a very low bar and minor time commitment to volunteer). Suggested solution: The application should require volunteers indicate their top choice for the committee they are most interested in joining. They will then be asked to rank order up to three additional committees they have interest in joining. The application should require the volunteer to submit their CV and a short statement about why they are interested in serving on their top choice committee. Finally, the application should clearly differentiate between student options and non-student options. The Student Committee office and committee needs should be collapsed into this volunteer drive to decrease confusion. This should be done on a platform that allows more manipulation and is more professional than google forms. Possibilities are Qualtrics or RhythmQ.

4) **Integrate the Student Committee Secretary to facilitate student involvement.** Issue: We have a great deal of volunteers and many of those volunteers are students. Suggestions solution: The solution outlined in #3 should help increase the burden to volunteer and in turn decrease the number of people volunteering who will not take the tasks seriously and who are not certain they want to volunteer. The solution in #3 will also enable the database to be clearly divided between students and non-students. The Student Committee Secretary will then
work with the student database to provide recommendations to the president for which of the student volunteers should be appointed to the committees. The Student Committee can then also use the volunteer drive to help with their officer slates and committee positions they need.

5) **Streamline process of committee appointments, involve Members at Large and committees.** Issue: Presidential appointments create a burden on one person that results in a bottleneck. It also does not provide the committee chairs with meaningful voice in the process. Suggested solution: As noted above, the Governance Committee will be tasked with overseeing the volunteer drive. The drive will have an online application form that will close the first Friday of April. From that drive, individual databases of volunteers for the different committees will be provided to the committee chairs. By May 1st, the committee chairs will provide the president and their MaL with a list of who they want to serve on their committee. The president will work with the Governance Committee to develop the full list of committee appointments and share that with the committee chairs by the end of May. The committee chairs will then communicate the appointments with their new committee members.

6) **Create clear deadlines and dates for people to volunteer.** Issue: The process of selecting committee members is confusing and seems not transparent to AP-LS members. Suggested solution: The Governance Committee should work with the President to establish yearly deadlines and clear processes that will be shared with the general AP-LS membership through the newsletter and at the business meeting. There should be clear deadlines for submitting volunteer applications, notice of receipt of those applications, sharing of volunteer database with committee chairs, committee chair selection of new committee members, approval by the president, and notice to those selected and not selected to serve. Ideally, new committee members will be in place by June each year so that they can have an appropriate on-boarding process before they officially start their term in August.

7) **Involve non-members-at-large committee members from the Governance Committee.** Issue: The Governance Committee is comprised of the three members-at-large (MaL) and only two additional members who are not MaL. We do not want to create too much of a burden on the MaL with the volunteer drive. Suggested solution: Once the systems are in place, this should be a relatively smooth process that should not need that much time; nonetheless, this could be delegated to one of the non-MaL Governance Committee members. Ideally, the administrative tasks of data management would be completed by an AP-LS administrative/executive assistant.

8) **Advertise volunteer drive through social media.** Issue: For AP-LS members not in attendance at the March conference or knowledgeable about the committee
volunteer drive may not fully understand the process and it may not seem transparent. Suggested solution: As noted above, the committee drive should be described and advertised in the newsletter before and after AP-LS and promoted on social media platforms.

Discussion ensued. There were some concerns about the timing of the volunteer drive, ending of the academic year, and budget requests all coinciding, but given the timing of our budget year and appointments, it is difficult to adjust. Miller inquired whether committees could request specific information from potential committee members and suggested bifurcating the process so that the committee can solicit specific feedback from potential committee members. Levett asked about volunteers for those committees that may be unpopular. Evans asked whether committees were required to take the people who volunteered given concerns about expertise spanning multiple areas in her committee (Dissertation Awards). Levett suggested that for certain committees it may make sense to have multiple mechanisms for getting on to a committee (e.g., CAC, Dissertation Awards). Brank agreed and said those mechanisms still stand, and that the volunteer drive is to be more inclusive and streamline the process.

Crossman asked about whether the application includes a question about current committee involvement, and Brank stated that it does. She also inquired about how a committee chair is chosen, and Brank stated this was a separate issue, and that chairs should come from serving in the committee. Miller stated that it might be difficult to use all volunteers, especially if they only indicate excitement about one committee and there are no openings. Brank stated that it will help to have the new system because we will have the ability to keep track of multiple applications from year to year (so someone who has asked for the same committee multiple times could theoretically be tracked).

Brank motioned to adopt the proposal as written. All approved and the motion passed.

15) Presidential Initiative Update – Douglas:

Douglas presented items regarding his Presidential Initiative. His goal has to been to further increase and facilitate opportunities for students, ECPs, and to further promote a focus on diversity, fairness, culture, and human rights. In addition, he wanted to formally acknowledge and celebrate AP-LS’s 50th anniversary (1969-2019), and look forward to our next 50 years. His initiatives attempt to combine these goals, as outlined below in the “Informational” and “Action Item” sections.

To formally celebrate AP-LS’s 50th, as well as promote the role of ECPs and the topic of diversity, fairness and human rights, the opening Presidential Plenary for AP-LS was a panel consisting of some of AP-LS’s founders and early builders (Stan
Brodsky, Edie Greene, Tom Grisso, John Monahan), along with the latest Saleem Shah winner (Stephane Shepherd). The panel discussion will ask panelists to address AP-LS’s early influences, its mission, what it hoped to accomplish, what it has accomplished, and the role of human rights, fairness, culture and diversity along the way. They also will reflect on these themes for the future.

Douglas has also had informal discussions with Patty Zapf about submitting an edited book proposal for the AP-LS book series that will mirror the purpose of the plenary. She was open to a formal proposal be submitted, and vetted through the regular process. Each chapter will address a substantive psychology-law topic, with roughly 50% focused on its history, “what we know,” and how issues of diversity, fairness, culture, and human rights have been represented within that topic, and 50% will be devoted to identifying gaps in that sub-field, and providing a road-map for the future. Douglas asked for feedback from the EC on this project.

Each chapter will have to include, as authors, at least one student and one ECP, in addition to a leading figure in the field (which may of course be an ECP). Douglas’s preference would be to have AP-LS members as co-editors.

Douglas also proposed to create awards that that specifically address research and scholarship on diversity for ECPs, undergraduate papers, or dissertations. These awards, together, would honor, recognize, and facilitate research by students and ECPs on topics of relevance to diversity within the psychology-law field, and round out and combine AP-LS’s existing emphases on these topics.

Douglas sought feedback from the Chairs and Incoming Chairs of the Dissertation Awards Committee, the ECP Committee, the MAC, the PDW Committee, and the Undergraduate Paper Committee. He also consulted our Treasurer about our general financial state, not in terms of seeking an endorsement, but rather to rule out that it was an impossibility if finances were a major concern.

The new awards would be as follows (note that he adopted existing AP-LS language use to describe these awards on our website, etc):

a. The **ECP Diversity in Psychology and Law Research Awards** supports ECP research on issues related to psychology, law, multiculturalism and/or diversity (i.e., research pertaining to psycholegal issues on race, gender, culture, sexual orientation, etc.). Recommend $5000.

b. The **AP-LS Award for Best Undergraduate Paper on Diversity** is awarded to an outstanding undergraduate research paper that is focused on the interdisciplinary study of psychology and law, with an emphasis on diversity – issues related to psychology, law, multiculturalism and/or diversity (i.e., research pertaining to
psycholegal issues on race, gender, culture, sexual orientation, etc.). To be eligible for an award, the student must be the major contributor to a project on a topic relevant to psychology-law and diversity (i.e., the student had primary responsibility for initiating and conducting the project even though the project will usually be conducted under the supervision of a mentor). Data collection should be complete.

c. The American Psychology-Law Society confers Diversity Dissertation Awards for scientific research and scholarship that is relevant to the promotion of the interdisciplinary study of psychology and law, with an emphasis on diversity -- issues related to psychology, law, multiculturalism and/or diversity (i.e., research pertaining to psycholegal issues on race, gender, culture, sexual orientation, etc.). Students who complete dissertations involving basic or applied research in psychology and law, including its application to public policy, are encouraged to apply for these awards. Only students who have completed their dissertations in the current calendar year are eligible to apply. First-, second- and third-place awards are conferred, and winners will be invited to present their research at the AP-LS Annual Conference.

Discussion ensued. Levett mentioned that it might make sense to keep the ECP award within the ECP Committee and add another category for the award. Douglas asked if people would be eligible to win both awards, and generally the sentiment was yes. Evans inquired about whether there would be an award if only one submission was made.

Douglas motioned for an initial approval for these awards pending a fleshed out proposal to be presented in August 2019. Neal mentioned that Douglas could work with Brank and the Governance Committee to help create the proposal. The general sentiment was to move forward with a formal proposal.

McAuliff commented that having been Treasurer of AP-LS, it’s a little embarrassing to have so much money as an organization and awarding such small award amounts to our members. He mentioned that at Law and Human Behavior, we have been seeing reviewers requiring increased sample sizes and work that requires more funding, so we may want to increase the budget of our research awards to account for these broader changes in the field.

15) Conference Co-Chair Update – King and Scherr:

The conference co-chairs updated the EC about conference activities. They mentioned they had been ‘tip toeing’ toward going digital, and that the mini program was the bridge for this year. They recommended that the post conference survey ask about the approach and that we consider going toward full digital.
They also mentioned a mixed experience with RhythmQ this year. RhythmQ was very responsive, but they had to script several things themselves which was less than idea. They plan to look at APA’s proposal processing mechanism, and Arrendondo suggested that we consider other platforms that perhaps we’d rejected in the past.

King and Scherr also mentioned that the EC could be helpful in bringing in speakers for future conferences, and Edkins suggested bringing this to the Nominations and Awards Committee. The co-chairs also expressed they were appreciative of the student committee and past conference co-chairs for their help in planning the conference.

Brank brought up the business meeting, and mentioned that there would be an announcement there about the committee membership drive. Douglas and Brank reminded everyone to attend the business meeting and give a highlight for the conference/their committee. Brank and Douglas will also talk prior to the business meeting to coordinate the volunteer drive.

Neal mentioned that it would be ideal to be able to give access to internet in conference rooms and/or the ability to digitally connect people unable to come to the conference. It may be cost prohibitive, but it would be helpful for those experiencing travel issues. Douglas mentioned that any such request would have to be proposed with the budget. Yasuhara mentioned that we have a hotspot that can support up to 5 devices, but there are questions about who would be responsible for the hotspot. Douglas said he would put it on the agenda for consideration for next year’s AP-LS.

15) **Future Presidential Initiative- Groscup:**

Groscup gave a brief preview of her Presidential Initiative, and stated it would focus on leadership and pipelines, following Brank’s Internal/External focus. Internally, she will focus on a leadership program or pipeline to get our members leading in our organization. Externally, she will focus on increasing the leadership of our members in the field. She possibly will bring in judges, policy makers, etc., to get insight about what they need so we can lead more effectively.

Gaskey announced the location of the hospitality suite. Seeing no other items to cover, there was a motion to adjourn at 11:35am, all approved.