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II. Welcome - Douglas

Douglas called the meeting to order at 4:07pm. 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 Division Program. Douglas also thanked everyone for participating in Gaskey’s evaluation and reported that he met with her earlier in the day to deliver the positive results. He also noted the hospitality suite was in room 2742 in the Marriott Marquis.

III. 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.

IV. Consent items – Douglas

Levett 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.

V. Minutes - Douglas

Minutes from the March 2019 meeting were presented for corrections. Edkins moved to approve the minutes. All voted in favor and the motion passed.

VI. Conference, Logistics, Reminders, Announcements - Gaskey
Travel. Gaskey reminded the EC that if EC members are planning on using APA Travel that they need to send Gaskey their names prior to traveling. Gaskey and Edkins also informed the EC that APA’s new policy is that reimbursements have to be sent to APA within 45 days of travel to streamline the process. After 45 days reimbursements are much more difficult to process.

Business meeting and social. Gaskey also reminded the EC that the Business Meeting was scheduled for the George Pullman room at the Marriott Marquis, and the social would follow in the adjacent room.

Conference Advisory Committee Announcements. Kathleen Kemp (Conference Advisory Committee Chair, not in attendance) also sent an announcement that the call for 2021 conference co-chairs went out to the membership. There was not an experimental co-chair who was identified to serve. The 2021 conference is scheduled for the first week of March in Denver, Colorado.

General Reminders. Gaskey reminded the EC to reserve rooms for APLS quickly once the room block becomes available. She also reminded the EC not to register for the conference as she does that for them.

VII. Code of Ethics – Douglas

Douglas notified the EC that APA is currently revising the Code of Ethics, and to contact him to be involved.

VIII. Wrightsman Award – Douglas

Douglas informed the EC that Larry Wrightsman recently passed away. Douglas received a request from Ron Roesch to name an award after him given his impact on the field and APLS as an organization. Douglas suggested the undergraduate paper award given Wrightsman’s contributions to undergraduate education (especially through his frequently used psychology and law textbook). Kovera commented that the book award might be the most appropriate given Wrightsman’s vast contribution to the field through books. Several members of the EC agreed. Levett motioned to name the book award the Lawrence S. Wrightsman Book Award. All approved.

IX. Changes to the presentation format for the APA 2020 Convention – Anumba

Anumba informed the EC that The Board of Convention Affairs has decided that as of the 2020 Convention, no more individual paper presentations will be accepted. Instead, the presentation format that are acceptable will include symposia, skill building sessions, discussions, and individual proposals presented using a poster format. The APA Co-chairs wanted to bring this to the attention of the EC for discussion about the likely impact this will have on division participation in the Convention.
Cutler brought up the idea that this change in format may have implications for APLS in that we may want to increase posters, data blitz, or individual papers at APLS given that APA will be a smaller outlet for paper presentations. Yasuhara mentioned that it might be confusing to announce this at the same time as the call for papers for APLS. Levett inquired whether we could review things prior to APA and organize into symposia before that deadline. Cutler opined that it would be better to announce the change and allow people to organize individually. Groscup mentioned that we could task the CAC to make recommendations about whether to change APLS sessions and/or change APA conference procedures based on this change. Douglas agreed, and stated that the CAC will discuss with the co-chairs and make recommendations, and Patry will work with the APA Co-Chairs to put an announcement in the newsletter.

X. Update on the Undergraduate Grant in Aid Award – Conradt (not present) and Kois

The Grant in Aid Committee updated the EC about their proposal to add an undergraduate grant in aid. The committee proposed adding the responsibility of reviewing and awarding these grants to the current Undergraduate Paper Award Committee. Alternatively, the option would be to form a new committee just for reviewing and deciding the undergraduate grant in aid. They are planning on proposing a $5000 budget for the 2020-2021 budget cycle. Neal mentioned that she liked the idea and that this dovetails nicely with her work on the committee structure/bylaws even though she’s rotating off. The Governance Committee will consider this in working on committee restructuring.

XI. Website updates – Wylie

Wylie presented two proposals from two different companies to assist with website redesign. One proposal was for $1700, and the other was for $5000. The EC expressed concern because the amount of the proposals were so different, although the EC was very supportive of the update. Discussion ensued.

Neal moved to approve the update of the website, and up to $5000 to improve the website. Edkins asked for more clarification on what the additional money would be used for; Wylie expressed that the proposal for $1700 would likely work well. Levett asked if we could approve the $1700 with a cushion because we were concerned the $1700 was under budgeted. Patry offered a friendly amendment to Neal’s motion to allow a buffer and give Wylie discretion on how to use the extra funds. Edkins further amended the motion to allow for $2200 in website expenses, including the $1700 in the proposal and an additional $500 for a possible buffer. All approved.
Wylie also brought a proposal from RhythmQ to help with handling reviews and grant awards, a need that has been identified and discussed by the EC at the past several meetings. The proposal for handling all the awards was roughly $13000. Wylie proposed to pilot test the system with two types of awards: Research grants and committee volunteers. Discussion ensued.

Brank pointed out that this is part of a larger discussion about taking our organization to the next professional level, and this is related to the issue of hiring another staff member and examining the organizational structure of the research committee, grants, and committees generally.

Edkins wondered if we should increase dues to handle these types of expenses, and Neal stated that we would need to raise dues to be able to do some of these types of things. Kovera mentioned that if we raise dues we risk losing members who are not super active. Bishop mentioned that other dues in similar organizations are low. Hazen mentioned that students pay more than $50 to be a part of other divisions. Kovera pointed out that we have recently dropped down the services we are providing for the membership as a whole (including no longer providing a print subscription to Law and Human Behavior).

Cutler mentioned there are many ways to balance a budget, and we should not equate this expense with an income source. He wondered if there was another place we could cut expenses.

Neal mentioned that she thought we might increase the conference registration fee in response to trying to increase digital access to the conference. She stated that it is worth looking into or thinking about for a couple of reasons: 1) would people want to pay for digital access? And, 2) environmental concerns may also contribute to wanting to increase digital access to the conference.

Levett inquired whether we could solicit donations for these types of things with dues as a way to raise funds. Douglas opined that we should assemble a working group to look into dues, and that the Finance Committee would make the most sense to examine the issue.

Douglas opined that doing the pilot made the most sense for RhythmQ, and that we commit to the contract for one year. Brank moved to pilot RhythmQ as Wylie proposed for $6400. All approved.

XII. Presidential Initiative – Groscup

Groscup provided the EC with an update about her Presidential Initiative for discussion and budgetary approval. The initiative is titled Leadership Inside and Out:
"Enhancing Skills, Building Pipelines, and Getting Out There," and is focused on developing leadership within AP-LS and developing leadership of AP-LS members in areas outside of AP-LS.

Groscup provided the background for the Internal Initiative, title *Embracing Leadership: Developing Skills for Your Career Evolution*. She expressed that the purpose of the Embracing Leadership initiative is four fold: 1) provide training for interested members in a variety of leadership skills that could benefit their careers broadly, 2) cultivate interest in leadership within the Division, 3) serve as a pipeline into leadership for previously unidentified new leaders, and 4) demonstrate that our members are prepared to take on leadership challenges.

To date, Groscup has met with several Committee Chairs whose committees might have an interest in or ideas for the leadership training program. They discussed what would make the initiative attractive to and effective for the groups they represent. All gave excellent suggestions and feedback about the potential program, which Groscup has been attempting to incorporate into the development of the topics to be covered and the materials and into the types of activities participants would undertake during the training.

Since March, Groscup has continued talking with Committee Chairs to share ideas about the program. She also has been doing research into leadership programs in general and have been participating in a leadership training program run by APA. One important note is that Beth Caillouet, Chair of the Continuing Education Committee, believes that the program would be eligible for CE credits, which would be very attractive to potential applicants in need of CE.

Groscup’s vision for the program is that it will have several parts:
1) A series of webinar or meeting-style trainings will take place throughout the year of the program. Webinars will be conducted by AP-LS members with experience or interest in the topic of the seminar or potentially by others outside the organization who specialize in leadership training. These trainings will be skill-building focused rather than theoretical. There will be readings and assignments that go with each session. Participants will interact with each other after the sessions about the material on an online.
2) A half or full-day workshop for participants will take place during the Wednesday prior to the AP-LS conference. Participants also will attend the EC meeting in March to get an insider’s look at Division leadership.
3) Participants will be formally connected to mentors already serving in Division leadership positions. They will work to complete an initiative of the Division with these mentors throughout the program. This will familiarize participants with the work of the Division and provide personal contact with members who already are in leadership positions. Hopefully, this will increase interest in serving the Division.
in the future for a wider variety of people and give the participants a feeling of ownership over the work of the Division.

Gros cup also proposed several topics that were under consideration for webinars or the workshop, and asked the EC and committees to identify some initiatives that participants could work on with the EC/committees. She also discussed the proposed timeline for the internal program.

For the external program, titled Leading the Way in Research for the Decision Makers: Opening a Gateway to Research Communication with Judges, Groscup discussed the background and context for the initiative. She explained that Over the past several years, the EC has discussed the breadth (or lack thereof) of research in psychology and law in a variety of contexts. Much of this discussion has been aimed at broadening the topics investigated by researchers in our Division. We have attempted to incentivize people to conduct “out of the box” research by creating the large research grant we now award as a Division. The purpose of that grant is to expand the topic areas of research we conduct. We have attempted to include the perspectives of practitioners in a variety of ways, such as special sessions at the conference for clinical practice issues and legal scholars. For the external part of her initiative, she would like to extend this practice to judges, doing outreach to judges. The purpose of this initiative would be to 1) provide the Division with information about new research areas, 2) open a pipeline with judicial organizations that might facilitate information sharing about research done by members of the Division, and 3) establish our Division as the leader in providing legally-relevant, psychological information to the courts.

Thus far, Groscup has done outreach with judges/people who work with judges to determine effective ways to conduct the initial outreach. She has compiled opportunities to contact/reach out to judges based on this outreach. She also reviewed the timeline for this part of her initiative.

To support the initiative, Groscup proposed several budget items, including funds to support the internal initiative (Wednesday APLS workshop, space, food, webinar costs, travel funds for the external initiative). Discussion ensued.

Bishop asked about the style of the webinars, and Groscup mentioned they would be an interactive style meeting preferably. In the initiative, Groscup proposed using Zoom. Hazen mentioned that any meeting has better features than zoom. Douglas supported Groscup’s ideas and mentioned that the National Courts in Science Institute may be worth looking into. Wylie asked if any kind of judge would be appropriate, and Groscup responded that yes, she is open to different kinds of judges, but she has been speaking with Federal Judges. Crossman mentioned that
given the variety of applications APLS tends to receive, it would be helpful to add more detail to the application to help differentiate among applicants.

Levett voiced that Groscup’s initiative would be great for developing leadership within APLS and for outreach. She motioned to approve Groscup’s budget as proposed ($6,694). All voted in favor.

At this point, Douglas called for a break (6:36pm).

Douglas called the meeting back to order at 6:52pm, at which point Cantone and Grisso were able to join after the APA Council Meeting.

XIII. APA Council Update – Cantone and Grisso

APA Council met on Wednesday, August 7 and Friday, August 9 during the APA Convention. This is a brief update of what was discussed at the EC meeting, but more information for interested parties is available by contacting Jason Cantone at cantone@gmail.com.

Cantone and Grisso reported several updates from APA Council to the EC.

First, Council was asked to approve a policy statement on immigration. In part, it reads, “Be it resolved that APA reaffirms its 1998 resolution in support of practical and humane immigration policies that consider the well-being of immigrants, and particularly immigrant families, including the provision of appropriate medical and mental health services. APA also calls upon the federal and state governments to provide sufficient funding to ensure these services are provided.” There were adjustments to the language and terminology, and at the end of the day, the resolution passed with 98% of the vote.

Prior to coming to the EC meeting, Council was discussing graduate student voting rights. Council was being asked to approve amendments to the APA Bylaws and Association Rules that would create a new membership category for masters and doctoral students and provide “Graduate Student” members (after a year) voting rights in the following elections: APA President-Elect, Board Member-at-Large, Bylaws, and the Apportionment Ballot (which determines how many Council representatives we get).

Cutler asked about the resolution on interrogations of criminal suspects that was passed in 2014 with the recommendation that Council will revisit the resolution. APLS took the lead on this resolution then. Cantone remarked that he will bring it up Friday with the APA General Council.

XIV. APA Opportunities for APLS Members - Cantone
At the March 2019 Executive Committee (EC) meeting, the EC requested a presentation on how AP-LS members could become more involved in APA. Cantone provided an overview of the opportunities at APA for AP-LS members (who are also members of APA).

Cantone provided an overview of the process of serving on ad-hoc committees and other boards and committees. For regular boards and committees, APA opens an online portal for members who are interested in serving. Members self-nominate and the names are then presented to the APA Board of Directors for the slating process. The Board of Directors takes the list of nominees and narrows it down to usually 2-4 nominees. There is a committee focused exclusively on needs assessments, slating, and election campaigns. The nominees for each position are then presented to and voted on by the APA Council of Representatives. Many nominees then actively campaign for positions via materials and e-mails sent to Council representatives. Most boards and committees require an ECP member (defined as someone within the first ten years of their Ph.D.) and there can be specific ECP slates. Cantone presented a list of several service opportunities that get disseminated to the APA Council Members.

Part of the issue of involving AP-LS members in these opportunities is that it is difficult to disseminate the opportunities. The newsletter isn’t the best source because the newsletter is often not in sync with the turn-around time for the call for volunteers. So, Cantone questioned whether we should increase the number of emails to the membership or use social media. This is especially pertinent when Council requests reviews of guidelines. That is the time when we can contribute to the development of guidelines. When the actual guidelines are on the floor, our Council Representatives can amend them, but it would be better to have input when guidelines are being developed.

Brank noted that we can include a call for people who want to get involved at APA in our request for committee members. Then people can upload CVs and the nominations committee can keep that list handy when opportunities arise.

Yasuhrara noted that email is a good mode for communicating with the membership. Cantone expressed concern with the threshold for sending an email. Right now, Cantone has been deciding whether the request is relevant to AP-LS membership. Generally, the EC expressed that giving the discretion on whether it was pertinent enough to send an email to the Council Representatives was acceptable.

Cantone also noted that AP-LS can have liaisons to boards and committees without being a full member of the committee, and that he would recommend at least adding a liaison to the Board of Scientific Affairs.
Douglas asked whether it made sense in the short term to use email, and then convert to the volunteer drive with the spring conference. Cantone confirmed the process of sending an email to the membership was to send it to the webmaster. Grisso noted that in the long term we will want to think about how to manage this, and that it could be part of the Council position. Levett noted that we would want to add this to the bylaws for that position.

XV. APA Council and EC Meeting Conflict - Cantone

Cantone raised the issue that in the past few years, the AP-LS EC Meeting at APA has conflicted with the APA Council Meeting, making it so that the APA Council Representatives cannot both attend the full EC Meeting and APA Council Meeting.

Levett was supportive of the idea to move the EC meeting, but mentioned that the reason we started scheduling it this way was to save programming hours on the APA program. So, having the meeting on Wednesday meant having more hours for programming at the conference. Anumba will check whether the hours are still counted less on Wednesday and revisit the issue in March.

XVI. Early Career Professional Report – Cantone

Cantone reported that the Early Career Professional Report that was presented at March’s EC meeting has been commented on, revised, and submitted to the EC for final approval. Douglas stated that we needed a motion to approve the report and post it on the AP-LS website. Neal moved to approve the proposal and post it on the website, and all voted in favor. It will be posted on the website and in the newsletter. Cantone will work with Patry and Wylie to post it.

XVII. Treasurer’s Report – Edkins

Edkins presented the Treasurer’s Report, noting that we finished last year (-$45,293.87) due to the realized and unrealized losses in our investments. We generally see a realized gain in excess of $150,000, and instead we had an approximate loss of $50,385. Edkins reported that we are still in very good shape and our investments have recovered nicely. Our net income for the year was $271,163.49 which is up from the previous year. Our cash totals at the end of 2018 were $327,662.66, combined with investments and advances, we finished the year with a total worth of $3,304,172.06. Our year to date expenses have been $545,502.18 in income and $448,859.96.

Edkins reported that the Finance Committee (Douglas, Levett, Huss, Hazen, and Edkins) met and reviewed all the committee requests and arrived at the final budget
submitted to the EC. She thanked the EC committees for getting in their detailed reports in a timely manner and for being excellent stewards of the resources allocated last year.

Edkins noted that the EC needed to approve the PLED budget line item.

Discussion ensued about funding PLED for the fourth year. Zapf noted that the marketing plan introduced in March was executed and increased the reach of the website significantly. She asked if this was something AP-LS wanted to move forward with/continue. Neal noted that similar themes came up in two committee reports, and that we had a similar project in the past that could benefit from help with dissemination. She suggested that perhaps we need a dissemination arm or structure to help support this.

Levett motioned to fund PLED for the fourth year based on their performance and seeing the project through. Neal offered a friendly amendment, and moved to approve the request for the fourth year of funding, with the stipulation that the Governance Committee in consultation with PLED and Wylie for the website will come back in March with a proposal for how we could integrate PLED into APLS from a structural standpoint.

Yasuhara noted that the integration of multiple websites is an issue that would need to be address.

Huss asked about how to best measure success with PLED. He inquired whether we measure success by the number of users. He noted that there is a trajectory of increased users, but the question is whether the website is actually doing anything. He wanted to encourage PLED to think about this – what are the goals/missions of PLED as concretely as they can make them?

Groscup questioned how what PLED provides is different from the research briefs in the newsletter, aside from who they are being disseminated to. She noted that if they are similar, we have resources that have been built across time and was curious if we could integrate PLED into these. Zapf responded that PLED is more systematic in terms of selecting articles to go into the database designed to give a broader overview. Groscup wondered if you could flag articles that would qualify for the database. Patry noted that this may require more work to make the research briefs searchable if we want to integrate.

Cutler noted that the PLED website is similar to a proposal that was made in the past by Gary Wells. The proposal was to create expert videos communicating about research. There were several questions at the time about who was selected, how they were going to be selected, etc. He noted that it is one things for another organization to decide or present reviews for the field, but it’s another matter for AP-
LS as a professional organization. He noted that this may result in unintended consequences because it is a big deal for AP-LS to endorse research review.

Neal inquired about the criteria for including a piece in reviews. Zapf noted that Cook could send a list of the inclusion criteria to the EC.

Edkins noted that the EC already approved the President’s Initiatives, and already approved the website improvements and RhythmQ for grants and committees. Edkins also noted that the interdisciplinary grants are decided by the average of the last three years of investment income, and the average for that calculation for this year is $61,100. The Childcare Grants for APLS were increased from $7500 to $10,000.

To accommodate these initiatives, two items were altered. First, $2500 allocated toward the APA Council Meeting was removed because we have not spent that money since 2014. Edkins also reduced the ‘other conferences and dues’ to $1500 from $2500 because this is also a rarely tapped item.

Edkins had a few notes for all committees:

1) The Newsletter Committee budget includes a subscription to a stock photo website. This is available for all committees, so please contact the Newsletter Committee if your committee would like access to this site.

2) The Finance Committee noted that several committees requested modest funds for lunch for committee members at APLS, but we wanted to make this consistent across committees, so allocated $30 per person.

3) Following the EC meeting, committees will get an email from Vanessa with their approved budget.

Edkins also noted that our investments are in healthy shape and reminded the EC to submit for travel reimbursement. Edkins also noted that she received an email from Mark Worthin asking for income budget sheets for APLS to be posted to the division website. Cutler noted that APA services may help advise us about how to be transparent and share this information safely with members, and Edkins will consult with them.

Levett motioned to approve the budget with the above stipulations. All approved.

XVIII.  Nominations Committee – Brank
Brank noted that it is our turn as an organization to nominate someone for the Weiss memorial lecture. The Nominating Committee moved to nominate Valerie Hans. Levett motioned to approve, and all voted in favor.

XIX. Professional Development of Women Committee – Godfried and Crossman

The Professional Development of Women Committee expressed that they wanted to do a survey following up to the #metoo conversation that started last March at AP-LS. They want to survey members about their experiences so we can start to systematically address these issues as an organization. Godfried and Crossman have also discussed working on a code of conduct. Bishop noted that the development of a code of conduct was already underway with Jenn Hunt, but that it is still a work in progress.

Neal moved to move forward with the development of a survey. Levett offered a friendly amendment to include working with task force members Jenn Hunt and Jason Cantone on the code of conduct. All approved.

XX. Request for Proposals on the Book Series – McAuliff

McAuliff informed the EC that our contract with Oxford in the book series is expired, and that he needs approval from the EC to move forward with a request for proposals to get bids for publishing the book series. The EC needs to approve giving notice to Oxford and doing an RFP. Brank so moved and all approved.

XXI. Internal structure examination Douglas and Brank

Douglas noted that there were requests from the Research Committee to examine the structure of how the Interdisciplinary Grant is awarded. Douglas noted that this was part of a broader discussion about our internal structure. As part of her Presidential Initiative, Brank lead an examination of our internal structures, working with the Governance Committee. The recommendation coming out of this partnership is to hire an executive director or administrative person who would be tasked with working with committees, grants, and awards. So, this position would have implications for the research committee’s requests.

Brank noted that one of the points our consultant noted was that it was remarkable we were this big with just one paid staff person. For a budget, Brank noted it would be roughly 50-70K for full time; less for part time, but then just 15-20 hours per week. Brank noted that we want a staff person to help us do what we do best better – essentially lightening the administrative load on committees and chairs.
Discussion ensued. Bishop noted that other organizations have this type of person in addition to the person who does the types of duties Gaskey currently handles. Gowensmith noted that it would be helpful to clearly define what this person is going to do. Redlich inquired whether this person would do the work of creating onboarding manuals and orienting new committee members and chairs; Brank responded affirmatively.

Douglas noted that at this point, the EC could support moving forward with putting a job description together and defining duties, essentially creating a proposal for hiring.

Edkins noted that we have cash reserves that could support the position and that we could also look at reducing costs elsewhere. Douglas noted that the motion then is to move forward with supporting the work. The Governance Committee will create a job description for the position for March, and Huss will work with Brank and Neal to do so. All voted in favor. The Governance Committee will also come back with a proposal considering the Research Committee’s request to restructure in the context of the development of hiring a staff person.

At this point, the agenda was addressed, and Edkins motioned to adjourn. All voted in favor, and the meeting ended at 7:35pm.