SWSer Barbara Risman receives ASA’s Award for the Public Understanding of Sociology. Photo courtesy of ASA.

President’s Message

By Tracy E. Ore, SWS President

The setting of this year’s meetings in Las Vegas was stimulating, to say the least. I hope that this column helps you to positively recall the many opportunities we had to engage in the important work of this organization and to celebrate our achievements.

As we continued to mark the 40th anniversary of the Sociologists for Women in Society one of the highlights of the meetings was the lecture “It’s Not Fair: Discursive Politics, Social Justice and Feminist Praxis,” given by Nancy Naples, this year’s SWS Feminist Lecturer. Her address gave us the opportunity to consider the new social movement (continued on page 22)

CSW 55: Global Advocacy For Women

By Susan Lee, Liliana Cisneros, Daniela Jauk, and Barret Katuna

“There is no other place where women can convene like this,” said the Egyptian activist sitting beside Dani Jauk at this year’s session of the UN Commission on the Status of Women (CSW) in New York. From February 20 to March 4, 2011, over 1300 women convened on UN headquarters to make presentations, exchange views, and monitor the progress on women reported by the UN member states. SWS was represented by three of our official UN delegates, Susan Lee, Pat Ould, and Barret Katuna, as well as several other SWSers including Dani Jauk, Liliana Cisneros, and Shang-Luan Yan.

The Commission on the Status of Women (CSW) began early in UN history and this year marked its fifty-fifth annual session. Forty-five states are official members of the CSW at any one time and other nations can sit-in on the meetings as well. In addition to official government delegations, many non-governmental organizations (NGOs) attend the session. NGOs monitor the official deliberations at the UN as well as meet among themselves across the street at the Church Center for the United Nations. These “side” gatherings are typically lively meetings of women activists from around the world in contrast to the often staid and formal deliberations at the official UN session. (continued on page 4)
Call for Applications for 2012 Campus Visits

* Distinguished Feminist Lecturer, Christine Williams
* Feminist Activism Winner, Laura Kramer

Due March 1, 2012

During the 2012-2013 academic year, each award winner will visit two campuses. These campus visits are intended to celebrate and enhance feminist scholarship and social activism on college campuses.

The Distinguished Feminist Lecturer visits campuses that are isolated, rural, located away from major metropolitan areas, bereft of the resources needed to invite guest speakers, and/or are characterized by hostility to feminist scholarship.

The Feminist Activism Awardee visits campuses with departments with a focus on feminist activism, social movements, sociological practice, and/or activist research.

The selection committee will look especially favorably on campuses that are committed to gaining the widest possible audience for these visits. This may be demonstrated by evidence of:

- collaboration with other departments and programs on campus
- multiple-campus cooperation
- community partnerships

SWS will pay at least a portion of the expenses for the two site visits; institutions should not let resource scarcity prevent them from applying. (See the detailed reimbursement levels and guidelines.) SWS awards the Distinguished Feminist Lecturer and the Feminist Activism Awardee a one-time honorarium of $1000.

Additional information (including addresses for submission, information to be included in the application, and guidelines for arranging and funding visits) will be available on the SWS website, www.socwomen.org.

Please Vote:

SWS Annual Elections

We will be electing our officers, chairs, and committee members online from October 15 to 31, 2011. The candidates’ profiles appear on the SWS web site (go to www.socwomen.org) so you can review them and decide for you whom will vote.

To vote, log in at www.socwomen.org/members, then click on “VOTE” to view expanded statements online and to cast your votes.

Login troubles? If you’ve forgotten your password, click “Forgot login?” at the login screen to receive it by email. If you still have trouble, Rachel in the SWS executive office can help: (401) 874-9510, swseo@socwomen.org.

Thanks to each of our candidates for their willingness to stand for election—this is an important service to our organization. They’re doing their part. Now is your turn: vote and help us choose our leadership for the coming years.

Thanks!
SWS Welcomes Two New MFPs

Each year SWS sponsors two participants in the ASA’s MFP: Minority Fellowship Program. Meet the two for the ‘11-’12 academic year, and for more background on the program, see http://asanet.org/funding/mfp.cfm.

Selina Gallo-Cruz
*Undergraduate Institution:* Wellesley College
*Graduate Institution:* Emory University

Selina is a doctoral candidate in sociology at Emory University. Selina conducts research on the global dimensions of political change. Her dissertation examines the role of a growing population of international nonviolent protest NGOs in supporting the development of democratic movements throughout the world. She identifies historical factors shaping the emergence and work of this population and analyzes the challenges and dynamics of their interaction with local protest movements. Selina has also conducted published and forthcoming research on the topics of alternative healthcare movements in the United States, transnational efforts to protest U.S. militarization in Latin America, and global cultural theory. She currently assists in the collection and analysis of data on an NSF-funded study of mobilization strategies among Latinos in the Nuevo South and provides research assistance to Nonviolence International. Prior to her tenure as a Davis Scholar at Wellesley College, Selina spent several years working with national and international social justice organizations, this work inspiring her academic research on globalization and social change. Outside of academia she enjoys dancing flamenco with a steady round of castañuelas and is always anxiously awaiting the next family trip to the seaside of her native Florida.

Heather M. Washington
*Undergraduate Institution:* West Virginia University
*Graduate Institution:* The Ohio State University

Heather is a doctoral candidate in sociology at The Ohio State University (OSU), where her work focuses on the consequences of mass incarceration for family and child outcomes. She received her bachelor’s degree in Criminology and Investigations at West Virginia University (WVU). While at WVU, Heather participated in the Ronald E. McNair Post-Baccalaureate Achievement Program and she, along with her mentor, Rachael Woldoff, conducted research on the effects of paternal incarceration on fathers’ engagement with their children, an experience that whet her appetite for sociological research. As a graduate student, Heather has retained her interests in crime, incarceration, and family and has explored them in a variety of ways. Her master’s thesis examined the effects of fathers’ participation in illicit work on mother-father relationship stability and quality. Her dissertation research, supported by The Criminal Justice Research Center at OSU and the Department of Sociology, examines the relationship between parental imprisonment and problem behaviors in early childhood. Specifically, she is investigating the mechanisms by which incarceration negatively affects child wellbeing and the extent to which the effect of parental imprisonment on child welfare varies across gender, race/ethnicity, and immigrant status. Additionally, Heather is exploring the simultaneous and interactive effects of parenting behavior and neighborhood characteristics on child outcomes.

empowerment including access to credit, land, and education; and make gender equality central in local and regional planning, budgeting, and statistics. Ms. Bachelet noted that UN Women is unusual among UN entities in that it incorporates both normative and operational functions, with policy-making authority at UN headquarters in New York and operational programs at the country level. UN Women has 15 sub-regional offices, 18 country program offices, 39 project offices, and 4 liaison offices at present and Ms. Bachelet wants to expand to additional countries. Ms. Bachelet’s summary of her vision for UN Women can be found at <http://www.unwomen.org/wpcontent/uploads/2011/01/VisionAnd100DayActionPlan_en.pdf>.

In a surprise move during her address to Consultation Day, Ms. Bachelet invited NGOs to a personal dialogue later in the first week of the CSW session. SWS was represented at that meeting by Liliana Cisneros. Liliana was impressed with Ms. Bachelet’s political abilities to handle the diverse constituency present, her fluency in various languages, and her receptiveness to the demands of women from regional caucuses. Ms. Bachelet stressed that the most important goal of the meeting was to listen to women’s voices. Liliana felt that she was responding to criticism among women at CSW55 that UN Women was becoming too technocratic, ignoring concerns of the women’s movement. Ms. Bachelet explained that UN Women would be not duplicating the work done with gender and women in the diverse agencies of the UN system. She announced the establishment of global, regional, and country level advisory boards with members of women’s groups to keep communication channels open. Women from all regions were delighted with Ms. Bachelet’s surprise invitation and seized the opportunity to advocate for women’s groups at

(continued on next page)
the grassroots level. For instance, Yvette Modestin, representing the Network of Afro-Latin American, Afro-Caribbean, and Diaspora Women, asked Ms. Bachelet to take into account women confronting multiple forms of discrimination associated with race, class, and gender. Margaret Owen from Widows for Peace through Democracy asked Ms. Bachelet to help the cause of widows and their families who suffer from extreme poverty, ostracism, and deprivation in many countries. Ms. Bachelet took note of the women's concerns and voiced her intention to convene regional thematic working groups to build consensus around UN Women priorities. Liliana felt that the meeting between Ms. Bachelet and the women's NGOs was the highlight of the CSW session.

A common thread among the women gathered for CSW 55 was the desire for another UN World Conference on Women. Four have been held, in Mexico City (1975), Copenhagen (1980), Nairobi (1985), and Beijing (1995). The Beijing conference produced a comprehensive program for advancing women's status, the Platform for Action. Blue "5WCW" buttons (Fifth World Conference on Women) were ubiquitous at CSW 55 and proactively distributed throughout the side events. A 5WCW website (www.5wcw.org) has been created as a clearing house of information and grassroots activism opportunities for those who wish to advocate for a new UN World Conference on Women. More than 110,000 women have already signed the online petition which was promoted in several events at CSW55. Among the supporters are Isabel Allende, Alice Walker, and Gloria Steinem. At CSW 55, Liliana went to a presentation by Jean Shinoda Bolen, author of The Millonoth Circle, a guide to women's circles, who is a prominent advocate for 5WCW. She emphasized to the social constructionist's astonishment - biological differences between men and women that make "the feminine" a most needed global moral force. "The world needs more estrogen," she asserted. Pam Rajput, women's studies director from Punjab University and CSW veteran, promoted India as a possible convention site with its historically strong women's movement and unique women's parliament. Michelle Bachelet on Consultation Day committed to support a Fifth World Conference on Women and Bolen announced meetings with her in the week following the CSW. However, there were also critical voices at the CSW. Since conservative women groups have gained global ground in the years since Beijing, some fear a regression to lower standards than those negotiated in the Platform for Action. Critics of the 5WCW effort felt it would be better to mainstream gender issues into the many "ungendered" UN agenda items such as climate change rather than engage in another world conference.

The official CSW session was held in a large conference room in the temporary North Lawn Building since the UN's permanent conference area was being renovated. Member state delegates sat at their country desks and were given a few minutes each to highlight progress for women in their country, especially on the session themes of education and employment. Many states were represented by their ministers for women's affairs. Ambassador Melanne Verveer, the US Ambassador-at-Large for Global Women's Issues, spoke for the US. She noted that because 2/3 of the world's illiterate are women, education is a top priority for the US. She also described a US initiative on clean cook stoves. The smoke from cooking fires is very damaging to women's health, she said, and estimated that one life is lost every 16 seconds due to cook fire smoke. The Indian CSW delegate pointed out that 1/3 of legislative seats at the local level in India are reserved for women, and one million Indian women are in politics today. The speaker for the Republic of Congo announced that Congolese public schools, which are mandatory to age 16, offer free tuition and free textbooks to students. Many other member states of the CSW reported on their activities throughout the session.

The highlight for Barret Katuna was her visit to the United States Mission to hear a report of how the US delegation to the CSW planned to move.

(continued on next page)
forward with issues raised by the CSW theme. When Barret was an intern at the United Nations, she had not had the opportunity to go to the U.S. Mission and she found it exceptionally exciting to be among other UN delegates in the new, renovated space directly across the street from the UN. Since the CSW theme included the issue of women in the sciences, the U.S. delegation included several prominent female scientists. The delegates radiated energy to the NGO representatives who asked about equal opportunities for women in the United States and abroad. Pat Ould attended another US briefing and conveyed to Ambassador Verveer our SWS concerns about the outcome document of the CSW, the Agreed Conclusions. The draft of the document did not mention the need to abolish school fees and Pat gave Ms. Verveer suggested wording to insert in the document. Ambassador Verveer agreed to look into it and the final Agreed Conclusions included a statement about reducing school costs.

The SWS delegates attended several side events that highlighted the concerns of women in various parts of the world. Barret attended a side event entitled “Rural Women, Technology, and Access: Education, Training, and Employment.” She learned about entrepreneurial successes of rural women from various areas of the United States. Dani Jauk went to an anti-poverty event sponsored by the Buddhist Tzu Chi Foundation. More than 140 people had gathered to learn how to break the cycle of poverty for girls through education. In contrast to many other events at the CSW, the Foundation served delightful vegetarian snacks and managed to bring activists from their field sites to speak for themselves. Often CSW side events appear elitist since they feature white middle class managers from NGO headquarters presenting the work of native women in the Philippines or sub-Saharan Africa who cannot afford to come to the CSW. For activists brought in by the Tzu Chi Foundation, such as Ellie from UNHCR Malaysia and Gladys and Ngema from South Africa, it was their first visit to the US. Ellie described how more than 13,800 Malaysian school-age children from illegal immigrant families have no access to formal education. Instead, they are given a rudimentary education in “shop house” schools, on the second or third story of shops.

Susan Lee went to a side event on Sudan organized by Labena, a women’s NGO. Labena staffers served as observers during the recent referendum that split Sudan into two countries. After official separation on July 9, 2011, Labena will have a presence in both Sudan and South Sudan, the newly created country. The Sudanese panelists noted that South Sudan has many female heads of household due to the extended civil war going back over 50 years. The separation raises many concerns for women in Sudan. In cases of intermarriage between northern and southern Sudanese, it is not clear whether the South Sudanese partner will be able to obtain citizenship and work permits in the north, or vice versa. The Comprehensive Peace Agreement of 2005 prescribed a 25% quota of women in the Parliament and panelists were unsure if the quota would continue in the north after separation.

Conservative voices were audible at a session that Dani attended on sexual and reproductive health in the global South. Among the five comments after the presentation, two advocated abstinence campaigns instead of contraception. Dani asked that gender identity issues be included in work on reproductive health and sex education and learned that the United Nations Development Program (UNDP) integrates gender identity issues in their work. Other UN entities, including UN Women, have yet to follow suit. In one of only two events on sexual and gender identity during the two-week CSW session, the International Lesbian, Gay Bisexual, Trans, and Intersex Association brought together activists from several countries. Most notably, a representative from the Institut Pelangi Perempuan, the Indonesian Youth LBT Women's Center, presented a comic strip on the Yogyakarta Principles they had created to educate Indonesian queer youth who face severe oppression and violence (http://ilga.org/ilga/en/article/nM156UD1m1).

Dani viewed two documentaries at the CSW that could be useful for teaching or campus screenings. Joanne Hershfield from the University of Chapel Hill at North Carolina presented Men are Human, Women are Buffalo, a 29-minute documentary about gender violence in Thailand. The stories of five women victims of domestic violence and date rape are creatively told utilizing interviews and shadow puppet theater (film website: http://www.menarehuman-womenarebuffalo.com/index.html).
Pink Smoke Over the Vatican tells the stories of the first female Catholic priests to be ordained in the 20th century, their harsh communications, and their lives and spiritual communities today. It features several feminist writers on biblical and church history and educates the viewer about underground women priests throughout history (film website: http://eyegoddess.com/pink_smoke.php). A 20 minute clip of the movie can be found at http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=GG/L4LobQ18).
2012 SWS Distinguished Feminist Lecturer

[Editor's Note: The 2011 Distinguished Feminist Lecture was delivered in Las Vegas by Nancy Naples. Also in Las Vegas, Lisa Brush presented the 2012 award as follows.]

It is with great pleasure that the Awards Committee announces the winner of the 2012 SWS Distinguished Feminist Lecture Award.

Our awardee’s work is innovative, smart, accessible, and relevant to today’s college students. Her distinguished contributions have built the literatures on gender, work, and organizations; gender and sexuality; consumer culture; and qualitative research methodologies.

Between 1989 and 2006, our next Distinguished Feminist Lecturer published three sole-authored books and edited or co-edited another four books that both display her skill as an ethnographer and have become the foundation of sociological research on gender, sexuality, and the organization of both work and consumption.

In addition to the books, our awardee has authored and co-authored numerous articles (including in 2 in Social Problems and 5 in Gender & Society) that articulate the central theme of her scholarship: ethnography as a way of grasping fundamental social processes of interaction in a wide variety of work settings and as providing a sound basis for far-reaching policy and practice recommendations.

In making this award, the committee acts on behalf of SWS to recognize distinguished scholarship on issues ranging from appearance rules in the workplace, to Don’t Ask Don’t Tell policies and the construction of heterosexual masculinity, to the gendering of part time work, to the gender/race/class dynamics of shopping.

Please join me in congratulating the 2012 SWS Distinguished Feminist Lecturer, a former editor of the SWS Journal Gender & Society, the scholar who made us all sit up and notice the proverbial glass escalator. Professor Christine Lisa Brush presents the 2012 Distinguished Feminist Lecture award to Christine Williams. Photo by Tracy Oer.

“Toward a Feminist Institution: Transforming the Academy”

February 2 to 5, 2012
St. Petersburg, Florida at the Hilton Bayfront

Register online at http://www.socwomen.org/web/conferences/upcoming-conference.html


Photo of the Salvador Dali Museum, courtesy of www.visittampa-clearwater.com
Call for Applications: 
Gender Report Card: 
SWS, Committee on 
Academic Justice

Deadline for proposal: January 10, 2012; 
deadline for report: October 10, 2012
Award: $500

The Committee on Academic Justice (CAJ) is seeking applications for scholars to prepare the 2012 Report Card on Gender- and Women-Friendly Sociology Departments (among Ph.D. Granting Institutions). Three seals of approval are determined using the ASA Guide to Graduate Departments: The SWS Seal of Approval for Faculty Gender Equity, The SWS Seal of Approval for Gender Scholarship, and the SWS Seal of Excellence for those departments that meet the requirements for both equity and gender scholarship. Please see previous reports (Hays & Risman, 2004 and Risman & Berube, 2008) for additional details on method. In addition to the existing method for determining the SWS Seal of Excellence, a supplemental survey created by the CAJ will be distributed to the departments chosen for the Seal of Excellence, and will be included as part of the report. Candidates should be prepared to collect all information and prepare a 10–15 page report.

The final report will be peer reviewed prior to distribution. The CAJ process for reviewing materials for public distribution includes CAJ co-chairs inviting:

- Two or three scholars who specialize in the areas studied to evaluate the final report, and/or
- The membership of the committee as a whole will evaluate the final report.*

The timeline for the project is 8 months. The Committee on Academic Justice will award $500 to the author(s) of the report once it has been submitted and reviewed.

Paired scholars have prepared previous reports, including one early-career and one mid/late-career scholar. The Committee on Academic Justice encourages joint applications of scholars at both stages in their careers, but will also consider single applications from individuals who are in advanced stages of their careers. Additionally, if you are in an early-career stage, want to submit an application but do not have a partner to work with, we will seek to find you a co-author who is more seasoned.

Applicants should send a cover letter outlining their participation in SWS, interest in the project, career stage, anticipated timeline for completion of the project, and contact information. Cover letters should be submitted electronically to Katrina Bloch and Kris De Welde, Co-Chairs of the Committee on Academic Justice at kbloch@kent.edu and kdwelde@fgcu.edu by January 10, 2012. CAJ co-chairs will base their decisions on the clarity of the cover letter, suitability of the time-line, and current SWS membership. The successful applicant will be announced at the 2012 winter meetings.

* The process for reviewing and evaluating materials to be distributed by CAJ on behalf of SWS was proposed and approved by Executive Council in September, 2008.

---
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Fact Sheet: LGBT Parents and their Children

Prepared by Melanie L. Duncan M.A. & Kristin E. Joos, Ph.D.
University of Florida
Distributed by the Sociologists for Women in Society
September 2011

Introduction
Recently, international groups that advocate on the behalf of LGBT families have declared May 6, 2012 to be International Family Equality Day. While this day is meant to highlight to increasingly visibility of LGBT families it is also a celebration of the diverse forms that families can take on. This is just one of the many changes that have occurred since the first version of this document was published, in 2003. Over the course of the past eight years, six states and Washington D.C. have come to legally recognize same-sex marriages, the Defense of Marriage Act is no longer being enforced, Don't Ask Don’t Tell was repealed, and same-sex couples can now adopt in a number of states, including Florida. Traditionally, depictions of the family have often centered on the heteronormative nuclear family of mother, father, and child(ren). However, as time has gone on we have seen that family forms have become increasingly diverse and include: single parents, child-free couples, parents who adopt or are foster parents, multiracial couples and their children, stepparents, etc. Parents who are lesbian, gay, bisexual, or transgender (LGBT), and their children are contributing to this societal shift that is broadening the traditional and idealized notion of family.

The presence of LGBT families in media, courts, and research has grown over the last ten years. What may have been a previously labeled as the “gayby boom” is now becoming a more commonly recognized by individuals and professionals means of forming a family. Mainstream TV shows such as Modern Family have highlighted that there is something to be gained from embracing the of diversity of LGBT families. This highlights that there is progress that may be due in part to the contemporary scholars who research “LGBT” or “Queer” families (these are the most inclusive descriptors for these families). Regardless of how these families are referred to, they are becoming increasingly visible and are challenging definitions of what it means to be a family. According to one of the most respected experts in this field, Judith Stacey. “Gay and lesbian families represent such a new, embattled, visible, and necessarily self-conscious genre of kinship, that they help to expose the widening gap between the complex reality of contemporary family forms and the dated family ideology that still undergirds most public rhetoric, policy, and law concerning families.”

The grassroots gay liberation movement of the 1960s-70s led to an increase in the acceptability of LGBT identities. Yet, it was not until this past decade that “having a family” was an option available to lesbian and gay individuals and couples. Policies and laws are now being challenged in the nation’s and world’s courts, since existing legislation does not accurately represent the current needs of LGBT families. Although there has been progress, there has also been backlash. Laws vary from state to state and county to county. Some courts represent these families fairly while others persist in denying their legitimacy as well as their very existence.

The legal system has historically been unfair to LGBT persons and families, which means that social scientists have played a major role in building the case that LGBT families are valid and their children are not adversely affected by their upbringing. Over the course of the past 40 years, a number of studies have been conducted by family sociologists, psychologists, and other scholarly researchers. Repeatedly these experts conclude that no evidence exists to demonstrate that lesbian and gay are unfit as parents or that their children are psychologically or physically harmed by having lesbian, gay, bisexual, or transgender parents.

---

2 See Lesbian/Gay Law Notes: Summer 2011
4 Alternative families is limiting because it presumes that research will be presented in a defensive stance, setting heterosexual families as the standard to which LGBT parents and their children should be compared. “Same-sex parents” is problematic because it excludes a significant population of LGBT parents, specifically lesbian mothers or gay fathers who are single by choice or circumstance, as well as combinations of gay men and lesbian women who are co-parenting together.
What we know about LGBT Parents and their Children

What do LGBT families look like?
Similar to heterosexual families, there is no singular LGBT family form, because the makeup of all families varies greatly. Not only do differences exist in terms of family relations, sizes, and forms, there is also diversity in terms of race/ethnicity, socioeconomic status, political affiliation, physical ability, religious tradition, etc. Some examples of LGBT family forms include a gay male couple who foster or adopt one or more children, or a lesbian couple who used a sperm donor to create a child. Much of the earliest research on LGBT parents and families involved a lesbian woman or gay man who was previously in a heterosexual marriage. After divorcing (often coinciding with their “coming out”), they negotiated custody with their former spouse. LGBT families also include single gay fathers and single lesbian mothers who are single by choice or following the death of a partner. Some LGBT families consist of combinations of LGBT individuals who raise children as platonic co-parents. Again, as with heterosexual families, LGBT families can take on many forms and these are only a few examples of them.

How many families are headed by LGBT parent(s)?
There is little consensus among experts as to the prevalence of LGBT parents and their children. Estimates have varied greatly, ranging from 1-20 million children in the United States under the age of 18 who have one or more gay or lesbian parent. An accurate number is, understandably, difficult to calculate. LGBT families are often invisible and for some, it is still unsafe for them to be “out.” A widely accepted statistic of 6 million children was first introduced in 1987. While social climate has changed dramatically in nearly two decades, the most frequently cited number has remained static. According to analyses of Census 2000, 1 in 3 lesbian couples and 1 in 5 gay male couples have at least one child under the age of 18 in their household. Of the more than 900,000 self-identified same-sex couples in the 2010 Census, approximately 22% of them are raising children. This statistic solely focuses on couples and excludes single LGBT parents, which has been noted as a limitation of certain data collection methods that cannot accurately capture the presence of LGBT families in the U.S. (i.e. the U.S. Census).

What are the research conclusions about LGBT parents and their children?
Historically, assumptions that LGBT parents were unfit threatened their right to raise children. All of the existing social research studies (appearing in rigorously peer reviewed journals such as the Journal of Marriage and Family, American Journal of Sociology, and Child Development, as outlined in the meta-analyses listed in the Major Research Articles section below) dispute this notion, instead asserting that LGBT individuals and couples are just as fit and effective parents as their heterosexual counterparts. Families headed by LGBT individuals and couples show few significant differences from other families. Indeed, children of LGBT parents are also just as healthy and well-adjusted as other children and their parents spend much of their everyday lives engaged in typical parenting activities such as getting the kids ready for school, arranging extracurricular activities, struggling to juggle the demands of work and family life, etc.

An overview of the existing research indicates that there are also no significant differences on the following dimensions:
- Gay and lesbian parents are comparable to heterosexual parents in the areas of mental health, self-esteem, approaches and skills related to parenting, as well as ability and commitment to parenting.
- Unlike the persistent myths portraying LGBT individuals as sexual predators, they are actually no more likely than heterosexuals to abuse their children.
- Children of LGBT parents are likely to develop gender-roles that are much like those of children raised by heterosexuals, with some exceptions, as explained in “advantages.”
- Multiple measures of children’s psychological well-being and social adjustment (e.g. self-esteem, anxiety, depression, behavioral problems, performance in school and extracurricular activities, IQ, ability to make friends, sociability and quality of relationships with peers and intimates, etc.) indicate no difference compared with their peers.

6 Numerous meta-analyses have been conducted in the last 10 years summarizing the current state of research on LGBT families. For the purposes of this fact sheet the major articles that were drawn on to create this summary were drawn from a review of the articles listed under the “Major Research Articles Section.”
- Children with lesbian mothers develop closer relationships to their mother’s new female partner when compared to the level of closeness that children of single heterosexual mothers report having with their mother’s new male partner.
- Lesbian co-parents are more egalitarian in terms of parenting and family responsibilities than are heterosexual couples.

**Advantages: Positive outcomes experienced by LGBT parents and their children**

- While there is an assumption that children raised by LGBT parents lack relationships and positive role models with adults of a gender other than that of their parent(s), research suggests the contrary. Same-sex parents provide their children with a wide array of role models from both genders (i.e. extended family members and affiliated kin).
- LGBT parents are somewhat more nurturing and tolerant than heterosexual parents.
- Children of LGBT parent(s) are more open-minded, less prejudiced, and express a greater sense of social responsibility than their peers.
- Daughters of lesbian mothers have higher self-esteem and aspire to future careers and occupations outside of those typically considered to be roles for women, such as nursing or teaching. In fact, they are more likely to aspire to be doctors, engineers, and astronauts than are daughters of heterosexual mothers.
- Sons of lesbian mothers are less physically aggressive, more caring, and more capable of communicating their feelings. They have higher levels of self-esteem and aspire to a wider range of career opportunities than do sons of heterosexual mothers.

**Challenges faced by LGBT parents and their children**

- LGBT parents who come out of a heterosexual marriage experience more difficulty arranging custody visits than heterosexual parents; yet the children benefit from more contact with their non-custodial parent than children of divorced heterosexual parents.
- Young adults of LGBT parents are more likely to experience stigma from their peers regarding their own sexuality than are the kids of heterosexual parents.
- Current federal and state legislation both in the United States and internationally continue to pose a challenge for many families although not as much as they have in the past. See the tables below.
- Overcoming legal discrimination and social prejudice are difficulties faced by many LGBT parents and their children. Not only are LGBT families largely culturally invisible, they often struggle to deal with homophobia and heterosexism.

**Are Children of LGBT Parents more likely to grow up to be LGBT themselves?**

Evidence from the existing studies are unclear regarding this question.

- Extensive studies have been published looking at the fitness of LGBT individuals as parents and compare the children of LGBT parent(s) with those of heterosexual parents indicate that there are no significant differences in terms of gender identity and sexual orientation (see Biblarz & Savci 2010, Committee on Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Concerns 2005, Johnson & O’Connor 2002, and Patterson 1995).
- One of the first studies that followed children of LGBT parents until adulthood found no difference in the proportion of those identifying as LGBT compared to the general population. However, children of lesbian mothers were more likely to have considered the possibility of having a same-sex relationship or have experienced one (see Golombok and Tasker 1996). A follow-up study was conducted that confirmed the results of the initial study (MacCullum & Golombok 2004).
- Children raised in LGBT families express greater openness to homosexuality or bisexuality reducing the risk of denial or self-loathing for those children who may question their sexuality. According to Stacy, “It seems likely that growing up with gay parents should reduce a child’s reluctance to acknowledge, accept, or act upon same-sex sexual desires if they experience them. Because the first generation of children parented by self-identified lesbians or gay men is just now reaching adulthood, it is too soon to know if the finding in that one study will prove to be generally true” (See Why it’s Wrong: The Social Science Case, A Conversation with Professor Judith Stacey).

**What we do not know about LGBT Parenting and Children**

At the time that this fact sheet was first constructed the majority of studies on LGBT families were based on small scale, self-selected, convenience samples. Oftentimes snowball sampling led to a very small portion of the LGBT population being heard
leading to samples that were disproportionately urban, white, and affluent. Early research on lesbian and gay parenting emerged in the late 1970s and early 1980s to "test" whether lesbian women or gay men were "fit" parents in custody cases. These studies tended to come from a "deviance" perspective, comparing LGBT families to the assumed heteronormative "ideal. More recent studies have sought to be more representative of the LGBT community. This is seen in representative national surveys (i.e. U.S. Census, the General Social Survey, etc.) including options that more accurately allow LGBT families to identify themselves and their family situations. In addition to more representative samples, there have also been longitudinal studies that have followed LGBT parents and their children (see Biblarz and Savci, 2010).

Often the ability of researchers to study certain portions of the LGBT population is limited by access; however, we continue to see a growing number of studies addressing the variety of forms that families can take on. There should be continued efforts to study lesbian and gay families, but also an expansion of research on bisexual and transgender parents as these families are still underrepresented in academic studies.

*Areas that Need Continued Exploration Regarding LGBT Families*

- Continued efforts to see more inclusive representations of LGBT families. This means being aware of different ages, races, ethnicities, incomes, level of education, and geographic locations.
- How do the different statuses that LGBT parents and children impact their lives?
- What challenges do bisexual and transgender parents face and how are they similar or different to other family structures?
- How do perceptions of LGBT family structures vary internationally and what challenges do these perceptions present?

*Position Statements of Major Organizations and Associations*

For over 30 years experts and major professional associations have asserted that there is nothing deviant or pathological about LGBT sexual orientations. The number of researchers, professors, physicians, psychologists and other experts who have voiced their support for LGBT parents and families has continued to grow. In the interest of space, only the position statement of the American Psychological Association is included in this factsheet. Other organizations make similar assertions that may be obtained through their websites. Links to the policy statements for the organizations listed below are available at: http://web clas ufi edu users krisij LGBTQfamilies/policystatements.html

- American Psychological Association (1976)
- American Bar Association (1995)
- American Counseling Association (1999) – Association for Gay, Lesbian, and Bisexual Issues in Counseling Division
- American Psychiatric Association (2002)
- American Psychoanalytic Association (2002)
- American Medical Association (2004)
- Evan B. Donaldson Adoption Institute (2006)
- Voice for Adoption (2006)
- National Adoption Center (Revised in 2008)
- National Foster Parent Association
- National Association of School Psychologists
U.S. State Policies & Legislation

Policies and Legislation regarding the legal rights of LGBT parents are constantly fluctuating. Beyond this there is a wide range of perspectives that the individual states take on these families. States indicated with an (*) have laws that explicitly allow LGBT parents a given right while the additional states listed do not explicitly prohibit those rights and have not had previous instances of denying them. (Current as of August 31, 2011)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Custody and Visitation</th>
<th>States that have not been found to discriminate against sexual orientation in custody/visitation rulings: Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, D.C., Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Vermont, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lesbian and Gay Individuals</td>
<td>States allowing lesbian and gay individuals to adopt: Forty-eight states and D.C. allow single individuals to adopt. Nebraska and Utah have provisions stating that individuals who are known to be homosexual cannot adopt, nor can single individuals who are in a cohabitating relationship. In the remaining states the restrictions that are placed on who can adopt are based on the living environment is the best choice for the child(ren).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**Note that while some states may not explicitly prohibit LGBT individuals and couples from adopting that there are restrictions placed in terms of the adoptees needing to be married.
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International Laws

International laws on LGBT relationships and families will vary. Similar to in the U.S. policies regarding marriage are separate from parenting laws and often marriage is a prerequisite to being able to adopt.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Joint Adoptions</th>
<th>Countries that allow lesbian and gay parents to jointly adopt: Argentina*, Australia, Belgium*, Brazil, Canada, Denmark*, Iceland*, Mexico, Netherlands, Norway*, Portugal, South Africa*, Spain*, Sweden*, United Kingdom*, United States</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Second Parent Adoptions</td>
<td>Countries that allow second parent adoptions: Australia, Belgium*, Canada, Denmark*, Finland*, France, Germany*, Iceland*, Netherlands*, Norway*, Spain*, Sweden*, United Kingdom, United States</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Indicates adoption rights are allowed throughout the entire country. All other countries adoption rights are only permitted in certain jurisdictions

Resources:

There are numerous resources for scholars wishing to study LGBT parenting issues as well as LGBT persons who are or are planning to become parents. Below is a list of major national and international organizations, key research articles, books, websites, films, educational curricula, and other resources such as magazines and family events. As categories are rather extensive we have included a small portion of the information in this fact sheet with a more comprehensive resources section (as of August 31, 2011) at: http://web.clas.ufl.edu/users/krisj/LGBTQfamilies/resources.html

Organizations:

- All Children – All Families
- American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU), Lesbian & Gay Rights
- COLAGE: People With a Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, or Queer Parent
- Family Equality Council
- Gay, Lesbian, & Straight Education Network (GLSEN)
- Human Rights Campaign (HRC): Family Project
- International Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Trans, and Intersex Association (ILGA)
- National Center for Lesbian Rights
- National Gay and Lesbian Task Force (NGLTF): Parenting & Family
- Our Family Coalition
- Parents, Families, and Friends of Lesbians and Gays (PFLAG)
- Welcoming Schools Project
- The Williams Institute

Major Research Articles:


Why it’s Wrong: The Social Science Case, A Conversation with Professor Judith Stacey. In Too High A Price: The Case Against Restricting Gay Parenting (See above link).

Books about LGBT Families and Parenting:


15 | Fall 2011


**Websites:**

*In addition to the websites of the organizations mentioned above there are other sites on the internet that provide much important information and resources and are a place for members of LGBT families to connect.*

*FamiliesLikeMine.com* a web site dedicated to decreasing isolation for people who have parents who are LGBT, and bringing voice to the experiences of these families. This site was created by Abigail Garner, a lifetime advocate for LGBT families because she comes from one herself.

*Families Like Ours – Online resource for families at various stages in the adoption process* (http://www.familieslikeours.org/)

*Family Diversity Projects – Art exhibits that depict various families (i.e. multiracial, LGBT families, religion and LGBT individuals, and trans individuals)* (http://familydiv.org/)

*Love Makes A Family* http://www.lovenmakesafamily.org/

*Kids of Trans Resource Guide – A resource for children who have trans parents that was compiled by COLAGE* (http://www.colage.org/resources/kot/)

*ProudParenting.com serves as an online portal for gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgender parents and their families worldwide.*

*RFamily Vacations – An LGBT friendly travel company that helps families find the ideal vacation spot.* (http://www.rfamilyvacations.com/)

*The Williams Institute – Research institute at UCLA that looks at sexual orientation law and public policy. Current Census stats on LGBT families is available at* (http://www3.law.ucla.edu/williamsinstitute/home.html)
TransFamily – A support group for transgender families in Ohio with resources on the local and national level (http://www.transfamily.org/)

TransParentcy – A website geared towards transgender parents and children (http://www.transparentcy.org)

Videos:
- Both of My Moms’ Names Are Judy:Children of Lesbians and Gays Speak Out
- Daddy & Pappa
- In My Shoes: Stories of Youth with LGBT Parents
- It’s Elementary: Talking About Gay Issues in School
- Living Adoption: Gay Parents Speak Out
- No Dumb Questions
- Our House: A very real documentary about kids of gay and lesbian parents.
- That’s a Family

Educational curricula about diverse families:
Framing the Family Tree: How Teachers Can Be Sensitive to Student’s Family Situations (http://www.stcloudstate.edu/socialresponsibility/articles/documents/RethinkingSchoolsKidsStuffSR.pdf)


Making Room in the Circle: Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender (LGBT) Families in Early Childhood Settings
Curriculum designed to educated children about LGBT families (http://www.parentservices.org/lgbt.php)

The Pride Education Network ( http://www.pridenet.ca)
K-12 resources for educators, counselors and administrators to aid in the support of, and education about, lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender youth and families. Resources include:
- Fiction & Non-Fiction Titles for K-12 (http://www.galebc.org/books.pdf)

Opening Doors: Education Issues for LGBT Parents, By the Educational Advocacy Committee of Family Equality Council (Formerly the Family Pride Coalition) (http://www.familypride.org/publications/openingdoors.pdf)

Opening More Doors: Creating Policy Change to Include Our Families, By the Family Equality Council (Formerly the Family Pride Coalition) (http://www.familypride.org/publications/openingmoredoors.pdf)


Talking to Children About Our Families, By Margie Brickley and Aimee Gelnaw for the Family Equality Council (http://www.familyequality.org/pdf/talkingtochildren.pdf)
Award Winners

CHOW-GREEN SCHOLARSHIP
Chandra Waring earned her bachelor’s degree from the University of Connecticut in 2007 and her master’s degree from the University of Connecticut in 2009. She is currently writing her dissertation, which is about the complex interactional patterns of black/white biracial Americans and how those patterns are gendered (i.e., how women engage in gender-specific ways of interacting with other women, both white and black, and how men engage in gender-specific ways of interacting with other men, both white and black).

In exploring the continuing significance of racial boundaries in perhaps the least likely population (e.g., bi/multiracial Americans), she intends to call attention to how race is still prevalent in a supposed “post-racial” era. In addition, she aims to show how gender and race intersect in unique ways in a racially mixed, and in some cases racially ambiguous, population.

Chandra says: “I am very grateful to my advisor, Bandana Purkayastha; and my dissertation committee, Davita Silfen Glasberg, Ronald Taylor and Marysol Asencio; and to SWS for this phenomenal opportunity to dedicate all of my time to my research!”

MENTORING AWARD
The Mentoring Award committee recognized two outstanding feminist mentors this year: Sarah Fenstermaker of UC-Santa Barbara and Nancy Naples of the University of Connecticut.

Nominating letters for Fenstermaker note that she “supports SWS’s legacy of building strong feminist communities, and works to maintain active feminist networks.” Giving students and colleagues inspiration, strategies, and resources, she embodies the spirit of feminist mentoring.

Nancy Naples’ nominators note that her mentoring puts a feminist sociological perspective into practice. From workplace power dynamics to the balance of career and mothering, Naples provides support and guidance that— as one letter says—“showed me what it

(continued on page 22)

SWS Newsmakers

A sampling of our members’ recent accomplishments—including media appearances, awards, and more.

MEDIA

September 2011:
Barbara Brents, Crystal Jackson, and Kathryn Hausbeck, authors of The State of Sex, were profiled in the Chronicle of Higher Education.

Erin Hatton and Mary Nell Trautner are the authors of “Equal Opportunity Objectification? The Sexualization of Men and Women on the Cover of Rolling Stone,” which examines the covers of Rolling Stone magazine from 1967 to 2009 to measure changes in the sexualization of men and women in popular media over time.

Research by Elaine Howard Ecklund and Anne Lincoln, on family size among scientists, was covered by venues including the Chronicle of Higher Education and the Wall Street Journal.

Afshan Jafar writes about the academic job market for InsideHighEd.com.

Meika Loe writes on Social Security and Medicare for the MS. blog.

Research by Kristen Myers and Ilana Demantos, on the recession spurring fathers to more caregiving, was covered by venues including ABC News and the Chicago Sun-Times.

July 2011:
Mary Churchill wrote “Beyond the Company Man’ Model: Rethinking Academic Administration for Work-Life Balance” at On Campus With Women.

Michael Kimmel wrote “Can Michele Bachmann Save Me?” at the Huffington Post.

Laura Logan wrote “The Case of the Killer Lesbians” at The Public Intellectual.

Meika Loe wrote “How to Model Healthy Sexuality to Our Daughters” at the Ms. Magazine blog.

Virginia Rutter wrote “This is What Heteronormativity Looks Like” at Grrl w/Pen.

Amy Schalet wrote “The Sleepover Question” at the New York Times.

Lisa Wace wrote “Culture-Jamming Sexist Ads” at the Ms. Magazine blog.

(continued on page 20)
Call for Papers

Violence Against Women Special Issue
Rape and Sexual Assault Prevention, Resistance, Education, and Intervention: The Role of Self Defense

Edited by Martha McCaughey and Jill Cermele

Sexual violence against women is a global health problem. Although there is solid, and growing, scholarship on the reality and efficacy of women’s resistance to rape and sexual assault, many scholars, activists, funding agencies, and members of the lay public remain skeptical about women’s right and capacity to thwart an attack, and about the ethics of teaching and funding of self-defense. Moreover, while both scholarly and advocacy literature on violence against women often discusses prevention, resistance, and intervention, these concepts do not always imply women’s use of verbal and physical self-defense techniques. Increasingly, we see positive images of women successfully defending themselves against perpetrators of violence in popular culture, but scholars of violence against women have much to communicate to both scholarly and lay audiences about women’s use of self-defense.

This special issue calls for papers that focus on the ways in which women prepare to defend themselves against sexual assault, the multiple and diverse methods women employ – including the use of physical aggression and violence – in their own defense, the effectiveness of self defense, and how self defense and resistance to sexual assault is understood and constructed in individual, social, cultural, and legal contexts. We define the term sexual assault broadly, to include verbal, non-verbal, and physical threats or acts of sexual violence, both implied and enacted; similarly, we define the term self-defense to include verbal and physical strategies, including aggressive, violent, and lethal means, that thwart imminent or ongoing acts of sexual violence and to serve to maintain women’s physical, sexual, and psychological integrity.

Possible topics include:

• Efficacy of physical and verbal resistance against sexual assault
• Efficacy of self-defense training
• Comparative studies of different types of self-defense programs
• Beliefs about resistance and self-defense training for women and girls
• Self-defense training as a clinical intervention
• Defining resistance, self-defense, and violence
• Identity, intersectionality, and resistance
• The collection of crime victimization data and women’s self-defense
• The impact of women’s self-defense training on rates of acquaintance rape
• The funding models impacting women’s opportunities to learn self-defense through schools, community centers, shelters, and crisis centers
• Where the training or use of self-defense fits into feminist discourses of sexual assault prevention
• Self-defense training in the workplace, on campuses, in public schools, in NGOs
• Where women’s self-defense fits into the gun control debates
• Gender, self-defense, and the law

We invite articles using a variety of theoretical and methodological approaches, including empirical research, research notes, review essays, legal notes, and clinical notes. Empirical research articles should not exceed 30 pages, and all other submissions should be between 12 and 18 pages, including references, tables, and figures. Manuscripts should be typewritten, double-spaced, with footnotes, references, tables, and charts on separate pages, and should follow the Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association (5th edition). Each article should begin with an abstract of about 100 words. For further details, consult the manuscript submission guidelines at http://www.sagepub.com/journalsProdDesc.nav?ct_p=manuscriptSubmission&prodId=Journal200837. All submissions will be subjected to review, and submission does not guarantee acceptance in the special issue. To discuss a possible submission or the scope of the issue, or to submit a manuscript, contact Martha McCaughey at mccaugheym@appstate.edu or Jill Cermele at jcermele@drew.edu.

Closing date for submissions is April 13, 2012.
Damaske, Sarah. For the Family?: How Class and Gender Shape Women’s Work.

Loe, Meika. Aging our Way: Lessons for Living from 85 and Beyond.

Anita Iita Carey and Karen V. Hansen. At the Heart of Work and Family, Engaging the Ideas of Arlie Hochschild.

Casper, Monica; Currah, Paisley. Corpus: An Interdisciplinary Reader on Bodies and Knowledge.


Bobel, Chris, & Kwan, Samantha. Embodied Resistance; Challenging the Norms, Breaking the Rules.


Renzetti, Claire. Feminist Criminology.

Britton, Dana. The Gender of Crime.


Hollander, Jocelyn; Howard, Judith; Renfrow, Daniel. Gendered Situations, Gendered Selves; A Gender Lens on Social Psychology.

Emma Jeanes (Editor), David Knights (Co-Editor), Patricia Yancey Martin (Co-Editor). Handbook of Gender, Work, and Organization.

Pearce, Susan; Clifford, Elizabeth; Tandon, Reena. Immigration and Women; Understanding the American Experience.


Mignon Duffy. Making Care Count, A Century of Gender, Race, and Paid Care Work.


Macdonald, Cameron Lynne. Shadow Mothers; Nannies, Au Pairs, and the Micropolitics of Mothering.

Sarah Sobieraj. Soundbitten: The Perils of Media-Centered Political Activism.

Jafar, Afshan. Women’s NGO’s in Pakistan.

See http://socwomen.org/web/resources/members-booksheet.html for further information on each book.

(Newsmakers continued from page 18)

June 2011:

Virginia Rutter wrote “In the modern sex scandal, boys will be idiots” at CNN.com.

Michael Kimmel wrote “Ah-nulid, DSK, Weiner—And Us” at the Ms. Magazine blog.

Sarah Cowan wrote “What if a President Served 42 Years?” at CNN.com.

Gaye Tuchman wrote about Regulating For-Profit Colleges at the New York Times.

Abby Ferber wrote “Schwarzenegger, DSK and Heterosexual Privilege” at the Huffington Post.

Michael Kimmel wrote “Dominique Strauss-Kahn and the Myth of Consent” at the Ms. Magazine blog.

AWARDS

August 2011:

The ASA (American Sociological Association) presented the following awards at its annual meeting:

Jessie Bernard Award, to Verta Taylor Award for the Public Understanding of Sociology, to Barbara Risman

Distinguished Contributions to Teaching Award, to Maxine Atkinson

June 2011:

Amy Blackstone received the University of Maine College of Liberal Arts and Sciences 2011 Award for Outstanding Faculty in the Area of Teaching & Advising.

(continued on next page)
Yvonne A. Braun received the Ersted Distinguished Teaching Award given by the University of Oregon for creative excellence in teaching by a junior faculty. She also received the Inaugural Enloe Award from the International Feminist Journal of Politics for her article, “Left High and Dry: An Intersectional Analysis of Gender, Dams, and Development in Lesotho,” International Feminist Journal of Politics 13(2): 141-162, 2011.

Hae Yeon Choo and Myra Marx Ferree were awarded the 2011 ASA Race, Gender, and Class Section Distinguished Contribution to Scholarship Article Award, for “Practicing Intersectionality in Sociological Research: A Critical Analysis of Inclusions, Interactions, and Institutions in the Study of Inequalities,” in Sociological Theory 2010.

Naomi Gerstel was named Distinguished Professor by the University of Massachusetts Board of Trustees.

Miliann Kang received the 2011 ASA Race, Gender, and Class Section Distinguished Contribution to Scholarship Book Award, for The Managed Hand. While a doctoral candidate, Kang had been awarded the SWS Cheryl Allyn Miller Award.

Kristy Kelly was awarded the 2010 Gail P. Kelly Award for Outstanding Dissertation in Comparative Education. It was awarded by the Comparative and International Education Society for her dissertation titled “Learning to Mainstream Gender in Vietnam: Where Equity Meets Equality in Development Policy.”

Zakiya Luna accepted the 2011-2012 Mellon Foundation Sawyer Seminar Postdoctoral Fellowship at the University of Wisconsin-Madison. She also received the 2011 Graduate Student Mentor award, and was one of six students selected to be a summer 2011 University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee Diversity Fellow.

Nancy Naples was awarded the 2011 Excellence in Research Award for Social Sciences from the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences at the University of Connecticut.

Julie Shayne, University of Washington-Bothell, received the Pacific Sociological Association’s 2011 Distinguished Scholarship Award for her book They Used to Call Us Witches: Chilean Exiles, Culture, and Feminism (2009, Lexington Books).

JOBS AND MOVES

September 2011:

Esther Chow is now Professor Emerita at American University.

Davita Silfen Glasberg is now associate dean for the social sciences in the University of Connecticut’s College of Liberal Arts and Sciences.

Kimberly Kay Hoang is now a postdoctoral fellow in the Center for the Study of Women, Gender, and Sexuality at Rice University.

June 2011:

Bonnie Thornton Dill is the new Dean of Arts and Humanities at the University of Maryland.

Hae Yeon Choo will be an Assistant Professor of sociology at the University of Toronto Mississauga.

Brianne Davila will be an Assistant Professor of sociology at Willamette University.

Georgiann Davis (PhD expected 2011) from the University of Illinois at Chicago will join Southern Illinois University-Edwardsville as an Assistant Professor in the Department of Sociology and Criminal Justice Studies.

Amy Blackstone will become Chair of the sociology department at the University of Maine.

Denise Copelton was granted tenure and promoted to Associate Professor of Sociology at The College at Brockport, State University of New York.

Jodie Lawton was granted tenure and promoted to Associate Professor of Sociology at California State University, San Marcos.

Jean Elson will retire from teaching in the sociology department at the University of New Hampshire. She has been awarded emeritus status and will continue to work on research projects.

SWSer Maxine Atkinson receives ASA’s Distinguished Contributions to Teaching Award. Shown here with (l-r): Sarah Nell Rusche, Jaslyn Brenton, and Sinikka Elliott. Photo courtesy of ASA
(Award Winners continued from page 18) means to live the idea that ‘the personal is political.’"

The committee is pleased to honor these outstanding women, and offers congratulations to both award winners.

CHERYL ALLYN MILLER AWARD
SWS has established an award for graduate students and recent Ph.D.s working in the area of women and paid work — employment and self-employment, informal market work, illegal work. The award is supported by a bequest from the family of the late Cheryl Allyn Miller, a sociologist and feminist who studied women and paid work.

This year’s recipient, Kimberly Kay Hoang, was selected to receive the Cheryl Allyn Miller Award for her insightful research on sex work in Ho Chi Minh City. She examines how sex workers employ a variety of economic, cultural and bodily resources in their relations with clients and investigates how patterns of race and class stratification influence sex workers’ access to these resources.

Kimberly is currently ABD at UC-Berkeley and is in the process of completing her dissertation, entitled “New Economies of Sex and Intimacy in Vietnam.”

ROSENBLUM AWARD
The Barbara Rosenblum Cancer Dissertation Scholarship selection committee (Sue Ilinze, Gayle Sulik, and Jan Thomas) is pleased to announce that the award this year goes to Ana Porroche-Escudero for her dissertation: Listening to Women: Political Ethnographic Narratives of Breast Cancer in Spain. Her work is theoretically driven critical, feminist scholarship on women’s experience of breast cancer, with an eye toward practical and policy directed applications.

This dissertation investigates how Spanish women living with breast cancer define their own health priorities by exploring their experiences and their dissatisfaction, which appear to have been excluded from public and biomedical discourses. Based upon a framework of narratives of resistance grounded in feminist theory, critical medical anthropology, and sociology, an ethnographic approach allowed a focus on breast cancer patients and survivors as “experts” of their own health, addressing fundamental concerns in the production of knowledge. Theoretically and methodologically, she argues that breast cancer patients’ narratives of their (dis)embodied experiences are essential for a better understanding of the structural forces that shape their experiences of illness and health.

(President’s Message continued from page 1) strategies necessary to contest the ongoing systematic efforts to dismantle the progressive social and economic policies that decades of activism have generated. Her talk highlighted the contribution of feminist scholars to the identification of the processes that have contributed to the depoliticization of movement goals through policy implementation, the delegitimization of movement frames through reframing in popular discourse, and the cooptation of social movement frames by those opposed to progressive social change. As I write this, many are gathering on Wall Street and elsewhere in the country to demand, among other things, new forms of democracy. As progressive feminist sociologists, I hope that we will continue to use the insights of these scholars to analyze these events and use our skills to assist in efforts to move us all in more human, more socially conscious, and responsible directions.

As always, the dedication of SWS to maximizing the effectiveness of and professional opportunities for women in sociology was present throughout the program. Betsy Lucal organized a session that was co-sponsored with ASA on navigating the job market with a “lavender vita.” Presenters Sara Crawley, Tey Meadow, Carla Pfeffer, and Salvador Vidal-Ortiz shared their insights and experiences with participants regarding the challenges of navigating the job market when one’s professional identity is marked in this way. Good advice continued in the session sponsored by the Sister to Sister and Student Concerns Committees and organized by Vrushali Patil and Ronni Tichenor. Discussing the road to tenure, presenters in this session focused specifically on guidance for women of color junior faculty and offered counsel regarding the balancing act of publishing, teaching, and service commitments pre-tenure. Finally, the ever popular, hands-on “Critique me” session, sponsored by the Career Development Committee and organized by Sara Crawley and Tina Fetter, provided advice on a variety of professional issues. These (continued on next page)
well-attended sessions demonstrated the continued value of and commitment to SWS in mentoring members of our profession.

Two significant sessions focused on the importance of public sociology. The first, moderated by Katherine Spillar, Executive Editor, Ms. Magazine, included presenters Carrie Baker, Adina Nack, Aditi Mitri, and Mako Fitts and focused on ways to bring feminist scholarship to Ms. Magazine and Ms. To the classroom. In this session presenters provided case studies of how the work of sociologists has been included in Ms. and how Ms. can be used to enhance student learning. The second session, sponsored by the International Committee and organized by Susan Lee focused on the role of feminist sociological insight on the challenges facing rural women with regard to poverty, hunger, and development. The impressive list of presenters included Kum-Kum Bhavnani, Barbara Mangala Supramaniam, Kaye Meola, and Yordanos M. Tiruneh, and all shared their insights on how feminist sociology can have an impact on state policy in order to positively impact the lives of rural women.

As always, members dedicated a great deal of energy to doing the work of the organization at committee and business meetings. In addition to the tasks of individual committees, the efforts that we began in San Antonio regarding strategic planning continued while in Las Vegas as Vice-President Leslie Hossfeld graciously volunteered to lead the second phase with an action committee.

(continued on back cover)
Contains these reports from Las Vegas:
  Business Meeting
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Business Meeting
August 21, 2011, 8:30-10:15am

Meeting called to order at 8:35am

I. Officers’ Reports

A. President
   a. Tracy read “Post-Convention Note from the President” (Alice Rossi) from the October-November 1971 SWS Newsletter.
   b. Buses for SWS banquet in front of Celine Dion Store.
   c. A few tickets are still available. Consider purchasing one for a graduate student. Spring Reserves is entirely smoke free.
   d. Strategic Planning and Action Coordinating Committee – charged with reviewing the data from the external consultants presented at Winter meetings, reviewing priorities and how to execute them. Approval by EC.
   e. Bylaws, mission statement (is it accurate), and long-range planning (i.e., Winter meetings – location, purpose, principles about how meeting(s) are organized, etc.)
   f. Leslie Hossfeld has volunteered to chair the SPACC.

B. Treasurer
   a. Kristen reported the organization is still making money.
   b. Org. has been making less in the last six months in comparison to first six months.
   c. Since Laura Kramer reported last year, SWS made $405,685. However, since December 2010, the organization has only made $17,000, so we are not on track to make as much this year.
   d. Rainbow, our investment advisors have said that there will be a market correction. Treasuries are selling off. They are doing well. There’s a bit of a “blip” but we are doing well. WE usually see how we are doing
according to the S&P. We didn't lose as much money as the S&P. We are making money, not as much as the S&P, but that is expected. Since we started with Rainbow, we are making more.

e. Total assets as of June 30, 2011 were $1,527,250. It had been projected that it would be $1,765,000.

f. The poorest performing fund is Fidelity. There is only one left which is slowly being sold off. The value has declined 50% since it was first purchased.

g. Revenues – 72% of revenue comes from Gender & Society. Membership dues, registration fees and dividends on investments, and in-kind contributions. Projected revenue for this year is $539,800.

h. The projected wealth is $2,304,800.

i. Meeting costs ($137,319.46), especially for food, has increased over the years. Kristen reported that Laura stated that last year, after registration fees we spent only $50,000.

j. This year, $110,000 was spent on the meetings. The decline was due to many not coming to San Antonio meetings. Some were refunded their registration money when they weren't able to come due to weather delays. We would like to keep a cap on these costs. The cost is doubling each meeting but we would like to keep our politics “correct”. Kristen and Jessica will work on this.

k. Another major cost this year has been the amount to support G&S. To date that amount is higher than usual due to the overlapping editorial offices during the editorial office transition this summer.

l. Network News is higher this year given we have returned to paper as a default method of distribution rather than the electronic version.

m. Since the Winter meeting we have new and clearer form for requesting funds. Paperwork must be filled out in advance so the Executive Office and the officers can make decisions on the requests in advance, know what amount is being requested and for what purpose, and to help advertise the event.

n. Treasurers and EOB go to the EO site to review accounts, etc. At the October 2010 site visit Jessica announced it would be her last year. A job description was devised based on what we have now and compared it to what exists in other similar organizations (i.e., SSSP, ESS). Some changes were made to EO position but not many. A lot of tasks have been contracted out. We know have complex contracted advisors. The EO position has changed a lot. We also see an office manager who would take care of day to day operations in the office. A search committee will be formed. We would like to open it up to people who have non-profit experience and would also like to interview at the St. Petersburg, Florida winter meeting.

o. Review of tables and charts.

C. E.O. & Communications

a. Jessica reported there were difficulties with the membership database on the website. It is expected that the test page will be sent this week to the E.O.

b. You can log on to the website to access additional information.

c. If anyone would like to receive hard copies of G&S in hard copy form, please contact Rachel Weisz-Smith.

d. Information may be found in the program regarding who to contact for meeting reimbursement, etc.

e. Appreciation of volunteers at registration desk.

f. Clarification that the membership and conference registration forms are separate. This will result in two different files/databases.

g. Communication

i. Theta Pavis has been assisting.

h. Website is getting thousands of hits from dozens of countries.

i. Press releases have gone out. Examples include The Telegraph and Guardian in England, Jezebel, Glamour, etc.

j. ASA has press packet given each year, this included the SWS 40th year

k. Facebook and Twitter are doing well. Rachel is monitoring Facebook. Jessica is monitoring Twitter.

l. LinkedIn we are getting lots of people requesting to join. She's been approving people (300) from over 30 countries.

m. NN is coming out 4X a year. Hardcopies are being sent out unless you opt out. Hard copy will include the
minutes from the meetings. On-line the minutes are behind the Members only option.

n. Workshops – Tuesday at 10:30am there is an ASA professional workshop. Nikki Jones, Theta Pavis, and Jessica will be running workshop.

o. Discussion of the website page that details recent awards, media, and job related announcements.

p. Theta and Jessica showed the poster announcing the 40th birthday of SWS. There was a drawing for a variety of prizes.

II. Bylaws proposal at last meeting regarding changing student representative position to two-years

a. This proposal was approved once and requires a second vote.

b. There was concern raised about changing bylaws with a small portion of the membership present at the meeting when we have a membership of almost 1000.

c. Motion passed. The change will take place with the next election.

III. Committee Reports

a. Academic Justice – Katrina Bloch reported that a second vote was needed for an additional elected member of CAJ which passed. Vote was called. Motion passed.

b. Awards –
   i. Heather Laube reported that they've been working on internal policies and procedures. As with CAJ, a second vote was needed for two elected committee members; one will serve as chair of Feminist Lecturer Committee; the other for the Activist Award Committee. Motion passed. One individual will be elected in the next election for the above.
   ii. Not all mentoring happens at doctoral level. Consider nominating people
   iii. Higher expense this year as lecturer is coming from Africa.
   iv. Discussion of a request coming from the Beth Hess Awards Committee for an increase in funding to $7000 from $3000 or increase to $15000 in line with the Chow-Green Award. If the latter, for five years; for the former, in perpetuity. SWS is the primary funder, but ASA and other organizations provide funds for this award. The first option was agreed on by the Awards Committee.

c. Career Development – Sara Crawley reported on the Critique Me Session being held tomorrow. They would like to offer more sessions at the winter meeting.

d. Discrimination – In Katja Guenther's absence, an update on the discrimination case first mentioned at the Winter meeting was discussed by Tracy Ore.

e. Gender & Society –
   i. Dana Britton reported we are on pace for receiving 500 manuscripts. Acceptance rate is 8%. Impact factor is #4 among sociology journals. ASR, AJS, and ARS are the top three.
   ii. Joya Misra reported they've received ninety submissions so far this summer; 88 were resubmissions.
   iii. Special journal on work of Pat Hill Collins
   iv. International focus for journal. They've changed the logo. It now looks like the SWS logo.
   v. Website has changed with a new Twitter feed, Facebook page, style guide, etc.
   vi. Three managing editors with three different tasks regarding direction of journal.

f. International – Clare Weber reported UN work is going strong. New reps. There are several new people who have joined.
   i. Discussion about Global Feminist Partners. Want to start revisiting this. Is it meeting our goals? Doing what we want it to do? They are proposing a plenary with the ISA and Global Feminist Partners, and Sociologists without Borders.
   ii. Membership is open but gets lost between meetings.

g. Membership – Leslie Hossfeld reported Gail Wallace is MFP liaison who will be welcoming them at banquet. Hand Program is going well.
Meeting this afternoon at 4:30. Please feel free to come.

h. Network News – See Communications Report

i. Nominations – Did not meet but Denise Segura reported that if you would like to run for office, contact her. She will be working on this over email.

j. Publications – Kathrin Zippel (co-chair with Barbara Risman) gave an overview of committee.
   i. Committee held meeting yesterday and will hold another one tomorrow. They’ve been working on issues related to the transitioning from Dana Britton’s office to Joya Misra’s and contracts with SWS between the Gender & Society offices. They will be reviewing special issue proposals. The budget has been complex but has gone smoothly.
   ii. Sage gives money to SWS that it distributes to the editors.
   iii. Manuscripts have doubled.

k. Scholarship & Human Rights – Denise Segura reported that they did write letters, including one for a faculty member who sought assistance of Discrimination Committee and SWS and co-signing approval for the Direct Care Job Quality Improvement Act.

l. Sister to Sister – no formal report but there was a meeting yesterday. Would like to bring Chow-Green award recipients together to talk about their work. They would also like to see more applications.

m. Social Action – Jeanne Flavin absent – Trina Smith gave report on popularity of Fact Sheets online.

n. Student Concerns – Logan Logan reported they have a Facebook page and have a listserv on Google Groups.

IV. New Business

V. Winter 2012 Meeting Preview – Pat Martin reported that the winter meeting will be held Feb. 2-5th in St. Petersburg, Florida at the Bayfront Hilton Hotel.
   a. Practical workshops and not show and tell. This may result in limiting the number of plenaries and perhaps requiring parallel workshops. About 40% of attendees last year were students. We have an obligation to give them practical help. Laura Logan will do her best to maximize student participation and inclusion in the program.
   b. NSF sponsored program ADVANCE grants: Sharon Bird and Katrin Zippel are organizing speakers, both inside and outside of academia, to encourage our members to apply for and participate in ADVANCE grant programs.
   c. Sister to Sister, roundtable presentations, and efforts aimed at emphasizing SWS’s goal of promoting gender scholarship will be included in the program. Heather Laube and Patricia Warren will help organize sessions.

Meeting adjourned at 10:15am.
Minutes respectfully submitted by Shirley A. Jackson
Treasurer's report
Submitted by Kristen Myers
Presented at business meeting, Las Vegas

Overall: We remain in a strong financial condition.

Assets: The net assets of SWS at the end of June total to almost $1.7 million. The investments accounts had a combined value on June 30 of $1,527,250. Our portfolio has increased in value $405,685 since August of last year, but it only increased in value $17,196 in the last six months. We did better in the market between June and Dec of 2010 than we have done so far in 2011. But we are still making money rather than losing it, despite the recession.

In recent weeks we have been watching for the effects of the S&P downgrade of the US from a triple A rating to a double A rating. Our investment advisors with Rainbow Solutions (since 2008), Sue Guynn and Donna Clifford, are not seriously concerned about the effects of the S&P downgrade on our portfolio. They do expect some short impact as the market corrects itself. Sue explained (in an e-mail dated 8/8/11), "Treasuries are not selling off and even with the downgrade, there is still confidence in the U.S. Treasuries as a safe haven for your money. In addition, money is still moving into higher quality U.S. corporate bonds that have AAA rated status." We also might be able to buy some securities at lower prices.

Until recently, our poorest performing investments were our Fidelity accounts. Rainbow Solutions have been gradually moving our funds away from these accounts. We have only one Fidelity account left, and it has continued to underperform, declining 50% since it was purchased. We are working toward selling it. Now, 61% of our assets are in Equities, 15% in mutual funds. 22% in cash and equivalents, and the remainder (2%) is considered fixed income.

Reminder: A report on the SWS investment portfolio will be available to members on request. The report will identify SWS's holdings on the last day of each quarter, and the value of each (on that date) as a percentage of the total investment portfolio of SWS. Requests should be addressed to SWS Treasurer, Kristen Myers (kmyers@niu.edu).

Revenues: Our projected revenues for 2011 total $539,800. Our major revenues are related to Gender & Society—72% of our revenues come from the journal. Other revenues include membership dues, meeting registration fees, dividends on investments (cd's, mostly), and in-kind contributions, such as those we get from university of Rhode Island to house the EO.

Expenses: Each year, we project our annual expenses taking into consideration last year's expenses, and any new costs we expect for the new year. This year, we have already exceeded (at the 6 month mark) some of our projections, most notably meeting costs, and Gender & Society operations support.

Our meeting costs have been going up over time, since past-treasurer, Tracey Steele, started tacking the costs in 2008. We subsidize members' travel to the meetings, and we subsidize a great deal of the food costs. Subsidies to support the meetings far outweigh the revenue produced through registration fees. Last year, Laura Kramer reported that meeting costs were about $50,000 greater than registrations. In San Antonio, the costs to SWS were close to $110,000 after registration fees were deducted. A major reason for the increase in cost to SWS is that food costs have been on the rise. Costs for food increased 265% from the Savannah winter meetings to the Santa Barbara meetings. They increased again between the Santa Barbara and San Antonio winter meetings by 211%. As of June 2011, we have spent 153% of our annual meeting budget—largely due to high food costs in San Antonio as well as the fact that so many people whom we expected to attend the winter meetings could not do so due to weather. We refunded registration costs to those registrants. Taken together, we are concerned about rising food costs at meetings, and the overall costs of meetings to SWS. We are committed to subsidizing these meetings so that as many SWSers can attend as possible. However, EOB is working on a strategy for keeping food costs under control for future meetings.

As of June 2011, we have also exceeded our projected budget in the support we provide to Gender & Society for their operations: we are currently at 105% of the annual allotted budget. This higher-than-expected expense is due to the overlap of editorial
offices as Dana Britton transitions out of the Editorship and Joya Misra transitions in. As such, this is not a normal expense and will not impact our budget again until the editorship moves in several years.

We expect the cost of Network News to be higher this year than in the recent past, because we have decided to go back to hard copies of NN in addition to the on-line version. Hard copies cost more, but we also think people are more likely to read the hard copies. People may choose not to receive the hard copy, but the hard copy will be the norm.

**New, clearer procedures for requesting funds:** After the winter meetings in San Antonio, Pat Martin and Tracy Ore created a clearer, easy-to-access form for requesting funds from SWS. This form is available in multiple places on our website, and we encourage you to check that out. You need to request funds before you spend them. Then the Treasurer will evaluate the request, and either approve, ask for changes, or reject the request. Occasionally in the past, people have spent money without seeking approval first, and then submitted receipts for reimbursement. *We cannot reimburse you if we have not approved your proposal.* So please go through the process—it’s easy and painless, even though it takes a little time. We have already had one proposal come through with the new form and it was easy to process, and we happily approved it. If you have any questions about this, contact me: (kmyers@niu.edu).

**EO Search**

Each year, EOB is invited to visit the site of the Executive Office (currently in Rhode Island) to learn about their operations. During our site visit in October, 2010, Jessica Sherwood announced that this would be her last year as EO of SWS. At the winter meetings in 2011, I was asked to write a job description and ad for the EO. I compiled a committee, in consultation with many of the leaders in SWS. Our committee consists of President Tracy Ore, Past Presidents Denise Segura and Shirley Hill, incoming Treasurer Kay Valentine, and Past Treasurers Laura Kramer and Tracey Steele. All of us work closely with the EO and know its procedures well.

With some input from Jessica, we relied primarily on the current job description of the SWS EO, comparing it to EO job descriptions of similar organizations, including ESS, SSSP, and even ASA. We went through the job descriptions and calculated who is doing what in the EO today. Many of our larger tasks—like the database, website construction, and financial accounting—are contracted out to experts, whom we pay. Based on our analysis of whom we are currently paying for what tasks, we decided that the EO job should continue to be a half time position, as it is now.

However, recognizing that the EO is becoming more managerial, we wanted to change the EO job description slightly to ensure we recruit someone with strong managerial skills. We see the EO as an upper-level manager, whose primary job is to facilitate the work of the leadership of SWS. We do not see the job of the EO as addressing the day to day minutiae of running the organization. As such, we added a second job description to recruit an office manager, who will be tasked with the day-to-day operations of the SWS executive office. The EO will oversee this office manager, as well as other contracted workers. Note: we did not construct these job descriptions with Jessica in mind, because Jessica had informed us that she was stepping down. Our task was future-oriented, with an unknown entity in mind. It is in no way meant to be a critique of the fine work done by our current EO.

The job descriptions have not been approved by EOB yet. If approved by EOB, they will go to Executive Council. If approved there, we will create a search committee and advertise the positions. The tentative goal is to interview candidates at the winter meetings in St. Pete, FL.
The charts below provide more detail about our assets/revenues and our expenses.

**Projected Net Assets 2011: $1,765,000**

- Citizen's Bank Acct. 14%
- Rainbow Investment Accounts 85%
- Other 1%

**Projected Revenues 2011: $539,800**

- Sage G&S 72%
- In-kind contributions 9%
- Dividends 6%
- Donations < 1%
- Meetings 7%
- Other 1%
- Memberships 6%

**SWS Projected Total Wealth 2011*: $2,304,800**

- Revenue $539,800 23%
- Assets $1,765,000 77%

*Before expenses are deducted.
SWS Projected Expenses 2011: $543,266

- EO office: 2%
- Website/database: 3%
- Committees: 3%
- Personnel: 21%
- Meetings: 21%
- Awards: 8%
- G&S: 25%
- Network News: 3%
- EO site visit: 1%
- Professional fees: 10%

Projected and Actual Expenses 2010 & 2011

- Personnel expenses
- Meeting expenses
- Scholarships & awards
- Professional fees
- Web site & data base
- Gender & Society
- Committee expenses
- EO office, non-personnel

- PROJECTED '10
- ACTUAL '10
- PROJECTED '11
Communications Report

It's been a good season for the little Communications department of SWS.

Here is the department staff:

| If you're wondering how to talk with a reporter, contact: | Media specialist: Professional with experience writing press releases and interacting with members of the media. | Theta Pavis  
| | | (201) 600-9593  
thetapavis@gmail.com |
| If you'd like SWS to link to something of yours online, contact: | Dir. of communications: SWS member to raise SWS's profile, including online; and to serve as liaison between the media and SWS members. | Jessica Sherwood  
| | | (401) 714-1136  
jessicasherwood@mail.uri.edu |

And here's what we've been up to:

1. **Website**: our website, launched February 2011, continues to earn compliments and traffic. Some statistics about the first half of 2011:
   - the website received over ten thousand visits each month
   - it averages over 400 daily visitors on weekends, and over 500 daily visitors on weekdays
   - the website had over 100 visits apiece from a dozen countries
   - After the home page, the top three "first landing" pages of the website were:
     - Chow-Green Women of Color Dissertation Scholarship
     - Upcoming Conference
     - Fact Sheets
   - The STEM Fact Sheet was most popular, with over a thousand downloads.

The website is now a rich source of current information. To learn more about SWS committees, awards, procedures, and more, please visit www.socwomen.org – it can answer many of your questions!

2. **Press Releases**: Now that our new website is in place, we've begun issuing press releases. Twice in 2011, Theta has:
   1. selected the most media-friendly article from the upcoming issue of *G&S*
   2. interviewed the author and brainstormed with her
   3. drafted the release and gotten feedback from article author
   4. prepped article author for talking to the media
   5. sent the press release
   6. Jessica tracks "pickups" of the release via Google Alerts

Pickups have been good so far, getting research from *Gender & Society* (and links to SWS!) into venues including PsychCentral, Jezebel, UPI, Telegraph, Guardian, Glamour, and the *New York Times* ArtsBeat blog.

Press releases have been sent in two ways: via Theta Pavis's correspondence with relevant targets/outlets, and via the SWS subscription to EurekAlert, the press service of the American Association for the Advancement of Science.

Our latest press release is about SWS's 40th anniversary. We're pleased to have it included in the ASA Press Packet at this meeting.

3. **Facebook**: over two thousand people "Like" SWS on facebook.
4. **Twitter**: over a thousand followers, including germane organizations and feminist writers and activists.

5. **LinkedIn**: Over 300 members of the SWS Group. We’ve been liberal in approving requests to join this Group, encouraging but not requiring SWS membership. The countries represented among our group members are amazing:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Austria</th>
<th>Israel</th>
<th>Portugal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bahrain</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Romania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>Rwanda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>Malawi</td>
<td>Spain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>Mauritius</td>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>Namibia</td>
<td>Switzerland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican Rep.</td>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td>Tanzania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>Turkey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>United Arab Emirates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>U.S.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>West Indies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>Zambia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. **Network News**: In 2010 we experimented with having the newsletter online and mailing hardcopies only by request. Readership plunged and prompted us to return in 2011 to the prior arrangement. Members all receive the newsletter in the mail unless they opt out. (*Gerder & Society* is also available online to logged-in members, and you can opt out of the mailing.)

A hitch with bulk mailing specifications required envelopes for issue 2, but it is fixed for issue 3.

The newsletter that’s mailed gets divided for the website: most of it is online for public viewing – and sharing, via http://bit.ly/SWSNetworkNews. But meeting minutes and reports are visible only to logged-in members. Also, please note that listings of members’ books, awards and so on have moved out of the newsletter to the website at the Bookshelf and SWS Newsmakers, respectively.

7. **Workshops**: Theta and I., with panelists Meika Loe, Gayle Sulik, and Adina Nack, conducted a successful session on the media at the SWS Winter meeting in San Antonio. If you’re still here on Tuesday, attend our ASA session: “What to Say and When to Say It: How to Make the Mass Media Work for You.” It’s at 10:30am with panelist Nikki Jones.

Find related resources at our “Media and Marketing Tips” webpage, visible to logged-in members.

**And here’s what’s to come:**

- overhaul online membership forms to de-bug
- add online forms for donations and gift memberships
- ensure website’s mobile compatibility, explore creating a QR code
- continue promoting SWS and the work of its members.

Respectfully Submitted 08/21/11
by Jessica Holden Sherwood
Executive Office report

Greetings from the EO
Things are humming along at the Executive Office of SWS. Our website is now a rich source of current information. To learn more about SWS committees, awards, procedures, and more, please visit www.socwomen.org.

Membership
It's been a rough year so far for our membership database. As 2011 began, we jumped in to our newly constructed database, but it hadn't been adequately tested and wasn't built properly. Worse, the programmers were unresponsive to our cries for help. A new company is now rebuilding. The faulty database caused myriad issues, as some unlucky members have experienced. Rachel Weisz-Smith has been researching and responding to all inquiries. She takes the beat although the errors are not her fault. During this trying time, I appreciate her endurance and that of our members.

Gender & Society for Members
Members logged in to the website have full-text access to all articles and issues of Gender & Society. If you haven't received hardcopies in the mail but you'd like to, please send Rachel at swseo@socwomen.org your request.

Strategic Planning
At our last meeting, we discussed a vision for SWS, presented by consultants based on input gathered from members in several ways. I call it a vision rather than a plan, because while it states goals for SWS it is silent on the accomplishment of those goals.

While the vision was well received, I am frustrated at the lack of progress on this front. I hope that SWS leadership will consider, again, investing in the organization by investing resources in developing an implementation plan.

On Site
I am sorry that our bookkeeper Donna Russo Morin is unable to attend this conference as planned. She continues to work closely with the CPA, the Treasurers, and me on the books and annual review for SWS and for Gender & Society.

I am pleased to be joined here once again by:

Theta Pavis
Rachel Weisz-Smith
Carly Winterhalder

Media Specialist
Administrative Assistant
Student Assistant

Thanks to Jennifer Keene for help with local arrangements, and to the many volunteers who are staffing the SWS Desk and welcoming new members on site.

Thanks also to Heather Macpherson Parrott, who has taken over as listserv coordinator. If you have listserv questions, please email heather.parrott@liu.edu.

Respectfully Submitted 08/21/11
by Jessica Holden Sherwood
Awards Committee

Heather Laube (chair), Lisa Brush, Andrea Miller, and Marcia Texler-Segal attended the meeting on Saturday, August 20, in Las Vegas.

A major goal for the Awards Committee is to get our procedures, guidelines, and documents in order so we have improved transparency and consistency, and that information is easily transferred from one chair to the next. To that end we have made significant progress in assembling a set of basic documents for each award, creating a document describing how committee members and chairs are chosen/determined/recruited, and in streamlining and clarifying policy guidelines and procedures.

The Distinguished Feminist Lecturer, Feminist Activist, and Feminist Mentor Committees have begun maintaining nominations packets for a period of three years. After much discussion, the committee determined that due to the relatively larger volume of submissions for Feminist Mentor, those nominations will be kept for one year. In addition, we noted that it is important to emphasize that not all mentoring happens at the graduate level. We would like to diversify the pool of nominees for this award and encourage members to consider the wide range of people who have mentored them and to recognize the diversity of their locations and practice. We also discussed the practice of choosing joint winners for awards and decided that committees should avoid this.

The close examination of expectations and benefits for each award revealed that several of the student awards do not include membership in SWS. The committee is requesting that all student winners receive this benefit.

The Executive Office and Budget Committee approved the request for increased funding for our 2010 Feminist Activist winner, Akosua Adomako Ampofo’s campus visits. She is traveling from Ghana and will make both visits on one trip.

The Beth B. Hess Memorial Scholarship Committee submitted two funding proposals for the committee’s consideration and ultimate recommendation to EOB. Option one would increase the funding level to $7000 yearly, beginning with the 2012 award cycle. Option two would increase the funding level to $15,000 a year for the next five years, beginning with the 2012 award cycle, and in the fourth year (2015), the Hess Scholarship Committee would revisit the award mechanisms and funding level to determine if the award has achieved its goals. On the basis of this evaluation, the Scholarship Committee will then submit a new funding proposal. After extensive deliberation the Awards Committee decided to recommend option one to EOB. This is no way represents the endorsement of a cap on the total award amount, but does represent the committee’s conclusion that this is an appropriate financial commitment by SWS as an organization. We hope that raising our contribution will encourage jointly sponsoring organizations (SSSP and ASA) to increase their contributions. The Awards Committee will forward this recommendation to EOB.

At the 2011 winter meeting the Awards Committee requested a second elected member and the membership voted in favor of this request. A second vote was required and the membership again expressed their support at the summer 2011 business meeting. This second elected member will enable the Awards Committee to function more efficiently and to ensure decisions are made in the best possible manner. We look forward to this change.

The next awards cycle is upon us and the committee will continue its work via email and phone. We welcome volunteers for the various award committees. Anyone interested should contact Heather Laube, hlaube@umflint.edu.
Committee on Academic Justice

Kris De Welde and Katriona Bloch, co-chairs.

Our committee meeting for the summer meeting was on Saturday, August 21, 2011, in Las Vegas. In attendance were Katriona Bloch (co-chair), Christine Slaughter, Tiffany Taylor, Kimberly Kelly, Wendy Christensen, and Michelle Jacobs.

First, the CAJ is excited to sponsor a workshop at the 2012 Winter Meetings in St. Petersburg. Abby Ferber, Andi Stepnick and Kris De Welde will offer a workshop titled "Building a Gender Progressive Department." This will be a hands-on workshop focusing on the best practices that lead to gender progressive departments.

At the meetings in Las Vegas, those in attendance also discussed ideas for the Summer 2012 meetings in Denver. In particular, the committee discussed plans for a session on unionizing, and the discussion will continue in February in St. Petersburg.

Secondly, the committee discussed possible responses to the recent report on the gender composition of ASA sections. The report on ASA membership showed that some sections, such as Theory, Economic Sociology, Sociology of Religion, Political Sociology, and Comparative and Historical Sociology were comprised of 40% or fewer women in 2010. Wendy Christensen has offered to organize groups of SWS scholars to attend male dominated section receptions for the Summer 2012 meetings in Denver. The groups are meant to make the ASA section receptions less daunting for SWS members, whether it be through strength in numbers or providing help with introductions for SWS members who do not have mentors attending the section receptions.

Third, we received an official decision regarding the Feminist Transformation of the Academy award (in a previous rendition, the Judith Lorber award). We received notice prior to the summer meetings that the award was not approved by the Executive Council. We discussed alternative ways to accomplish the goals set forth by the award, including rewarding departments that have transformed their environment into one that is gender friendly and sharing the practices that led to the transformation. Additionally, we wanted to expand recognition to types of institutions that are not Ph.D. granting. Early formulations for plans of compiling best practices were discussed and this conversation will continue at the Winter meetings in St. Petersburg.

Fourth, the 2012 SWS Report Card on Gender Scholarship and Equity in Sociology Departments Among PhD Granting Institutions was discussed. This report is now on a 4-year circulation, and we are currently accepting applications from scholar(s) interested in writing the report. We will review these applications, make a decision at the winter meetings, and then announce the chosen authors shortly after the meeting. At the completion of the report, the authors will be awarded a $500 stipend. Traditionally, the report has been conducted in pairs by a SWS member who is early in their career and a member who is mid or later in their career. We encourage joint applications, but will also attempt to match students or early faculty with faculty who are mid or later in their careers if they do not have a mentor that they feel comfortable asking. At the committee meeting, we discussed possibilities to strengthen the methodology of the SWS Report Card. The committee focused on ways to address some of the limitations in the current approach (counting number of women faculty, number of women faculty who list gender as an area). The committee suggests the addition of a supplementary portion that allows departments nominated for the seal of excellence to illustrate why they are gender friendly, supportive of gender-focused scholarship, and whether or not their department promotes intersectional research. To create this supplemental report, a short survey will be sent to department chairs and graduate directors. Tiffany Taylor has agreed to draft these questions. Responses to this report will not alter the original Report Card scores, but will provide additional information to those who are considering attending graduate school or accepting jobs in these graduate departments.

Finally, the required second vote for an elected member to the committee (not just elected co-chairs) was approved at the business meeting, and will result in a change to the bylaws. CAJ will now have two chairs (co-chairs) and one elected member in addition to volunteer members. In the upcoming election, the membership will be electing this new member and a new co-chair as Kris De Welde will be cycling off her three-year term at the Winter Meetings.
Career Development Committee

The Career Development Committee (CDC) is comprised of elected members: Sara Crawley (CDC chair), Laura West Steck (mentoring program coordinator), and Tina Fetner (Hey Jane! Column coordinator). As the committee members work in concert to accomplish CDC activities, this report comprises subsections from each committee member.

I. Summer Meetings committee activities (from Sara Crawley)

Because summer meeting attendance for CDC activities are traditionally less well attended than winter meeting activities, the committee purposefully only sponsored one session during summer—a Critique Me! session for junior and senior members looking for critique on job application materials. Two senior members and ten junior members sought advice on their materials while eight members volunteered to act as reviewers.

The CDC would sincerely like to thank the following members for volunteering to review materials:

Maxine Craig, Mary Nell Trautner, Betsy Lucal, Kathleen Lowney, Cameron MacDonald, Katja Guenther, Jennifer Reich, and Bernadette Barton.

Sara Crawley would also like to thank Tina Fetner for co-organizing this session and for jumping in to review materials as needed during the session.

The session seemed well received by participants as each junior participant was able to receive at least three reviews on materials they had in hand. Senior reviews were more limited, yet still individualized, and also seemed well received. The reviewers represented various types of university settings as well as specialties in terms of expertise in reviewing, including giving advice on issues regarding spousal hires/dual career couples, LGBT issues, family/work integration, and issues for feminists of color.

Organizers felt the event worked particularly well because various issues were represented by reviewers and because the number of reviewers nearly matched the number of members requesting review. Also committee members worked diligently to meet the needs of senior job applicants needing their materials reviewed by obtaining requests for senior reviews prior to the session. (While we expected fewer of these reviews, we wanted to be sure they were accommodated specifically. We assumed junior members would be less forthcoming with requests for review prior to the session and we assumed all reviewers could accommodate their needs regardless of whether they announced their interest in participating prior to the session.) The balance of reviewers to junior members needing reviews happened serendipitously. But this balance worked so well that for future sessions, we will hold future Critique Me! sessions in which we attempt to strike the same balance by soliciting a list of junior members looking for reviews as well. We continue to expect to hold Critique Me! sessions at both summer and winter meetings.

II. Preparations for Winter meetings in St. Pete, FL (from Sara Crawley)

We expect to hold more, diverse sessions for the winter meetings than we planned for summer. As we hope to meet the specific and timely interests of the membership, we intend to use the SWS listserv to solicit input from members interested in career development activities, rather than work only within the committee to predict membership interests.

III. Hey Jane! column report (from Tina Fetner)

The Hey Jane! column is moving forward by carrying on the column, “Hey Jane! How do I get published in Gender & Society?” that was begun by Sue Hinze. I am hoping to have that out for the Fall semester, and I have a list of topics for future columns after that. Any new ideas for columns are more than welcome.
IV. Mentoring Program report

The mentoring program is carrying on as usual generally by matching via email members who request a mentor. Laura West Steck, the program coordinator, has been active in responding to member requests, although she did expect to have a brief hiatus from the CDC summer activities as she became a mom in July 2011.

V. Career Development Committee Meeting report

Saturday, August 20, 2011, 4:30 pm
Caesar's Palace, Anzio Room

Members present: Tina Fetner, Trina Smith

Regrets: Sara Crawley, Laura West Steck

Note: Because both Laura West Steck (mentoring program coordinator) and Sara Crawley (CDC chair) were attending to family issues and not expected to attend the summer meetings, the committee members had worked via phone meetings in early summer to plan summer meetings sessions to ensure sessions would be managed regardless of committee meeting attendance. Tina Fetner (Hey Jane! Column coordinator) was present, yet the committee meeting did experience very low attendance. Trina Smith did offer food for thought for future meetings that she shared with Tina Fetner.

Discrimination Committee
Submitted by Katja M. Guenther, Chair
August 31, 2011

Since the Winter Meetings, the Discrimination Committee has worked to provide direct assistance to one member of SWS and to give information to two others, all of whom reported problems with discrimination at their institutions. In the first case, the Chair of the Discrimination Committee and the current, past, and future Presidents of SWS co-signed a letter to the university in question requesting immediate attention to the race, gender, and disability-based discrimination the SWS member experienced in her department. The administration of the university in question has taken some action to address the members’ situation. In the other two cases, the Chair of the Discrimination Committee offered advice and referrals. Neither of these two SWS members requested additional assistance. The Committee reminds SWS members that we are available as a resource for information about discrimination issues. The Committee hopes to organize a discussion-based session on the persistence of discrimination in academia at the Winter Meetings in Saint Petersburg. This session would serve as a follow-up to the more formal panel the Committee organized in San Antonio by creating a forum for conversation and problem-solving.
Executive Council

Meeting 1: Friday, August 19, 2011

Present: Leslie Hossfeld, Shirley A. Jackson, Laura Kramer, Pat Martin, Kristen Myers, Tracy E. Ore, Denise Segura, Jessica H. Sherwood, Catherine "Kay" Valentine
Absent: Laura Logan
Meeting called to order by Tracy Ore at 5:35pm.

1. **EOB Report**
   a. Feminist Activist – Dr. Ampofo will be spending more on her Campus Visits due to health reasons and international travel.
   b. Theta Pavis is being renewed until February to help with press releases (1 per month)
   c. Pat will develop policy on registration refunds.
   d. Refund members whose memberships were lost in database.
   e. Volunteers at Summer will have comp registration at 10% off of the Winter meeting registration.

2. **Report from Strategic Planning Taskforce (SPTF)**
   a. Tracy organized SPTF request and is attempting to populate SPTF.
   b. She has sent out an email asking if individuals who were referred would be willing to serve. Has heard from two people so far. She is still attempting to get names of people to serve. Would like to receive at least two names from each committee.
   c. Charge of committee and names will be shared on Monday at Business Meeting.
   d. Discussion ensued regarding the history of the SPTF and the suggestions made by the consultants.
   e. The SPTF will come up with recommendations about what needs to be focused on and then bring that information to the Executive Council before moving forward.
   f. Pat suggested that the SPTF work on no more than three items. Pat also suggested that no charge be given to the Task Force without action by Council and that the direction to the Task Force should come from Council.

3. **Winter meeting committee**
   a. Tracy suggested that there be a committee to discuss setting up at least three possible regular winter meeting sites.
   b. It was suggested by some that this be done by the president. It was also agreed that it would be sent to the Long Range Planning workgroup of the SPTF.

4. **Business Meeting Preparation**
   a. Jessica raised discussion about use of Roberts’ Rules/Martha’s Rules. This would be helpful for the business meeting on Monday. No decision was taken on the matter.
   b. Discussion ensued regarding how to handle motions and votes at time of meeting. Resolutions can come forward but concern was raised regarding when votes can take place.
   c. There was a brief discussion on what the president reports on at the Winter meeting when taking office. It was affirmed that the president reports on major highlights addressed over the course of the year at the business meeting.

5. **New Business**
   a. Laura K. suggested that the president and vice-president complete the preliminary conference program two months in advance of the meeting.
   b. It was agree that it was a great idea but would be difficult to implement.
   c. Jessica said that it could be done. Tracy concurred but noted that the Council had to be involved.
Meeting adjourned at 6:30 pm
Respectfully submitted by Shirley A. Jackson

Meeting 2: Monday, August 22, 2011

Present: Leslie Hossfeld, Shirley A. Jackson, Laura Kramer, Laura Logan, Pat Martin, Kristen Myers, Tracy E. Ore, Jessica H. Sherwood, Catherine “Kay” Valentine
Absent: Denise Segura
Meeting called to order by Tracy Ore at 4:35 pm.

1. Treasurer’s Report
   a. Kristen Myers reported that Cecilia Ridgeway is leaving position on Publications Committee as she has been elected as President-Elect of ASA. Next highest person who received votes will be asked to serve. If they decline, three people will be asked to serve. Kathrin Zippel will ask the runner up if they would be willing to serve.
   b. Book review editor is paid by Sage, not through U Mass. Sage gives SWS money and SWS gives it to book review editors. $6000 is the amount that will be coming from Sage.

2. Terms & Conditions for Membership and Privacy Policy
   a. Jessica reported that we do not currently have terms and conditions for membership. The programmers asked for this information with the online membership form. They are directing people to the privacy policy which is online. It was mentioned that it might be helpful to write up a draft of terms and conditions.
   b. This will be forwarded to the bylaws workgroup.

3. Gender & Society Back Issues
   a. Members have access to full articles of G&S online. If you join after the membership year begins, we can send the back issues automatically once the membership form is processed. In the past, people have requested the back issues.
   b. You can opt out of receiving G&S in hardcopy form. However, if you receive hard copies, these will be sent automatically when you join.

4. Schlesinger Paperwork
   a. Review of form from archives from 1975. Deed of gift and terms of use needs to be approved. President and executive officer sign the form. This is a way to check with donors. President and co-chairs of Publications will discuss whether they think it should be reviewed by a lawyer or signed off on.

5. Communication Items and Venues
   a. A Review of Communications Items and Venues handout was received from Jessica. The table presented on the form asks for clarifications on the information that should appear on the website and where (i.e., listserv, newsletter, website, meetings program).
   b. There was a motion that the information appear on the website where indicated in the handout. A motion was made that “Book announcements” be included in the newsletter. The motion passed.

6. Report from Ad Hoc Strategic Taskforce
   a. Leslie Hossfeld reported that the taskforce met this morning and presented a report to the E.C. Leslie asked for approval of the charge for the taskforce.
      i. The charge now reads: “The duties of the taskforce are to review the mission statement and bylaws, to develop long range planning goals, and make recommendations for change to Council.”
b. The three critical issues for taskforce will be:
   i. Long range planning
   ii. SWS mission statement
   iii. Bylaws

c. New committee would stay an additional night during Winter meeting for an additional planning session to take place Sunday afternoon and Monday morning, February 5-6, 2012.

d. Leslie requested an E.C. conference call on September 22nd to finalize list of committee members. Request October 14th conference call to obtain EC feedback on Mission Statement recommendations. Ensuing discussion resulted in consideration of email versus conference call.

e. At the February 2012 meeting there will be a progress report of the Taskforce and committees working on the items listed in 6.b. It is possible that a new SWS Mission Statement would be presented for members’ feedback/approval by the February meeting.

f. Leslie requested E.C. review what was submitted by Ad Hoc Strategic Taskforce Committee. There will need to be monthly meetings (on-line, phone) until the work is done. Members must be willing to participate in the meetings.

g. Discussion of makeup of STFC ensued. This included suggestions about diversity of committee (regional, institutional, race & ethnicity, students, faculty at various levels, etc.) and number of members. It was determined that there would be two students maximum none of which will serve on taskforce.

h. A motion was made to accept the change to the task force with the proposed changes. The motion passed.

i. Jessica brought up concerns about the new job description for the E.O. position not turning into full-time.

j. Discussion ensued regarding no final decision being made as to the position, length of time the possible new hire would have in the position, etc.

Meeting adjourned at 6:13pm

Minutes respectfully submitted by Shirley A. Jackson

EOB (Executive Office & Budget) Committee

Present: Kristen Myers, Laura Kramer, Tracy Ore, Dana Britton, Jessica Sherwood (notes), Kay Valentine, Barbara Risman, Pat Martin, Denise Segura
Visiting: Theta Pavis
Absent: Kathrin Zippel

0. Investing report: SWS is still making money, although less than before. Should be fine in the long run, outdoing the S&P since inception. Myers will email the investors’ reports.

1. Review & respond to spending requests, if any
   a. Feminist Activism campus visits = especially difficult this time (with awardee coming from Ghana), but worthwhile. A proposal that Intl invitees have an expense cap of $5000.

Discussion:
Business class may make sense this time, but not as precedent.
Europe wouldn’t require as much as $5000.
No policy, but one-time $5000 approval; one dissent. A suggestion: maybe we only pay economy.
Another member notes the costs will vary and maybe even out over time. Let’s not question the Business Class decision. Maybe we should consider limiting Intl winners to every third year or something.

Vote = 6 Yes 1 No about approving: max $5000 for Akosua Ampofo’s campus visits.
2. Site Visit plan—October 14 or 21
Discussion: who will go & why: normally a small group, but maybe all EOB if something unusual is happening, which it is in 2011. 10/14 with all EOB invited but Risman and Britton declining – Sherwood to notify Zippel and Misra.

3. Reimbursement/refunding issues:
   a. Protocol for refunding people who register for meetings but then cannot attend
   Note: $4240 refunded after San Antonio.
   Martin will draft a policy about (partial) refunds and circulate it to EOB.

   b. Refund members whose membership was lost in faulty database
   Note: estimated cost: $1212
   Refund OK.

   c. Officialize what Thank-You volunteers get in Summer and Winter
   Note: we reimburse people for registration in summer ($10-15), but it’s very expensive to do that in winter, when registration includes food costs. Agreed on a 10% registration discount/refund for Winter.

4. Report on costs and negotiation process for food at meetings.
   * Reviewed a file with food cost history. Discussion of food costs and politics.
   Proposal: per capita food spending of $250 @ winter mtg.
   But sites vary in their costliness.
   Suggestion: total $ for president to conduct meeting, up to her how foody to go.
   But how much should SWS mtgs change according to President’s priorities?
   No decision made, discussion must continue later.

5. Renewal for Theta Pavia?
Discussion, Sherwood/notes missed most of.
Renewal with adjustment: focus less on the website and more on the press releases.
Consider reviving a media advisory team?
Renew and consider expanding her hours, and add focus/structure to her work.
CCF volunteers get one thing to the media every month. A monthly press release should be her priority.
Agreed: Renew Theta through the next meeting, with these as her priorities:
* monthly press release
* session for St Pete
* available to Sherwood re website

6. Proposal (discuss/agree): “The Executive Officer signs all contracts for the organization. For her own contract/s, the SWS President shall sign.” (10 minutes)
Table. File under Bylaws workgroup.

Sherwood excused; no notes.
Gender & Society
Outgoing Editor's Report

Editorial Staff
Sarah Donley, Sarah Jones and Laura Logan concluded their managing editor duties. Deputy Editors Bandana Purkayastha and Betsy LuCal have also concluded their duties. From January – July 2011 Dana handled 202 manuscripts and each deputy editor approximately 20. Joya Misra has handled 35 manuscripts.

Statistics
From January 1, 2011 to July 31, 2011 Gender & Society received 284 submissions; 236 new and 48 revised manuscripts. This is up 8 percent from the total manuscripts received from January 1 to July 31, 2010. We are on pace to receive 500+ manuscripts this year.

We sent 430 review packets out to reviewers, 385 were returned. The average reviewer response time was 27 days.

Through July 31, 2011, we made 273 editorial decisions. This includes 24 accepts, 18 conditional accepts, 20 revise and resubmits, and 211 rejects (133 of which were rejected without external review). Our acceptance rate through July is approximately eight percent.

The average time from submission to editorial decision is 29 days. The average time from submission to editorial decision for externally reviewed manuscripts is 53 days. The range of decision was 31 days (min.) to 81 days (max.).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>At a Glance Statistics 2010-2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>January 1 – July 1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2010</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New MS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised MS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total MS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review Packets Sent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviews Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Reviewer Days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Decision Days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2011</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New MS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised MS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total MS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review Packets Sent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviews Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Reviewer Days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Decision Days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Difference</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New MS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised MS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total MS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review Packets Sent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviews Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Reviewer Days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Decision Days</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Impact factor
Our two year impact factor is 2.088 (119 citations in 2010 to 57 citable items published in 2008 and 2009). This is the highest in our history, and ranks us FOURTH among 129 Sociology journals (only ASR, Annual Review of Sociology, and AJS are ranked higher). Our five year impact factor - 2.877, ranks us 7th among all Sociology journals. We are ranked 2nd (two year) and 1st (five year) among 35 Women's Studies journals.

Editorial transition
My office has now officially closed, though we continue to work with some manuscripts through the final stages of the process.

Gender & Society
Incoming Editor's Report

Transition
Thanks to the remarkably helpful, supportive, and thoughtful work of Dana Britton, Sarah Donley, Sarah Jones, and Laura Logan, the transition of Gender & Society from Kansas State to UMass has been going quite smoothly. Joya Misra and Laura Heston
visited Manhattan, KS in April; Sarah Donley and Sarah Jones visited Amherst, MA in May. Between the two visits and hundreds of emails, the UMass Amherst team is slowly getting up to speed on how to process manuscripts efficiently, and everything else necessary to run this operation. Publications Committee has also been very supportive as we have made the transition, and worked especially hard providing some additional monies for the SWS budget during this transition year, when we have had two office open for several months, as well as on the new editor’s contract, which does a better job of specifying how we will make the next transition work financially.

Statistics & Information
R.J. Barrios, Elisa Martinez, and Laura Heston are our managing editors. They perform a wide variety of tasks, such as handling author inquiries, ensuring manuscripts are the in the correct form for review, managing manuscript invitations, processing reviews, creating thank you packets and decision masters for papers, managing the editorial board, managing publicity, and many other tasks. Although the G&S budget only provides for two managing editors (since UMass labor costs are very high), UMass Sociology has supported a third for 2010-11. We do not know how we would do this job with only two managing editors.

Deputy Editors Adia Harvey Wingfield, Melissa Milkie, Maxine Leeds Craig, and Mary Bernstein assist in the editorial decision process by providing initial reviews of manuscripts, choosing reviewers, and providing assessments of reviewed manuscripts. From May 15-August 15 Joya has been in charge of 70 manuscripts and each deputy editor between 4 and 5 (these are all manuscripts, not just those who have been decided).

From May 15, 2011 to August 15, 2010 our Gender & Society office received 88 new manuscripts; from June 1 to August 15, our office received 2 revised manuscripts; this reflects the fact that most authors with R&Rs from the Kansas office submitted them to Dana before June 1. We sent 216 review packets out to reviewers, and 159 have been returned. The average reviewer response time was 25 days. We have made 49 editorial decisions. This includes one conditional accept (on a previous R&R from Dana’s office), 6 revise and resubmits, and 42 rejects (30 of which were rejected without external review). We have asked for an R&R on 14% of all submissions, 36% of externally reviewed submissions.

Of the 30 papers rejected without external review, the most common reason for rejection was poor fit for the journal: these are articles were either very short, only tangentially related to gender, or not theorizing gender in any way. In every case, we provided comments explaining the reason for rejecting the piece, as well as suggestions for journals that would be better outlets for the paper. In 9 (or 30 percent) cases, we encouraged the author to revise the paper to more effectively frame the journal for Gender & Society, and make a new submission, since we believe that a reframed version of the paper is more likely to receive helpful comments. In these cases, however, we also mentioned journals that would be better outlets for the paper as currently written. We are trying to see these desk rejects as another form of mentoring – helping authors develop better strategies for choosing journal. If we think that an author will be better served by sending the paper to a more appropriate journal, we try to steer them that way.

The average time from submission to editorial decision is 25 days. The average time from submission to editorial decision for externally reviewed manuscripts is 49 days. The range of decision was 1 day (min.) to 63 days (max.).

Invited symposia
There is one invited symposia in progress. This symposia focuses on Patricia Hill Collins’ contributions to gender scholarship. We will have comments from Elizabeth Higginbotham, Maxine Baca Zinn, Christine Bose, Hae Yeon Choo, Nira Yuval-Davis, Bandana Purkayastha, and Mignon Moore. This will appear in our inaugural issue of the journal in February 2012.

New Style Guide & Updates to Website and Journal Logo
We have revised the style guide, breaking it up into several separate documents, and have also developed a new guide for reviewers. These materials are included in the folders, and also appear on our website. On Manuscript Central, authors also have to check that they have reviewed the relevant submission guide before submitting, which we hope will lower the number of grossly inappropriate submissions we receive.
We have also updated the websites, making it clearer what *Gender & Society* does, and how very competitive the journal is. As you can see, we have changed the *Gender & Society* logo, so that it mimics the new SWS logo, and are in the process of making decisions on the new UMass cover. It will be a black cover, with the new logo. Julie Reid has informed us that she is too busy to continue her work designing *Gender & Society* covers. Eiko Strader, a former graphic designer/current graduate student, has spoken at length with Julie, and we are currently choosing the next four covers.

**International Diversity in Reviewers & Authors**
The UMass office is committed to broadening the already impressive global reach of the journal. We have made a request to the Publications Committee, which they will vote on later during the meetings, to merge the International Advisory board, which was not being used all that much, with the Editorial Board. In addition, the UMass budget includes funding for two internationally-located board members for each meeting—Eric Anderson graciously is attending this meeting; we will have three internationally-located board members at the February meeting. We are also using the networks of these members to expand our reviewer database, along with appeals for new reviewers sent out over the SWS listserv and other social media and listservs. Since mid-May, we have added more than one hundred new reviewers.

**Social Media Publicity**
One of the goals of the UMass office is to increase the internet footprint of the journal. In this vein, we have embraced social network websites such as Facebook and Twitter. We use this method of promotion to highlight recent issues of *Gender & Society*, give advice to submitting authors, and post news that might be of interest to gender scholars. The majority of our growth has been through the social networks of our editors, and from the retweets and reposts of the SWS and ASA Facebook and Twitter feeds. As of August 15th, Sage has also posted links to both our Twitter and Facebook pages via the gas.sagepub.com website; we expect our Facebook and Twitter subscribers to continue to increase as a result. Our office sees social media networking as a way to bring *Gender & Society* to a larger audience. We expect to use podcasts and public sociology write-ups to increase the use of *Gender & Society* scholarship in classrooms and newsrooms around the globe.
International Committee

1. Susan Lee, Pat Ould and Sarah Swider will be stepping down as representatives to the UN ECOSOC and the CSW. Everyone thanked them for their hard work and leadership. The new representatives will be Dani Jauk, Kristy Kelly and Shobha Gurung. The IC is working with the Social Action Committee to discuss ways that SWS might act to pressure the US government to sign on to CEDAW. At the Spring SWS meeting in 2011, the IC committee elected Barret Katuna to serve as the lead representative to the UN. She has now assumed that position. Barret plans on proposing a side event, possibly around the theme of rural women. There was some discussion about coordinating with ISA RC 32. Hara is interested in helping on that. Pat suggested that the UN reps look into sponsoring a “Sociology day” with C.O.N.G.O.

2. Hara Bastas, Pat Ould and Clare Weber volunteered to help with the strategic plan as IC members.

3. The committee discussed a proposal for a plenary session at the Winter meetings. The plenary will focus on the topic of “Effective Global Feminist Partnerships and How We Build Them.” An invitation will go out to Judith Blau of Sociologists Without Borders, Margaret Abraham of the ISA, and two of our existing global feminist partners to be determined. The participation of three international representatives of the Gender & Society editorial board was also discussed. The hope of the proposed plenary is to be better informed and reconsider the structure and effectiveness of the Global Feminist Partnership program as it now stands. The committee also discussed inviting the international partners present to discuss the issues and work that they are doing in their respective locations. We have one application submitted by Salvador Vidal-Ortiz, who nominated Instituto Pensar/Pensar (en) Género Research Group (which focuses on feminism, gender, and sexuality studies in Colombia). Shobha Gurung is initiating the GFT partnership with the Women and Gender Studies Program, Kathmandu-Nepal.

4. The list serve for the IC committee will serve as the site for SWS members to join the SWS committee and help further the work in between the summer and winter meetings.

5. Minjoeong Kim is the coordinator of the Global Feminist Partnership program and she wrote a summary of the history of the program.

Membership Committee

In Attendance: Leslie Hossfeld, Chair, Tamara Smith (outgoing liaison for local and regional chapters), Tiffany Taylor (chair, welcoming committee), Trina Smith (incoming liaison for local and regional chapters), Jessica Holden Sherwood, Jennifer Keene, Stephanie Nawyn

- Local/Regional Chapters: Local chapters are just beginning to forward budget requests to the liaison rather than directly emailing the Treasurer for funding requests. This allows the entire committee to both keep abreast of what local chapters are doing, and to advocate for the funding requests that local/regional chapters request.
- The Membership Committee has created a Welcoming Committee for meetings, chaired by Tiffany Taylor. Membership committee members serving in this venue were visible at the banquet, at Happy Hour, and throughout the meeting to maintain ties with new participants and to help with retention of current members. The winter meetings will be a time to focus on institutionalizing the welcoming committee’s role further through Bingo at the opening reception for the winter meetings, and being visible to members through the purple SWS sash indicating them as Welcoming Committee members.
- The Hand program continues to thrive. Patti Guiffre and Kristen Schlitz matched 24 new conference attendees with 24 senior SWS members. We greatly appreciate members taking on this important role.
- Tamara Smith will be helping to coordinate the Hand Program for the winter meetings.
- We want to continue fine-tuning the extremely valuable Hand Program. Some ideas focus on finding ways for new conference attendees to meet with their match throughout the course of the meetings, or at least on several specific times during the meetings. This, of course, is more difficult for summer meetings because of so much occurring at the same time (other conferences and sessions).
• Trina Smith has volunteered to become the liaison for local and regional chapters
• Winter meeting: We plan to have a workshop discussing the ups and downs of local/regional meetings, how to start a new local/regional group, how to request funds, etc.

Publications Committee

The Publications Committee (Pubs) is co-chaired by Kathrin Zippel and Barbara Risman. The members of Pubs are Karen Pyke, Cecilia Ridgeway, Julia McQuillan and Josephine Beoku Betts. The Ex Officio Members are Kristen Myers (Treasurer), Kay Valentine (Treasurer-Elect), Dana Britton (Gender & Society Outgoing Editor), Joya Misra (Gender & Society Incoming Editor), Joan Spade (Gender & Society Book Review Editor), Denise Copelton (Gender & Society book editor), Jessica Sherwood (Network News Editor). Josephine and Denise could not attend the meeting. The committee regularly invites Tom Mankowitz (Sage Publications) to provide a publishers report and Theta Pavis the Media Specialist.

The Publications Committee (‘Pubs’) charge is to oversee all publications of SWS including Gender & Society, Network News etc. The major task in this past year has been the budgetary, legal, and administrative details of the transition of the Gender & Society editors from Dana Britton and Kansas State to Joya Misra at the University of Massachusetts at Amherst. This process involved working out and signing contracts with the new editor, Joya Misra, and the Book Review Editors. The pubs co-chairs thanked everyone for their patience and diligence during this rather complicated process.

Gender & Society

Dana Britton reported the exciting news that Gender & Society is now ranked number 4 among Sociology Journals in the 2 year Tomson 2010 Journal Citation Reports. Submissions remain high -- there were 284 submissions in the first six months of this year (between January 1 - July 31, 2011). These submission received quick attention, creating fast average response time of 27 days. Overall the Publications committee applauded Dana's great work in helping to make Gender & Society a high impact journal that furthers the work of SWS.

Joya reported that the transition to her office is on-going and that having overlapping money for four months was a great help for this process. The invited symposium issue on intersectionality is coming together well and is scheduled for February 2012. In response to a question posed by Joya, the members of the Pubs committee agreed that deputy editors can submit articles to the journal because the review process -- aided by the journal software -- is double blind even to the author-editor.

Members of the Pubs committee also discussed and agreed with Joya’s proposal to extend the size of the editorial board to 40 members and to merge the domestic and international board members. We welcome the efforts to further internationalize Gender & Society. We therefore support Joya’s efforts to invite international board members to the winter meetings, involve international board members to in SWS meeting activities more broadly, and by drawing often on their expertise. Pubs committee members encouraged Joya to communicate her emphasis on an international sensibility to potential Gender & Society authors. For example, Joya is initiating a new practice to have all articles reviewed by at least one person not from the home country of the author(s). This new practice should help authors to write their articles in a way that explicitly acknowledges the social location of the research rather than using “American” as an assumed default category. Please see the Editors’ reports for more detailed information.

Joan Spade, the Book Review Editor, reported that the book review editors have a new assistant who is highly efficient and a useful office handbook. Please see more details in the book review editors’ report. The book review office has a significant backlog. The committee discussed ways to publish book reviews in a more timely manner. For now, new books from SWS members will continue to be mentioned in Network News.

With the transition to Joya Misra as the editor G&S, the SWS office has taken over the distribution of SAGE’s payments to the Book Review Editorial office. In the past the money went from SAGE to SWS to the Gender & Society editorial office and then to the Book Review Editorial office. The new procedure will now involve the Book Review Editorial editors submitting their yearly budget separately to the Publications Committee for review/approval. The Pubs committee approved the budget proposal with a unanimous vote.
Network News Newsletter

Jessica reported that she had tried to distribute Network News in electronic format as the default and as a hardcopy by request only. Her impression was that doing this resulted in much lower readership went way down. Therefore she plans to make the paper version of Network News the default and make the electronic version by request only. Members of the Pubs committee recommended that Jessica also proposed moving some announcements to the web page only to aid in timely information for SWS members. The committee encouraged adding announcements to the web page and keeping important announcements in Network News as well for members who count on the newsletter for important announcements.

Use of the Internet and New Media Update from Sage

The SAGE publisher report by Tom Mankowski stressed that we will need to pay more attention to how to use social media to promote articles and the journal using Twitter, tags and mobile devices. Pubs committee members are aware that many journals are facing competition due to changes in technology. Theta Pavis, the SWS media specialist, also discussed ways to promote articles in the popular media. Joya Misra explained her media plan specifically for G&S. Through the discussion at the meeting, Theta and Joya agreed to have the managing editor work with Theta in the SWS office to make the most of media opportunities. We discussed ways to identify articles for popular press audiences. We set a goal of at least one manuscript from every issue of G&S used for a press release. Pubs committee members agreed to ask Joya and Theta to report back about the process of G&S and the media specialist working together for our February meetings.

The Publications Committee held their two regular meetings (the first with guests, the second with committee members only to discuss and vote on committee business).

Sister to Sister Committee

Announcements

The committee is pleased to announce Chandra Waring as the 2011 Chow-Green Fellowship awardee.

Sister to Sister, in partnership with the Student Concerns Committee, sponsored a lively and informative session entitled “The Road to Tenure: Some Advice for Women of Color Junior Faculty.”

Old Business

Co-Chair Ronni Tichenor provided an update on questions the committee had previously raised concerning the Beth Hess and Chow-Green awards. First, applicants for the awards had raised the possibility of a joint application process, to minimize the work for those applying for both. However, since the Beth Hess Award is co-sponsored by other another organization, the Awards Committee did not see this as feasible. Second, the committee members expressed support for increasing the benefits associated with the Beth Hess Award so that they are on par with those received by Chow-Green awardees.

The committee reviewed plans for sponsoring sessions at upcoming SWS meetings and would like to organize informal mentoring/writing support around the breakfast roundtable presentations at the Winter Meetings in St. Petersburg for those interested. Presenters would be paired with either a senior or peer reviewer in advance and discuss the papers informally after they are presented. The committee also affirmed its desire to sponsor a session at the 2013 Winter Meetings that would feature past Chow-Green Award winners and give them the opportunity to present their research.

New Business and Future Plans

Chandra Waring volunteered to create a Facebook page for Sister to Sister. Once it is up and running, an announcement will be posted on the SWS listserv. (Note: the page is currently available). Committee members will also work with the Executive Officer to create a Sister to Sister listserv that will be open to all SWS members interested in the work of the committee.
Future plans include working with the newly formed Welcoming Committee to ensure that all new members are fully included and integrated into the organization, to partner with the Student Concerns and Faculty Development committees on areas of overlap, and to reach out to ABS and SSSP to sponsor joint sessions at future ASA meetings.

For more information, contact Co-Chairs Vrushali Patil (patilv@hu.edu) and Ronni Tichenor (rtichenor@me.com).

Social Action Committee

SAC Business Meeting Update
The Social Action Committee met after the SWS business meeting. During the business meeting, we reported on the following activities of the committee.

REPORT OF THE SOCIAL ACTION COMMITTEE
Compiled by Jeanne Flavin, SWS/SAC Chair
Activities undertaken between February and August 2011

1. Fact sheets (solicitations)
   a. 14 proposals received.
      i. Girls and Education (3)
      ii. Women and Prison (2)
      iii. Women and Land (1)
      iv. Gender and Food/Hunger (1)
      v. Open category (7)
   b. Each proposal was reviewed by at least two people and sometimes three before a determination was made regarding whether to invite the author to submit a fact sheet. There is one proposal that is still under review; four that have been submitted in the "open" category have been wait-listed pending discussion by SAC and availability of funding.
   c. People who participated in the review process include: Kylie Parrotta, Carrie Smith, Andrea Boyles, Chris Calderia, Sarah Flett Prior, Judy Wittner, Roberta Villalon, and Jeanne Flavin.
   d. Authors of proposals that were not selected have been encouraged to seek other outlets for their scholarship, e.g., op-eds
   e. Given the large number and high quality of proposals submitted in the "open" category, (and Jeanne's desire to spend a little less time on fact sheet-related activities in the upcoming year) SAC Chair Jeanne seeks support for the possibility of publishing at least 2 or 3 of these in 2013.
   f. Jessica Sherwood helpfully provided a list of the top 100 downloads of the SWS website, of which around one-quarter were fact sheets. The top half dozen fact sheets appear to be:
      2. Women in Science, Technology, Engineering and Math (STEM) (Kristine De Welde, Sandra Laursen, and Heather Thiry, 2007) 
      4. Gender and Medicalization (Miranda Waggoner and Cheryl Stults, 2010)
      5. Gendered violence (Laurel Westbrook, 2009)
      6. Oppression without Bigots (Abby Ferber and Dena Samuels, 2010) (only a few hits less than #5)

2. Feminists for Life America: A response
   a. Issue: Serrin Foster, president of Feminists for Life America (FFLA), often is invited to speak on college campuses. A need exists to support students in respectfully challenging some of her more dubious claims.
b. SWS/SAC Action: Katie Johnson and her colleagues at Pennsylvania State University developed two documents in response to a campus visit from Feminists for Life: 1) a summary of their experience with FFLA and preparing for the event; 2) a pamphlet that they prepared and distributed at the actual event. Katie agreed to share these materials with SWS members. We also have announced their availability on the list-serv and the Facebook page. People who are interested in obtaining copies of these materials should contact SAC Chair (jilavin@fordham.edu) or Katie (km1655@psu.edu).

c. Future Action: See if these materials can be published as part of the Minutes to the Vegas meeting and/or posted in a members-only area of the SWS website (i.e., “Gender Issues on Campus”).

3. ASA/SWS sociology high school science fair award
   a. Issue: A need exists for awards in sociology to be included in local, regional, and national science fairs in order to advance interest in and the visibility of social sciences and to promote young women's participation in science, more broadly.
   b. SWS/SAC Action: At the winter meetings, Mary Vrnoche and Abby Ferber expressed interest in working with ASA to create a high school science fair award. Abby Ferber helpfully compiled information on local, regional, and national science awards into a 5-page report. We shared this information with ASA's Margaret Vitullo. Margaret reports that Jean Shin is in the early stages of developing an ASA initiative on high school sociology. Hayley Lentspeich, a high school teacher of sociology from Chicago, is the ASA Director of Planning for the High School Affiliates Program (a two-year assignment).
   c. Future actions:
      i. Continue to stay in touch with Margaret to keep this initiative on ASA's radar screen and to offer our assistance as needed.
      ii. If SWS members are interested in establishing a local or regional award, they should contact Abby Ferber and request a copy of her report.

4. Lactation space for ASA annual meeting in Las Vegas, and at future meetings
   a. Issue: To date, lactation space has been available at ASA annual meetings on an ad hoc basis.
   b. SWS/SAC Action: Jeanne polled the list-serv re: the helpfulness and features of lactation space and shared this information with ASA's executive office who responded positively. Margaret Vitullo (ASA's Director, Academic and Professional Affairs Program) reports: "Regarding the lactation space, the ASA office at Caesars Palace has multiple small rooms with doors - if anyone is in need of a lactation space, they will be given access to one of those small private rooms. This fact is listed in the Annual Meeting Program on p. 38 under "Accessibility Resources and Services," which also includes information on the Comfort Zone, Unisex/Gender Non-Specified Restrooms, Shuttle Services, and Disability-related services." A similar arrangement was in place last year in Atlanta. In the future, women in need of lactation space are encouraged to consult "Accessibility Resources and Services" in the meeting program for information on the location of small private rooms.
   c. Future action: Stay in touch with ASA's Executive Office and offer our assistance as needed. Assess whether SWS should have lactation space at the winter meetings.

5. Best practices and principles for undertaking social action.
   a. Issue: In order to better advance the charge of the SAC committee, we would like to get a better sense of how SWS members employ feminist sociological knowledge in our jobs, communities, and as informed citizens. What forms does social action take? What makes undertaking social action easier/more likely or harder than it needs to be?
   b. SWS/SAC Action: Trina Smith and Kristy Kelly have offered to work on identifying some "Best Practices and Principles" for undertaking social action. Toward that end, we have discussed the possibility of holding some conversations and possibly fielding a short survey. We are interested in hearing from a range of members, including and especially those who work within universities as administrators, staff, and teachers, those who work outside of academic environments, and outside of the United States.
6. CEDAW/Gender and human rights.
   a. Issue: A need exists to integrate transnational feminist perspectives into our work as feminist sociologists. For instance, many US-based feminist sociologists are unaware of CEDAW or larger discussions of gender and human rights.
   b. SWS/SAC Action: Jeanne has reached out to members of the SWS's International Committee (e.g., Clare Weber, Susan Lee, Kristy Kelly) to discuss ways in which we might support each other's efforts. Trina Smith has identified several other individuals we should consider pulling into the conversation. ASA's Margaret Vitullo has introduced Jeanne to Jessica Wyndham, director of the science and human rights coalition of AAAS. http://shr.aaas.org/coalition/
   c. Future actions: Clare has offered to ask for space for a meeting to discuss IC and SAC collaboration at the SWS winter meeting. We will also encourage posts to the list-serv which will help to "make the circle bigger" and educate members about transnational feminist perspectives and actions.

Social Action Committee Meeting Notes, SWS Summer Meetings 2011
Recorded by Trina Smith

With only two people in attendance at the SAC meeting, we focused on a potential collaboration between the Social Action Committee and the International Committee. With Susan attending as part of the international committee, we discussed ideas on how the Social Action Committee and the International Committee can work collaboratively on CEDAW (the Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Discrimination Against Women) and ideas for the winter meeting, which were stated to Pat Martin, in-coming president, as she stopped by our meeting.

As such, Susan mentioned that the United States has not ratified CEDAW. There was an effort 2.5 years ago in the US government, but it did not succeed. SWS members have attempted to raise awareness about CEDAW to the SWS general membership, but there seemed to be little interest. As such, working together the International Committee and the Social Action committee would like to at least raise awareness about what CEDAW is and its importance among SWS members. For the US to ratify CEDAW, 67 votes are needed in the senate and if ratified, CEDAW is a UN Convention that is a non-executing standard (meaning it is not forcible international law, but standards to abide by).

In discussing ideas for the 2012 SWS winter meetings, we would like to dedicate time to CEDAW education and also advocacy. One thing we would like members to do, as we are spread out across the nation, is to see where our senators stand on the issue. Thus, we might be able to target some SWS members who live in certain states where there might be resistance to CEDAW in asking them to call upon these senators to show support for CEDAW. We also talked about how we could have a session at the winter meetings in relation to CEDAW that we could have tangible results. One idea was to have a letter writing activity in which members could look up their senators and email or have hard copy letters available for members to send to their senators urging them to support CEDAW. We also talked with in-coming SWS President Pat Martin shortly about the winter meetings and ideas for the Social Committee and International Committee to combine forces.

Although our meeting was small and we were not able to discuss all items on the agenda, the Social Action Committee is working on some exciting areas including “Best Practices” related to activism and promoting the idea of sponsoring sociology awards at science festivals.

Student Concerns Committee

We had a small but vibrant showing at the Student Concerns Committee meeting in Las Vegas. In addition, the Student Representative (Laura Logan) met with some students individually (because of scheduling conflicts). One of the dominant concerns
Students expressed was related to the limited avenues within SWS for funding student research and accomplishment; however, we did discuss the Hand Program and the Mentoring Program as good sources of support.

Students continue to find the Google Group useful for communication (contact Laura Logan to be added to the group - loganls@ksu.edu). There are 62 members in the Google Group. There are 138 followers of the SWS student Facebook page (named “Student Sociologists for Women in Society”).

Students discussed plans for the Winter 2012 meeting, enthusiastically sharing ideas for sessions and other activities.

Finally, approximately 15 students met for the Student Happy Hour in Las Vegas. Many thanks to Crystal Jackson for recommending a wonderful location!

There will be another Happy Hour at the Winter Meeting, and additional discussion about SWS support for student research and accomplishment.
(President's Message continued from page 23) This group is charged with reviewing the data from the external consultants presented at the Winter meetings, reviewing concerns identified by the membership, examining our bylaws, and considering priorities for long-range planning. As we continue to celebrate the 40th anniversary of this wonderful organization, the process of strategic planning affords us with opportunities to pause and reflect and to (re)imagine our future both inside and outside of the academy.

As has become our annual tradition, the banquet provided us with opportunities to celebrate our individual and collective accomplishments. Held at the Springs Preserve just outside of Las Vegas, the setting offered what was, at least for me, a very welcome respite from the chaos of "the strip." Thank you to the faculty at UNLV as well as Susan Farrell for suggesting such a perfect location for our gathering. There, we shared in celebrating award recipients, recognized the leadership of outgoing Gender & Society Editor Dana Britton, and enjoyed good food and conversation. I want to express my appreciation for the wonderful leadership of Awards Committee chair Heather Laube, not only in facilitating the good work of her committee members, but also for organizing the presentation of awards that went off without a hitch. In all, it was a lovely and festive evening and evidence of the strength of our organization.

I would like to thank everyone who helped make the Summer Meetings so successful. I am fortunate to work with such a wonderful group of people, including a long-time group of friends and wise advisors, as well as committee members and chairs. In addition, thank you to Tiffany Taylor and all of the members of the SWS Welcoming Committee who organized many initiatives to greet new and returning members at the meetings. I also want to especially thank Executive Officer Jessica Holden Sherwood and her assistant Rachel Weisz-Smith who worked tirelessly to make everything run smoothly. The generosity of time and creativity on the part of all involved in the planning and organization of all of our activities is something that I continue to be thankful for. I look forward to seeing you all in February in St. Pete, and to seeing what President-Elect Patricia Yancey Martin has in store for us.