

Organizational Challenges, Resilience, and Healing:

2016 Annual Report of the Policy and Planning Board

2016 Policy and Planning Board of the American Psychological Association

Author Note

The members of the 2016 Policy and Planning Board of the American Psychological Association include (in alphabetical order): Armand R. Cerbone, PhD, Allen M. Omoto, PhD, Konjit Page, PhD, Richard E Petty, PhD (Chair), Ronald H. Rozensky, PhD, Kenneth J. Sher, PhD, Lori C. Thomas PhD, John S. Westfeld, PhD. Lucia Gutierrez, PhD serves as the Staff Liaison.

Suggested Citation: American Psychological Association. 2016. Organizational Challenges, Resilience, and Healing: 2016 Annual Report of the Policy and Planning Board. Retrieved from:

Abstract

The American Psychological Association's (APA) Bylaws Article XI.7

(<http://www.apa.org/about/governance/bylaws/article-11.aspx>) requires that the Policy and Planning Board report annually by publication to the membership. This 2016 annual report presents organizational trauma theory as an organizing model for conceptualizing the impact of organizational stressors on the APA and recommends strategies for managing and mitigating the negative impact of these stressors, using two stressors as exemplars: (1) lack of clarity regarding the functions of the APA (501 (c)(3)) versus the APA Practice Organization (APAPO) (501(c)(6)); and (2) many members' desire for stronger prioritization of social justice within the APA. The organizational trauma framework provided sets the stage for APA to capitalize on both its history of resilience in the face of stress and its significant contributions to psychology and the public to heal and grow from the inevitable organizational and societal stressors that it encounters.

**ORGANIZATIONAL CHALLENGES, RESILIENCE, AND HEALING:
2016 ANNUAL REPORT OF THE POLICY AND PLANNING BOARD**

Background

The American Psychological Association (APA) is an effective organization that flourishes in many of its longstanding missions (e.g., publishing scientific journals, issuing practice guidelines, advancing psychology education and training). However, in the past few years it has undergone a period of organizational challenge in response to internal and external stressors, many of which were highlighted in the Policy and Planning Board's (P&P's) recent five-year report to the membership (American Psychological Association Policy and Planning Board, 2016). Key recent stressors include: (1) organizational critiques brought forward in the Independent Review Relating to APA Ethics Guidelines, National Security Interrogations, and Torture (Independent Review (IR) a.k.a. Hoffman Report) (Hoffman et al., 2015); (2) organizational restructuring via the Good Governance Process aimed at improving APA's efficiency, nimbleness, transparency, and aligning the governance with strategic priorities (<http://www.apa.org/about/governance/good-governance/default.aspx>); (3) concerns raised about the alienation of marginalized groups within APA; (4) APA Assessment Fee Litigation (i.e., class action settlement) that negatively impacted both the APA and the APAPO (American Psychological Association, 2015; Top Class Actions, 2016); and (5) reports of members' frustrations that APA is not meeting their needs and/or is led by a small group of individuals who rotate throughout various governance roles.

Two additional ongoing pertinent stressors relate to the lack of clarity regarding the functions of APA (501 (c)(3)) and the APA Practice Organization (APAPO) (501(c)(6)) and many members' desire for stronger prioritization of social justice in the APA's Strategic Plan's

Mission, Goals and Objectives and Strategic Priorities. Struggles are not new to APA as witnessed historically when a large number of psychological scientists left the APA to join the American Psychological Society in the late 1980s, when the Association of Black Psychologists was formed due to concerns about APA's responsiveness to minority issues, a financial problem when APA purchased and then sold *Psychology Today* (Holden, 1988), and ongoing organizational restructuring efforts (Wright, 2008).

To some extent, the confluence of these historical and recent events has led to a concern about APA's ability to optimally carry out its mission and a sense, expressed by some that the organization has been in crisis. In response to these organizational difficulties, P&P has noted a complex mixture of emotional, cognitive, and interpersonal reactions at APA Town Hall Meetings, at the APA Council of Representatives meetings, on various listservs, and even within its own deliberations about these topics. We believe that individual member reactions were mirrored at the organizational level, and vice versa, as reflected by examples of collective unease, dissension, and difficulties making progress. In addition, APA governance has been very focused on addressing these issues, capitalizing on its strengths to heal the organization, and often putting off policy discussion due to the time and energy necessary to address these organizational crises and traumas.

One purpose of this 2016 annual report from P&P is to offer organizational trauma theory as a guiding framework for understanding the impact of the organizational stressors and for offering effective ways to manage them and mitigate their negative impact. This framework capitalizes on APA's longstanding resiliency and accomplishments of significance to psychology and the public and builds upon the literature on healing from organizational trauma. This report begins with an overview of organizational trauma theory (Vivian & Hormann, 2013) and

addresses its relevance for contextualizing and honoring organizational responses to the stresses and challenges APA has been encountering.

Organizational resilience, a key construct associated with organizational theory, is highlighted in terms of its relevance for appreciating APA's actions in response to these challenges and stresses and its investment in forging new more positive pathways forward. Two major systemic stressors, the lack of clarity regarding the functions of APA and the APAPO and the need for stronger prioritization of social justice within the organization, are used as exemplars in this report of APA's organizational challenges. After discussing these stressors, attention is paid to the impact of these and other organizational challenges within and between various subsystems and the system-as-a-whole (Kahn, 2003), as well as ways in which these organizational crises can serve as opportunities for strengthening organizational ethics (Pope, 2018) and for organizational growth. Recommendations and associated strategies aimed at continuing to facilitate organizational healing, growth, and vitality (Simola, 2016) are then provided. Hopefully, these suggestions will maximize the organization's efforts to move forward so it can optimally function and meet the needs of all its members and of society.

Resilience in the Face of Trauma

As a microcosm of the APA, P&P believes that the literature on organizational trauma theory and resilience may provide helpful and valuable frameworks for conceptualizing the events that APA has encountered in past few years, for assessing how it has responded to those events, and for indicating what might build on the progress and healing that has already begun to take place.

Organizational Trauma and its Impacts

Organizational trauma is defined as a "collective experience that overwhelms the

organization's defensive and protective structures and leaves the entity temporarily vulnerable and helpless or permanently damaged" (Vivian & Hormann, 2013). Organizations can be traumatized in multiple ways. For example, it may occur through human behavior that creates maladaptive internal processes; through sudden and cumulative internal and external threats and shocks (Stein, 2001, 2004); or in the form of institutional betrayal that extends to the organization, its members, the profession, and society more broadly (Smith & Freyd, 2014).

Organizational trauma impacts the identity of the organization (Hormann & Vivian, 2005) and can lead an organization away from its principal missions. Moreover, people within the organization may experience varying levels of anxiety and stress that may permeate individuals at every level in the organization and may become the lens through which organizational actions and process are understood (Figley, 2002; Herman, 1992; Hormann & Vivian, 2005). As a result, the organization may become less effective and productive and unwittingly repeat problematic patterns that create a gap between its potential and the realization of that potential, and the entity may unwittingly repeat the problematic patterns it is striving to change (Hormann & Vivian, 2005). This then can lead to a sense of organizational "stuckness" and relational disturbances that may persist after the cessation of the crises (Hormann & Vivian, 2005; Kahn, 2003; Kahn, Barton, & Fellows, 2013).

If organizational traumas are not adequately resolved, their effects can linger and impact the organization's functioning (Kahn et al., 2013; Kleinberg, 2016). Individuals or groups within the system may retreat and/or react defensively, exhibit various levels of cognitive distortion including paranoia, and may exhibit problems engaging in collaborative processes and problem-solving efforts (Kleinberg, 2016). At these times, levels of transparency may lessen and there may be shifting in organizational values and morals in the service of protecting the individual

and/or the group (Kleinberg, 2016). This may lead to potential long-term performance problems of the organization (Kahn et al., 2013). However, organizational challenges and traumas are most effectively dealt with by organizations that demonstrate a high level of resilience. APA's past and present abilities to recuperate and recalibrate after highly publicized losses suggests that it is an organization that is primed for resilience and posttraumatic growth.

Resilience in the Storm

Organizations that are resilient thrive even when confronted with uncertain, unstable, and adverse conditions (Lengnick-Hall, Beck, & Lengnick-Hall, 2011). Resilience is a latent organizational capacity that is present before crises occur; a source of positive adaptation during crises; and a facilitator of learning, healing, and recovery following crises (Lee, Vargo, & Seville, 2013; Weick & Sutcliffe, 2007). It involves the system's capacity to not only return to its baseline state but more importantly to attain a new and more desirable state. It entails the ability to repair and ultimately balance relational systems within the organization following crises, which can support the organization's positive transformation (Kahn et al., 2013). Such transformation involves learning from mistakes, devising and implementing new procedures and processes, and surpassing its pre-crisis level of functioning (i.e., posttraumatic growth) (Tedeschi & Calhoun, 2004). An organization with resilience has the capacity to plan for, and respond to, internal and or external shocks; maintain positive adjustment under challenging conditions; recover in the face of such challenges; and emerge from such conditions in a stronger and more resourceful fashion (Annarelli & Nonino, 2016).

Post-traumatic growth goes beyond resilience; it enables organizations and their members to function collaboratively, capitalize on strengths, and appreciate new possibilities. It can lead to profound differences in the ways in which leaders and members partner to define and deepen

their collective purposes, act according to their shared values, and pursue new pathways (Tedeschi & Calhoun, 2004). Organizations that invest in resilience and posttraumatic growth prioritize situational awareness, acknowledge and capitalize on their strengths and adaptive capacity, and are mindful of their vulnerabilities and invested in overcoming them (Lee et al., 2013; McManus, Seville, Vargo, & Brunsdon, 2008).

Exemplars of Organizational Crises and Areas to Demonstrate Resilience

Before offering some potential solutions that build upon the APA's capacity for resilience and commitment to organizational healing and growth, we outline two major systemic problems in need of solutions that continue to require ongoing attention and that, at times, easily can be characterized as organizational crises given their potential impact on the association. These ongoing and historically challenging issues with which APA has grappled over the years are: (1) navigating and clarifying APA's relationship with its legally separate companion organization (APAPO); and (2) prioritizing social justice, both within the APA as an organization, and within society at large. Below we briefly overview APA's history with each of these complex issues and provide an update on the status of these challenges. These two topics, along with APA's challenges in effectively managing them, reflect the importance of the organizational trauma literature discussed above.

APA's Relationship with the APAPO

This section begins with a description of the APA's legal tax status as a 501(c)(3) organization and the APAPO as a 501 (c)(6) organization and the ways in which these companion organizations differ. This description is then contextualized in an historical context. Then, findings from a recently conducted survey by the P&P board regarding members' understanding of the two organizations are presented. This section closes with some concluding

comments.

Companion Organizations

APA: 501(c)(3). APA is incorporated as an organization that is chartered to focus on advancing education, science, and public welfare. It is not an organization whose primary aim is to benefit psychologists, *per se*. APA's charter reflects its origin as a classic scholarly professional society and makes it clear that APA is not a guild. APA is legally incorporated as a 501(c)(3) organization. According to the US Internal Revenue Service (<https://www.irs.gov/charities-non-profits/charitable-organizations/exemption-requirements-section-501-c-3-organizations>), such organizations, commonly referred to as “*charitable organizations*,” cannot be operated for the benefit of private interests and “are restricted in how much political and legislative (lobbying) activities they may conduct.” As such, APA, like any 501(c)(3) organization, “shall be exempt from taxation under this subtitle ...” Thus, dues paid to the 501(c)(3), APA, are tax deductible, as they are contributing to the charitable educational, scientific, and public service missions of the Association. In addition, the US Internal Revenue Service guidelines require such organizations to operate “exclusively for the promotion of social welfare ... and the net earnings of which are devoted exclusively to charitable, educational, or recreational purposes” (<https://www.law.cornell.edu/uscode/text/26/501>).

Meeting that standard, APA notes in the first paragraph of its bylaws that its objectives are “to advance psychology as a science and profession and as a means of promoting health, education and human welfare by the encouragement of psychology in all its branches in the broadest and most liberal manner” including “the application of research findings to the promotion of health, education, and the public welfare.”

Nonprofit organizations, like the APA, then qualify for tax-exempt status as long as their

major focus is in service of their mission: for APA, that is to use psychology for the enhancement of education, science, and the public good. 501(c)(3) organizations may engage in legislative lobbying, if a ‘substantial part’ of their activities are not focused on ‘influencing legislation.’ APA, therefore, under the lobbying safe harbor election, is permitted to spend a million dollars a year in lobbying (influencing specific legislation) that advances its public benefit mission. Lobbying is narrowly defined as influencing specific pieces of legislation; APA’s broader outreach and advocacy work on issues related to its mission is not included in this restriction. 501(c)(3) organizations are also restricted from any electioneering activity; they cannot participate in any activity for or against the election of a specific candidate.

APAPO: 501(c)(6). The need for a separate 501(c)(6) organization to foster the professional activities of practitioners is relatively recent and reflects, in part, the large increase of health service providers among the membership beginning as far back as the 1950s. Prior to that time, there were very few independent psychologist practitioners. Over time, high priority guild related issues such as credentialing and licensure, third-party insurance reimbursement, and professional liability insurance became increasingly important to practitioner members.

In response to these increasingly important concerns, the APAPO was established as a 501(c)(6) to promote and support practicing psychologists; advocate on behalf of practicing psychologists’ marketplace interests to Congress, state legislatures, and the courts and the public - a guild. Section 501(c)(6) of the IRS Code describes how “a business league is an association of persons having some common business interests, the purpose of which is to promote such common interest ... [and] must be devoted to improving business conditions of one or more lines of business as distinguished from performing particular services for individual persons” (<https://www.irs.gov/charities-non-profits/other-non-profits/business-leagues>). Dues for

501(c)(6) entity dues are tax-deductible to a lesser extent as a professional expense, and a 501(c)(6) is permitted to have an affiliated Political Action Committee (a PAC) which engages in political campaign activities. Thus, as a 501(c)(6), the APAPO has been permitted to promote the financial interests of psychology as a profession, and establish a PAC for the purposes of supporting or opposing candidates for elective office.

In order to expand the topical reach of the APAPO, in 2005 the board of directors of the APAPO established the Education Advocacy Trust (EdAT) (Belar, 2005, October). The EdAT's goal has been to lobby and participate in the PAC for the political recognition and expanded government funding of education and training in psychology.

Differences between the APA and the APAPO. Table 1 (American Psychological Association Practice Organization, 2017) provides a brief summary of the differences between APA, a (c)(3) organization, and the APAPO, a (c)(6) organization.

Historical Context

To appreciate the organizational tensions associated with the relationship between the APA and the APAPO, the aforementioned description of the two companion organizations needs to be understood in a historical context.

According to Wright (Wright, 2001), following World War II the APA became increasingly practice-focused and many practitioners felt that their professional practice needs were not being adequately met by the organization. This resulted in internal tension between practitioners, who saw the APA as largely controlled by academics with relatively little interest in using its resources to address practice issues, and non-practice oriented groups within the APA (Wright, 2001). During the 1980s, there were a series of attempts, including from Division 12 [now known as The Society for Clinical Psychology] to have the APA review the quality of

education and training requirements for the professional practice of psychology, which also heightened some of the internal tension (Rozensky, 2013).

Groups within the APA including the Ad Hoc Committee on Insurance and Related Social Developments (AHCIRSD), some of the leadership of Division 12, and the full leadership of Divisions 29 [Now Known As the Society for the Advancement of Psychotherapy] and 31 [State, Provincial, and Territorial Psychological Association Affairs], began to press for the creation of a national-level political lobbying group established and operated by the APA” (Wright, 2001) (p.30). Wright (2001) speculated that this effort was resisted by the APA leadership at the time because of concerns about the APA losing its “cherished (c)(3) tax status” (p. 30), which was viewed as key to protecting the APA’s income from publications and real estate. The self-labeled “Dirty Dozen” (a group of practitioners who coordinated their efforts at influencing the APA to become more practitioner-focused through their own political activities within the organization) believed, based on their own outside legal opinion and consultations with the US Internal Revenue Service (IRS), that such concerns were overblown. Disagreement over this matter added to the organizational conflicts of that time.¹

Perhaps as a result of the increasingly practitioner-focused interests of the APA combined with a failed attempt at governance reform, in 1988 many research-oriented psychologists left the APA to form the American Psychological Society (APS; now the Association for Psychological Science) (Cautin, 2009). Although many scientists and researchers remained in the APA after the APS was formed, APA’s increasingly professional focus coupled with the departure of some of its scientists resulted in a membership that may have been perceived as skewed towards

¹ Note that Wright, one of the “Dirty Dozen” himself, believed it was a mistake for the APA to remain a 501(c) (3) organization and had they “forced the issue” and become a (c)(6) “many of the limitations under which the APA continues to operate would have been alleviated” (p. 31).

practitioner interests despite the stated goals of a (c)(3). Another member of the “Dirty Dozen,” noted that the exodus of scientists from the APA during “this period marked another watershed in the ascendancy of practitioners in the organization” (Fox, 2001) (p. 113). These perceptions persist among some members, even though an examination of the APA’s current budget [(c)(3)] reveals relatively comparable core budgets across the four directorates (Science, Practice, Education, Public Interest) representing its major activities as an organization.

The APAPO was established in 2001 to promote the professional interests of psychologists in all practice settings and legally advocate for practitioners’ marketplace interests. Following the establishment of an organization with a clearly stated mission to support the professional interests of psychologists rather than psychology as a public good, tensions continued between those psychologists with a primary practice focus versus those whose primary focus was science, public interest and/or education. For example, those psychologists who believe that the (c)(3) mission of the APA must be focal have had serious concerns about the fact that the major governing body of the APA, the Council of Representatives, has long included individuals representing 501(c)(6) organizations, most notably the majority of the State Associations and at least one APA Division (Division 14, the Society for Industrial\Organizational Psychology) (Tipton, 2017), whose primary interests may not be aligned with what is in the best interests of the APA. In addition, there are concerns that some of the divisions represented on the Council of Representatives, although legally 501(c)(3) public mission organizations, have large numbers of members who are primarily concerned about the economic issues of practice [e.g., Division 42 (Psychologists in Independent Practice)], which again may conflict with the primary focus and best interests of the APA. The history of the presence of primarily practice-focused divisions on the Council of Representatives dates back as

early as 1967 (Fox, 2001) and concerns about their key role in the governance have been present since that time. In addition, and more currently, because of the changing nature of the APA and its membership over time, there is some evidence that many current members expect APA to function as a practitioner-oriented guild and express frustration with the APA's historical mission.

These tensions between (c)(3) and (c)(6) interests recently came to a head when as noted earlier (American Psychological Association, 2015; Top Class Actions, 2016), a subset of the APA members engaged in a class action lawsuit regarding the APAPO Assessment Fee. This class action lawsuit pertained to the “practice assessment,” a special assessment for practitioner members of APA that became the APAPO dues. The plaintiffs believed that the APA dues statement misled practice members into believing the APAPO dues payment was mandatory and thus required as part of the APA dues. A financial settlement was reached in the lawsuit and changes were made to the APA dues statement such that the voluntary nature of the APAPO dues was made clear. Subsequent to both the settlement of the lawsuit and the change in the dues statement, the membership in the APAPO has declined by 26% from 25,977 in 2015 to 19,318 in 2016 (Tanner, 2017), which is a more significant membership decline than that noted in the APA during the same time period. This sharp reduction in members and associated dues money in the APAPO is threatening its viability and ability to carry out its mission.

A Survey: What Members Understand about the APA and the APAPO Relationship

To better understand perceived differences between the mission and roles of the APA and the APAPO, the P & P Board conducted a brief survey of the APA membership. The key goal of the survey was to examine the extent to which the APA members believe that the APA currently expends its resources on 501(c)(3) issues advancing psychology as a public good versus

501(c)(6) activities focused on the professional interests of psychologists. Members were presented with a list of activities in a random order. For each activity, respondents were asked to indicate “yes” or “no” with respect to whether **“APA currently DOES expend resources on it (i.e., allocates budgetary or staff resources to that item).”**

The survey had a low response rate of 13.8% of those who provided responses to most of the questions (276 of 2000 randomly selected APA members sampled by email). As a comparison, the percent of all members responding to APA presidential elections was 15.9% and 16.9% in 2015 and 2016 respectively.

The item that received the strongest endorsement, was that the APA expends resources “to develop ethical standards for psychologists” (endorsed by 95%) and the least endorsed item was that APA expends funds “to ensure that no occupations other than psychologists can treat those with psychological disorders” (endorsed by 21%).² Responses for all items are included in Table 2.

In a separate survey question, we asked respondents about their interest in joining one or both of two hypothetical psychological organizations with different missions. Organization “A” was described as having a 501(c)(3) mission (i.e., focusing on psychology and its scientific and educational contributions to promote health and human welfare) whereas organization “B” was described as having a 501(c)(6) mission (i.e., focusing on the mutual professional interests of psychologists in their careers). Many respondents (58%) wanted to join **both** organizations. A smaller subset preferred the organization with only one mission: 501 (c)(3) mission (31%) and 501 (c)(6) mission (9%).³

² The survey deliberately included at least one C3 and one C6 item that was presumed to be disliked to achieve a diversity of endorsement levels.

³ Two percent of study participants did not respond to this question. Because of the small

Concluding Comments

As discussed above, there are longstanding tensions between the APA and the APAPO. P&P believes that these tensions are related to a lack of clarity of the missions of and boundaries between the APA and the APAPO. The APA's mission is "to advance the creation, communication, and application of psychological knowledge to benefit society and improve people's lives." The APAPO's mission statement notes that its purpose is "to promote the mutual professional interests of psychologists" (<http://www.apapracticecentral.org/about/bylaws.pdf>). The APA promulgates the science, education, and practice of psychology for the benefit of society and human welfare, whereas the APAPO carries out activities that support the professional interests of psychologists, including psychologists' scope of practice and income. The APA's strategic plan includes making certain that all its activities are aligned with the education, scientific, practice, and public interest missions of the organization (<http://www.apapracticecentral.org/about/bylaws.pdf>).

The APAPO aligns its actions for the enhancement of the practice activities and success of psychologists. This includes political action through the PAC, and lobbying for the economic interests of psychologists especially in health insurance reimbursement, prescriptive authority, and recognition of psychologists' scope of practice in healthcare organizations and hospitals. It is the Policy and Planning Board's interpretation of this survey data that it is possible that many APA members do not belong to the APAPO because, as our survey seems to suggest, they already believe that APA engages in a broad array of 501(c)(6) activities and many of the allowable c(3) activities that APA does engage in seem, we believe, to supplant the need to

sample, we did not analyze the results further, for example, to see if member demographics predicted survey responses.

contribute to the c(6) efforts. Thus, the great interest in belonging to both kinds of organizations as noted in the survey is potentially good news for the APAPO. This desire does not, at least on the surface, appear to be problematic for the APA; APA members' overall interest in 501(c)(3) activities (combining those who prefer to be in a (c)(3)-only organization with those who wish they could be in both kinds of organizations) approaches 90%. Clearly, for both the APA and the APAPO to flourish, it is critical that the missions of both organizations are valued by the large number of current APA members who opt to join both organizations.

Navigating and clarifying APA's relationship with the APAPO is critical to the health of both organizations. Also, critical to the health of the APA, is how social justice is prioritized, both within the APA as an organization, and within society at large. In the next section, we discuss the intersection of psychology and social justice, APA's history of addressing social justice concerns and the resulting tensions that have, at times, divided the organization.

Social Justice

This section focuses on the second exemplar of an arena that has been linked to a series of organizational crises within APA, but also one in which the organization has the potential to demonstrate organizational resilience. After discussing social justice as a core value with consideration given to definitional concerns associated with the construct, this section delineates a series of specific internal and external challenges related to a prioritization of social justice.

Definitional Concerns

Social justice is a challenging construct to define and has a variety of definitions. It generally refers to the fair and equitable treatment of all individuals and groups of people and attends to the treatment and outcomes of individual citizens as a consequence of societal structures, laws, and practices (Vasquez, 2012). For many psychologists in APA, social justice is

a core personal and professional value, one they believe should be central to APA's vision and mission. However, other APA members believe that social justice is an unattainable abstract goal, that its pursuit may necessitate or lead to preferential treatment of some individuals or groups over others, that a focus on social justice will detract from other missions, and/or that an increased focus on social justice will generate competition for resources and energies. P&P believes that confusion over the definition of social justice and its role in informing the work of the APA may directly or indirectly contribute to divisions within the Association and at times slow its work on policy matters germane to psychology.

Social Justice and Psychology

Over the years, numerous discussions related to social justice have been advanced in the psychological literature, as well as in the literature of other disciplines (Arfken & Yen, 2014; Comas-Diaz, 2012; Louis, Mavor, La Macchia, & Amiot, 2014; Suyemoto, Day, & Schwartz, 2015; Thompson, Hardee, & Lane, 2011; Vasquez, 2012; Walsh, 2015). The linkages between social justice and ethics in the practice of psychology have been examined (Walsh, 2015). A social justice imperative for the use of psychological science also has been noted. This imperative states that if scientific evidence reveals factors and conditions that are harmful, psychologists must document and report these harmful effects and develop and implement intervention approaches aimed at ameliorating the harmful conditions in order to both improve the wellbeing of individuals and benefit society as a whole (Rosenthal, 2016). These examples represent only a small sample of what has been written about the connection between social justice and psychology.

Social Justice and the APA

Core value. Social justice, be it instantiated in issues related to race, social class, gender,

sexual orientation, ability status, or a myriad of other variables, has enjoyed considerable attention by the APA throughout its history. It is included among the APA's core values and in addition, the vision statement proclaims that the APA will be "(a)n effective champion of the application of psychology to promote human rights, health, well-being, and dignity." The long-standing and important connections between social justice and psychology in general and in APA more specifically were highlighted in Vasquez's APA presidential address and she encouraged the Association to more fully embrace social justice causes (Vasquez, 2012). She reviewed the history of social justice within APA, described the positive impact of many APA leaders (e.g., Kenneth B. and Mamie Clark; Leona Tyler; Charles Kiesler; Carolyn Payton; Patrick DeLeon; and Division 9 the Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues), and called attention to Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.'s address at the 1967 APA convention.

Controversies and tensions. As Vasquez (2012) noted, there is a long history of controversy in the APA focused on social justice, including the APA Report on Abortion and Mental Health (American Psychological Association Task Force on Mental Health and Abortion, 2008); report on sexual orientation change efforts (American Psychological Association Task Force on Appropriate Therapeutic Responses to Sexual Orientation, 2009); and Resolution on Same-Sex Relationships and Parenting (Paige, 2005). In addition, at present, there are tensions related to social justice and the APA mission. First, it has proven difficult within APA to develop agreement on, or even consistently use, a specific definition of "social justice." Second, concerns have been raised about the "appropriate" role of social justice in the APA's work. Indeed, the role of social justice continues to be a contested issue that according to P&P observers has occasioned many (heated) discussions in the APA Council of Representatives and in other venues. This is even though as one P&P Board member opined, "human rights and social justice

are in APA's DNA."

Some of the tension related to the role of social justice in the Association are linked to the fact that APA is a 501(c)(3) scientific and educational organization, and as such is not explicitly a human rights organization. Despite this, however, P&P believes that some members who value APA as a 501(c)(3) organization contend that advocating for social justice and human rights policies, education, and research are critical to APA's mission and core values. If part of APA's vision is to promote human welfare, then using its resources to improve human welfare and advocate for social justice policies, education, and research are considered by these psychologists to be appropriate and commendable. Similarly, given that many social issues significantly impact mental and behavioral health, these psychologists believe that not using psychological science and knowledge to inform these debates is tantamount to reneging on APA's core values and its mission.

Third, there are differing expectations for the role of social justice work in the mission and *raison d'être* of the APA. For example, if social justice issues are perceived along politically partisan lines or as challenging long-standing cultural or religious traditions, advocacy on these issues is likely to be regarded as being politically biased by some and/or negatively impacting the ability of psychologists to deliver services and to be properly reimbursed by these services by others. However, by others, not advocating given the data that show that issues of social justice (e.g., prejudice, discrimination) are related to mental health (Office of Minority Mental Health, 2011; Smedley, Stith, & Nelson, 2003) is considered to be abdicating our responsibility.

Fourth, another factor implicit in these opposing views is a conflation of APA's advocacy for mental health and human rights policies, which may be perceived by some as prejudicially promoting a human rights agenda rather than informing public debate on social justice issues

with psychological science (Cummings, 2011). It may be that the scientific and psychological underpinnings of the policies that the APA adopts and the actions it takes to implement them need to be more clearly promoted and explicated to our members, our governance groups, the public, and health policy makers (see Factors affecting APA involvement in litigation, 1983; Procedures for submission of *Amicus Curiae* briefs, 2003). This educational and advocacy work for the benefit of society is clearly within the purview and mission of a (c)(3).

Fifth, the members who mistakenly believe that APA is a (c)(6) organization seem likely to maintain that resources and energies spent adopting policies that advocate for social justice compromise the APA's ability to promote and protect psychology as a health profession (Cummings, 2006). Some people have argued that APA's passage of social justice resolutions creates problems for psychologists who provide services in politically conservative states and jurisdictions because APA's advocacy for social justice concerns paints the organization and psychologists as politically liberal (Hatch, 1982). These issues seem to be especially salient when the APA advocates for the welfare of stigmatized or minority populations.

Internal and External Challenges That Hinder APA's Work and Reputation

There are additional internal and external social justice-related issues of concern. The internal concerns focus on APA policies and practices around member engagement, decision-making, and policy implementation, whereas the externally focused concerns center more on APA's participation and visibility in national or international arenas. While not attempting an exhaustive list, we consider a few illustrative examples of how these social justice issues may have negatively impacted APA's efforts and reputation.

Diversity awareness. Some members of APA governance, including those on advisory boards and committees and on the Council of Representatives, have expressed concerns about

the treatment of ethnic minority individuals in these different forums and decision-making bodies. They point to examples of actions and attitudinal displays that intentionally or unintentionally undermine the contributions of people of color or other minority individuals, as well as the relative underrepresentation of people of color and members of other minority groups in APA governance. Several years ago, and partially in response to reports of alleged microaggressions and overt acts of prejudice, the APA adopted a policy to conduct regular diversity training for members of these governance groups. It separately adopted a Diversity Plan that, among other recommendations, called for the hiring of a Chief Diversity Officer for the Association (American Psychological Association, 2014; Suinn et al., 2015). Recently, P&P learned that some elected members of governance have suggested ending or shortening diversity training sessions; some reasons stated include the quality of the training and the paucity of time for Council of Representatives policy matters. Meanwhile, several recommendations from the adopted Diversity Plan have yet to be implemented, including the recommendation that called for hiring a Chief Diversity Officer due to budgetary constraints. A newly formed diversity workgroup has been examining these recommendations and how they can be advanced and recently submitted a detailed report.

These events have frustrated some members of the governance of the APA, who perceive there being a downplaying of diversity and social justice priorities and a continuing (and anecdotal) mistreatment or disregarding of concerns raised by members of marginalized groups. Some of these members are concerned that such events have a chilling effect on many members of the Association and are counterproductive to the Association's efforts to advance its mission. As seen in the minutes of recent Council of Representatives meetings, some members report feeling that their contributions are not valued and that they do not feel personally welcomed or

included (<http://www.apa.org/about/governance/council/index.aspx>). For some members of the APA governance and the APA membership, social justice, diversity, and inclusion are core values of the Association in words, but are not fully embraced in principle or in practice. P&P notes the importance of these matters and their impact on the health and progress of the Association and appreciates the need for systematic and targeted data collection to document the prevalence and magnitude of instances of mistreatment and to determine potential solutions to this issue.

Inclusivity. Inclusivity in this context refers to the extent and degree to which the APA welcomes and integrates traditionally marginalized groups, e.g., people of color, sexual and gender minorities, persons with disabilities, into the life, agenda, and governance of the association and balances the interests of diverse groups. There is a range of perspectives among members of the P&P regarding inclusivity within the APA, though all agree that inclusivity remains a longstanding and difficult challenge for the association. P&P members believe this mirrors the beliefs of the general membership. As an example, some members of P&P point to the fact that a by-law change proposal to add voting seats to the Council of Representatives from the national ethnic minority psychological associations (EMPAs) failed to be approved by two-thirds of voting members of the APA in 2007, 2008, and 2012. Others hypothesize that the defeats reflect concerns by the membership regarding including as voting members of the Council of Representatives individuals representing other independent psychological associations whose mission and agenda differ substantially from the APA's and whose fiduciary responsibilities are to a parent organization and not to the APA.

Yet, the fact that the repeated defeats denied inclusion to EMPAs in combination with requests to disband annual diversity training for governance groups and the delayed full

implementation of the approved Diversity Plan may suggest, according to some members of the P&P, that elements of APA and its governance system may not be as welcoming and respectful to diversity as hoped. In addition, some members of P&P as well as members from marginalized groups and their allies also are concerned that these collective actions may suggest hostility toward inclusion and latent biases on the part of some. The APA must develop and implement a systematic plan for inclusivity, determine how best to advance social justice, and facilitate the engagement of all its members in its governance and in its broader programming and practices.

Public statements and policy involvement. The APA regularly files *amicus curiae* briefs to inform courts about relevant psychological research related to cases before them. The Procedures for Submission of *Amicus Curiae* Briefs are clear, reasonable, and useful. The APA also engages in advocacy and educational activities on pending legislation through its Government Relations offices (see, for example, <https://www.apa.org/pubs/info/reports/2015-report.pdf>). Both sets of efforts have been very successful. Nonetheless, the complexity and large size of the APA combined with the protracted process for developing relevant policies have resulted in complaints by some constituency groups that APA is too slow in making public statements about world events and occurrences. This pacing reflects a combination of factors, including the need for a sound scientific basis for making statements and the vetting of statements that must occur at multiple levels and by many people and offices before release. Unfortunately, this pacing can have the effect of preventing the APA from making statements or significantly delaying its participation in pressing social issues and events. There is some suggestion that the speed and frequency of releasing public statements has improved and P&P believes that it is critical that this trend continue.

The historically relatively uneven response by the APA in response to key societal issues

has been viewed by some as a reflection of an inefficient if not failed attempt to pursue social justice. Often time, some event occurs or comes to light for which psychology is relevant and many APA members want to see their national organization take a public stand.

Following its current policies, the APA makes statements or participates in select social justice issues (American Psychological Association, 1983, 2003). It appears that the APA increasingly has taken positions on social justice matters when there are relevant data to support such positions, as well as pertinent APA policies. Yet, many people note that it is practically and logistically impossible to expect the APA to respond to every domestic or world event in which social justice concerns play a pivotal role. In addition, there are members that insist that statements be based on science only and that only when such science exists should the APA take a position. In contrast, however, others assert that the APA appears “stuck” in inaction, perhaps because its bar for involvement is set too high or the body of science upon which action will be based in is insufficiently mature or judged inadequate to support advocacy efforts. Some of these individuals argue that the APA sits on the sidelines in silence when other (non-psychological) organizations and leaders make statements, act, and set agendas for change. In addition, they are very concerned about the organizational impact of the group of the members who assert that the APA should focus on only science, practice, and educational issues and not act as a social justice organization.

Impact of the Independent Review. A final example is a set of social justice challenges, some that are primarily internal and some that are relatively external, that derive from the Independent Review relating to APA Ethics Guidelines, National Security Interrogations, and Torture (Hoffman et al., 2015). Upon its release, this Independent Review created turmoil and instability within the APA, and damaged the public face of APA.

In addition to raising critical questions about the extent and nature of relations between APA and APA staff with military and national security entities, the Independent Review highlighted specific concerns about whose interests the APA was working to protect (i.e., psychologists, detainees, or members of the military), the manner in which decisions were made (i.e., failing to check self-interested influences, limiting participation, and discrediting or silencing dissenting voices), and apparent subversion of the APA's own processes in policy development and implementation (i.e., questions about the content, interpretation, and revisions of the APA's Ethical Principles of Psychologists and Code of Conduct, a member-initiated resolution limiting participation of psychologists in national security settings and its implementation, etc.) (Pope, 2018). Individually and collectively, these specific concerns embody social justice themes as reflected in the APA's mission as well as in its operations and policies.

The APA is in the process of addressing the issues raised by the Independent Review and its release. Table 2 includes nineteen separate actions taken by the Association directly related to concerns raised. The actions, initiated in 2015 and 2016, are still underway or have been reported, with recommendations to the Council of Representatives. APA has made several changes to foster transparency, launched initiatives focused on ethics review, developed a new conflict of interest policy, and begun to question the effectiveness of its systems of checks and balances. In addition, it has renewed discussions of the role of human rights in the work and mission of the APA, including seating a task force commissioned to recommend strategic advice to the APA on how to engage in the promotion and protection of human rights. Reverberations from the Independent Review are also being felt within governance bodies and the membership, and particularly through discussions about how to recognize and hear dissent rather than to

dismiss it, and how to ensure the consideration of minority perspectives throughout association decision making.

Beyond the focus on APA-military relations, then, the Independent Review has brought attention to fundamental social justice issues at many levels that impact the substance and process of APA's work. APA has taken steps (see Table 3) to address the organizational problems identified in the Independent Review. However, as of this writing, there are divergent perspectives on how wide-ranging and substantive the changes have been, need to be, or ultimately will be. What is clear, however, is that the APA is now engaged in work with important social justice implications and that this will take time to complete. In the end, there should be greater clarity about the role of human rights and social justice in the mission of the APA, and a set of procedures and practices that help ensure socially just processes are followed in the development of Association policies and decision making. Ultimately, it is important for APA to do its best to resolve these many issues, and to try to move forward productively in advancing its espoused mission "to advance the creation, communication and application of psychological knowledge to benefit society and improve people's lives."

Final Thoughts

As a scientific and professional organization, APA is dedicated to protecting and promoting human welfare through research, education, and advocacy. APA has long recognized the link between human rights and human behavior. The APA's science and policies have demonstrated the effects of social location on the society. APA has encoded this linkage in its mission statement, core values, and the ethics code. In addition to its mission to advance and safeguard the welfare of human beings, the bond among human rights, human behavior, and psychological science constitute the rationale for APA's mandate to advocate. It should be

acknowledged that APA's advocacy is neither a political endeavor *per se* nor a human rights organization *per se*, but rather a deep commitment to inform public debate with data from rigorous behavioral research on issues that have consequences for human welfare, dignity and often with political implications.

Impact of APA's Organizational Challenges and Opportunities for Growth

Challenges

Members' reactions to the challenges outlined in this report have depended in large part on the level and nature of their engagement and investment in the APA and the APAPO, as well as people's worldviews and values. P&P members, who serve the organization in other capacities, have observed through conversations, listserv discussions, and open letters an array of reactions and responses to these organizational ruptures. In some cases, members expressed sadness, anger, fear, shame, and even despair. In other instances, members expressed a sense of confusion, complained of low morale, and endorsed a significant sense of loss and hopelessness about the future of the APA. In other instances, people have been angry and this anger has been a reaction by people with very different views and perspectives. Like what has been observed in other organizations, interpersonal responses revealed in different contexts, both orally and in writing, have included disaffiliation and disconnection, a need to self-silence, and feelings of distrust and a sense of betrayal (Gomez, Smith, Gobin, Tang, & Freyd, 2017; Grohol, 2015; Thomas, 2016). In addition, as has been observed in other organizations after major challenges, there have been examples of increases in incivility, divisiveness, competitiveness, and chaos, along with a strong pull to resist change and return to business as usual (Medley & Akan, 2008). Of course, the less involved members of the APA may be very unaware of these issues and may especially find this report useful.

Opportunities for Growth

Fortunately, however, organizational crises also provide windows of opportunity for change (Kingdom, 1995), that is formal and informal responses to the crises themselves and to the direct and indirect effects of the crises (Birkmann et al., 2010). Such opportunities for change occur most often in organizations in which members have appropriate responsibility and feel empowered; where good work is acknowledged; where people are members of cohesive teams; where there is an investment in linking solutions to the problems associated with the disasters; and where leadership is renegotiated in response to the challenge and as a result there is greater engagement in social policy and social justice endeavors (Birkmann et al., 2010; Kingdom, 1995; Patton, 2005).

Such growth is evident in the APA. P&P members have observed members demonstrating an openness to addressing the organizational challenges discussed in this report. Specifically, governance boards and committees have dedicated time to constructively address these matters and the APA Council of Representatives has embarked on 19 separate endeavors (See Table 3) to ensure these challenges are addressed. These include reviewing policies and implementing new procedures regarding conflict of interest, creating guidance related to civility⁴, calling for and receiving a review of APA's ethics processes and procedures, actively engaging the membership, creating a more open path to becoming a member of the APA governance, and selecting new senior leaders. Hopefully, these changes will allow for a more diverse set of members in leadership roles who will be engaged in developing policies for the APA and for the discipline of psychology.

⁴ The efforts of the Civility Working Group were published following the completion of this Annual Report (Plante, 2017).

Improving APA's health requires leveraging and building upon its existing strengths and resources, which includes its members, governance leaders, and staff, as well as its remarkable programs and initiatives. It entails harnessing the dedication and talents of those most invested in the organization and engaging as formal and informal leaders the subgroups of individuals who respond to organizational challenges with compassion and courage and who are supportive to diverse others (Powley, 2013). These individuals can help the APA acknowledge and find innovative ways to transform its problematic dynamics for the good of the organization (Brown, 1997). Collectively, these individuals can be key to the healing process and can help facilitate the culture change needed to support forward movement (Cameron & Plews, 2012).

Recommendations for Organizational Healing, Change, and Vitality

In this section, we offer potential strategies that the P&P believes can support the APA's healing process, bolster its organization, and enable the organization to surpass its pre-existing levels of strength and to become more inclusive and vital (Simola, 2016; Sonnentag, Niessen, & Neff, 2012). P&P's recommendations for positive change build upon the work of other psychological and professional/disciplinary organizations/societies and the literature on organizational change particularly in institutions that have been traumatized. This literature suggests that healthy change requires a focus on: 1) social and organizational processes, routines, and structures associated with restoring relationships and organizational functions; 2) acknowledging, understanding, and addressing institutional failings; 3) repairing and mending the social fabric of the organization after a threat or shock; 4) fostering organizational compassion; 5) bolstering connections; 6) empowering a more heterogeneous group of people in decision-making; 7) refocusing on core values and expanding core values; 8) engaging in difficult dialogues; 9) implementing meaningful corrective and preventive measures; and, 10)

participating in truth and reconciliation activities, etc. (Powley, 2013; Powley & Cameron, 2006; Powley & Piderit, 2008). In addition, this literature suggests that positive organizational change requires capitalizing on and mobilize existing resources in the service of greater social involvement (Cameron & McNaughtan, 2014). It also indicates that the organizational valuing of virtuousness will be linked to organizational resilience, greater productivity, and improved organizational performance.

Recommendation #1: Undergo an Organizational Self-Assessment

The APA must remain committed to an ongoing process of organizational self-assessment.

An organizational self-assessment is crucial for the APA's health to be optimized. Such processes require institutional courage, but are a prerequisite to organizational healing. To its credit, the APA has already actively engaged in an organizational self-assessment process with plans to continue this effort. The following recommendations are offered to support the effectiveness of such ongoing efforts.

- Recognize that an initial and necessary step for instituting change is an organizational self-assessment aimed at creating a shared narrative about what occurred to produce dissatisfaction among the membership.
- Conduct the organizational self-assessment in a manner that attends to concerns expressed by some members (e.g., the APA is a relatively closed system in which the governance structure, those holding positions on boards and on the Council of Representatives, is occupied by a relatively small group of senior members and as a result is somewhat insular and less open to making requisite changes and improvements).
- Determine and institute concrete changes to be made going forward that are based on the

organizational self-assessment.

- Engage in corrective actions steps when necessary (Gillespie & Dietz, 2009).

Recommendation #2 - Secure Appropriate Consultation

The APA would benefit from seeking appropriate, and ongoing, consultation from individuals with expertise in facilitating change after significant challenges.

Ideally, the APA would have secured such consultations during and immediately following the organizational crises described earlier. These consultations could have assisted the staff and the APA members in stabilizing the organization and in providing guidance with regard to organizational processes commonly encountered following organizational trauma (Hormann & Vivian, 2005). However, at present, consultants could still be valuable in terms of addressing the unresolved aftermath of the organizational crises. For the APA to secure effective organizational consultation at the current time, we offer the following recommendations.

- Secure organizational buy-in for the value of the consultation and the consultant(s).
- Attend to the building of a trust relationship and a collaborative partnership among the consultant, governance and staff leaders, and members of the organization - some members of the APA dislike or mistrust outside consultations because they believe that in recent years such consultations have not been helpful or have been harmful.
- Select consultants who are compassionate, offer hope and safety to all parties, and foster the creation of an environment in which reconciliation that involves collective meaning-making is possible (Hormann & Vivian, 2005).
- Consult with psychologists outside of APA and international psychology organizations who have offered alternative pathways for addressing and resolving the conflicts inherent in various social justice issues, such as those related to torture, ethics, and international

law. [See (O'Neill, 2016), which references the Canadian Psychological Association decision to revise its ethics code to reflect a variety of social concerns]

In the future, it is recommended that that APA:

- Consider securing organizational consultants in a timely fashion.
- Seek support, guidance, and assistance from outside stakeholders, experts, and organizational consultants who have expertise in working with organizations that have been encountered traumas and demonstrated organizational resilience in the face of such challenges (Powley, 2013).

Recommendation #3: Prioritize Transformational Leadership

The APA must prioritize selecting, developing, and empowering transformational leaders.

For the APA to continue to heal and to prosper, the organization needs to support transformational governance and staff leaders who are committed to positive organizational change (Bass, 1985, 1998; Cameron & McNaughtan, 2014) and the strengthening of organizational ethics (Pope, 2018). In keeping with a prioritization on transformational leadership, the following recommendations are made for the APA.

- Select, encourage and support leaders who demonstrate empathy, support all parties, foster trust, take problems with morale seriously, mitigate the organization's vulnerability to unethical behavior, encourage growth at all levels of the system, and take action based on moral courage and inspire others to do the same (Pope, 2018; Powley, 2013).
- Select, encourage, and support leaders who adopt a positive lens, focus on indicators of positively deviant performance (i.e., outcomes that exceed what is expected), adopt an affirmative bias, and assume that the system is virtuous and aspires to achieve its

potential (Cameron & McNaughtan, 2014).

- Establish and maintain trusting relationships between leaders and members of the APA and strengthen the social bonds within and the social fabric of the APA (Cameron & McNaughtan, 2014). which will require organizational trustworthiness reflected in:
 - Leadership and management practices, culture and climate, strategy and systems, and policies and processes (Gillespie & Dietz, 2009; Gillespie, Dietz, & Lockey, 2014).
 - APA's willingness to respond to recent organizational traumas with reforms and to address proactively the interests and concerns of its diverse stakeholders (Gillespie et al., 2014).
 - Leaders' openness to sharing their triumphs and tribulations in their attempts to change (Powley, 2013) and to applauding individual and subgroup efforts at creativity in support of organizational change.
 - Leader's capacity to foster a loyal, productive, and engaged leadership team that can innovate change by balancing the tensions among advancing the business of the organization; attending to the diverse reactions of members; repairing the fissures in the interpersonal dynamics created by the organizational traumas; and responding to the tensions with realistic optimism, authenticity, and a willingness to leverage personal and organizational strengths (Bunker & Wakefield, 2005).
- Create a context in which there develops a mutual understanding about the different types of information sharing within the organization (e.g. result oriented, rule following, relationship-based, and risk taking) (Choo, 2013); information sharing is viewed as an evolving concept; the tensions created by various needs and expectations about how

information is managed are addressed; and there is more congruence between the types of information sharing approaches and APA's mission, values, and strategic plan.

- Elucidate and repair the relational disruptions that have emerged in response to APA's organizational traumas, as failure to do so can hinder progress and result in members viewing the efforts to resolve the crises as unsuccessful (Kahn et al., 2013).
 - Use the following strategies for repairing relational disruptions: encouraging and demonstrating empathy toward other members and bidirectionally between leaders and members to promote and support positive social interactions and taking actions to foster the rebuilding of social connections following disruptions (Powley, 2013; Powley & Piderit, 2008).

Recommendation #4 - Engage in Systematic Activities Consistent with APA's Strategic Plan

The APA must prioritize internal and external activities that are consistent with its strategic plan.

Healing within organizations involves engaging in systematic activities focused on revisiting the organization's strategic plan and both reaffirming and when needed modifying the organization's mission, vision, and goals and objectives (Powley, 2013). To support and advance APA's strategic plan, the following recommendations are offered.

- Make decisions about system-wide changes that are congruent with the APA's strategic plan
- Use the strategic planning process to determine and implement significant changes to the technical and infrastructural elements of APA's internal processes and its external image (Gillespie et al., 2014), which to be effective requires that the evaluation of the current

infrastructure is accurate, systematic, and transparent (Gillespie & Dietz, 2009)

- Attend to the relevance of recent organizational changes so that future strategic planning efforts can strengthen the APA's internal organizational culture (Powley & Piderit, 2008)
- Consider thoughtfully including a specific goal in the next strategic plan related to social justice and human rights

Recommendation #5 - Educate Members about Differences and Benefits of the Companion Organization

Members of the APA must be educated so that they understand the functions of both the APA and APAPO organizations, as this is crucial for strengthening and furthering the separate though complementary missions of these organizations.

P&P recommends that a clearly defined educational approach be developed and implemented for members of the APA to clarify concretely the differences between the APAPO and the APA (See Table 1). Such educational endeavors must make clear that in its (c)(3) mission, the APA educates the public and policymakers, advocates for psychological science and its application to improving human welfare as well as lobbying and other advocacy work to advance psychology as a science and public good, advance public access to psychological treatment, and advance the use of psychology to serve the public good. And, in its (c)(6) mission, the APAPO advocates for the professional financial interests of psychologists. The educational efforts must make clear that the two organizations must work together for the common goals of making psychology an important part of society and psychologists the resource that makes that happen whether in practice, in the classroom, in the laboratory, or in the community.

Recommendation #6 - Strengthen the Companion Organizations

The structures of both the APA and the APAPO need to be bolstered to reflect their separate yet complementary identities.

Separate and strong companion organizations are critical for both advancing the discipline of psychology to serve society and for supporting the careers of psychologists. To strengthen and ensure the vitality of both organizations, and based on our review of survey data collected in last 2016, P&P recommends that the following courses of action be considered.

- Have both the APA and the APAPO develop alternative dues structure models, such as allowing: (a) the membership in the two organizations to be independent so members could belong to one, the other, or both organizations with a discount if they select both; and/or (b) establish a dues structure that would encourage membership in both the c(3) and c(6) organizations simultaneously, with clear and distinct member benefits for each organization based on the understanding that their missions are complimentary.
- Develop plans for the governance of both organizations to include representation of all segments of psychology (e.g., science, education, practice, and public interest)
- Clarify the governance structures by making it clear that the goals of the two organizations are complimentary but distinct and aligned with their respective missions, which could include: (a) restructuring the APA Council of Representatives so that seats are associated with varying aspects of its (c)(3) mission only; and (b) reconfiguring the boards of directors of each organization so that the boards of the two organizations are distinct and membership on these Boards is aligned closely with the organization's mission.

These aforementioned recommendations must be considered based on P&P's interpretation of data collected in late 2016 and in light of the efforts of current deliberations of the (early 2017)

work group, the APAPO Integrated Dues and Membership Model Forum (American Psychological Association Practice Organization, 2017), which included the P&P Chair as a member. P&P is aware that this work group is addressing mechanisms that will help ensure that the companion organizations are linked in a manner supportive of the complementary missions of both organizations. Whatever model is proposed, it must be vetted for both its possible success meeting the goals of legally coordinated organizations and for any unintended consequences that would reawaken concerns like the class action lawsuit concerning the APA dues statement.

Finally, where APA members experience tensions or trauma that is related to the class action lawsuit and/or misunderstand the separate APA and APAPO missions, the following suggestions are offered.

- Address those issues so that the two organizations can legally work in tandem for the good of society and the good of the members
- Change the name of the APAPO (the American Psychological Association Practice Organization) to the American Psychological Association *Professional* Organization (APAPO), as suggested by former Interim APA CEO Dr. Cynthia Belar
 - This would help ensure that members of both organizations see that the (C)(6) function of the APAPO is for all professional activities of psychologists (includes advocacy for practitioners and, via the Education Advocacy Trust for educators and in support of funding education and eventually the benefit of scientific psychologists as well).
- Provide other needed clarifications and changes aimed at enhancing the effectiveness of the two organizations' efforts at working collaboratively

Recommendation #7 - Prioritize Social Justice Activities in Accord with APA's Strategic Plan

The APA must prioritize social justice, as it is a key area for growth within the organization.

P&P offers several recommendations pertaining to social justice, psychology, and the APA that it believes will promote growth, internal and external to organization. Many of these recommendations build on work that has been previously recommended but has not, yet been prioritized. The recommendations include the following.

- Adopt decision- and policy- making processes and procedures that are rooted in social justice, such that they encourage, value, and incorporate dissenting voices
- Include a specific goal in the APA Strategic Plan related to human rights and social justice and an associated prioritized agenda and pool of resources
- Develop science-based policies related to human rights and social justice and disseminate such policies broadly to the members and the public and in a timely manner in response to world events
- Engage in dialogue about creating a decision-making process for making public statements, in response to world events, when those statements are consistent with the organization's values but scientific evidence is still in its infancy
- Allocate sufficient financial resources for diversity and inclusion efforts, hiring and empowering a Chief Diversity Officer, implementing the diversity plan, collecting data in an ongoing manner related to the climate of inclusiveness within the APA, and developing and evaluating diversity initiatives training

Concluding Comments

In this report, we used organizational trauma theory as a framework for understanding

two key recent organizational crises within the APA, one related to the tensions concerning APA's relationship with the APAPO and the other surrounding the prioritization of social justice within the organization. We used the construct of organizational resilience to inform our understanding of the ways in which the APA can heal and move forward in positive and productive ways. We have argued that for APA to heal, it must repair and mend its collective social fabric after the various threats and shocks to its system (Powley & Cameron, 2006). The P&P believes that the APA must continue to create and utilize structures and processes that bolster the organization's resilience and that restore and promote key organizational relationships and practices (Powley & Piderit, 2008; Somers, 2009). Such healing will be facilitated by a genuine process of organizational self-reflection, the use of relevant consultants, and the prioritization of a model of transformational leadership (Sommer, Howell, & Hadley, 2016). Thus, in the view of P&P, a central tenet to the APA's success going forward is its ability along with the ability of its members to engage actively in the healing process. It is our hope that the recommendations offered in this report not only influence positive organizational changes within APA, but also will enable psychologists embedded in other organizations and institutions to more effectively address their internal challenges.

References

- American Psychological Association. (1983). Factors affecting APA involvement in litigation. Washington DC: American Psychological Association.
- American Psychological Association. (2003). Procedures for submission of *Amicus Curiae* briefs. Washington DC: American Psychological Association.
- American Psychological Association. (2014). APA Diversity Implementation Plan. Washington DC: American Psychological Association.
- American Psychological Association. (2015). Agreement ends APAPO practice assessment dispute. Retrieved May 2, 2017 from <http://www.apa.org/news/press/releases/2015/01/practice-assessment.aspx>.
- American Psychological Association Policy and Planning Board. (2016). Responding to change in a challenging climate: 2015 five-year report of the Policy and Planning Board. *American Psychologist*, 71, 415-426. doi: 10.1037/amp0000016
- American Psychological Association Practice Organization. (2017). APAPO Integrated Dues and Membership Forum. Personal Communication, March 31, 2017.
- American Psychological Association Task Force on Appropriate Therapeutic Responses to Sexual Orientation. (2009). Report of the American Psychological Association Task Force on Appropriate Therapeutic Responses to Sexual Orientation. Washington DC: American Psychological Association, Retrived March 23, 2017 from <http://www.apa.org/pi/lgbc/publications/therapeutic-resp.html>.
- American Psychological Association Task Force on Mental Health and Abortion. (2008). Report of the Task Force on Mental Health and Abortion. Washing DC: American Psychological Association, Retrieved March 7, 2017 from <http://www.apa.org/pi/wpo/mental-health->

[abortion-report.pdf](#).

Annarelli, A., & Nonino, F. (2016). Strategic and operational management of organizational resilience: Current state of research and future directions. *Omega*, 62, 1-18. doi:

10.1016/j.omega.2015.08.004

Arfken, M., & Yen, J. (2014). Psychology and social justice: Theoretical and philosophical engagements. *Journal of Theoretical and Philosophical Psychology*, 34, 1-13. doi:

10.1037/a0033578

Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. New York, NY: Free Press.

Bass, B. M. (1998). *Transformational leadership: Industrial, military, and educational impact*. Mahwah, N.J.: Erlbaum.

Belar, C. (2005, October). Overcoming barriers to advocacy: The Education Advocacy Trust. *Monitor on Psychology*, 36, 36.

Birkmann, J., Buckle, P., Jaeger, J., Pelling, M., Setiadi, N., Garschagen, M., et al. (2010).

Extreme events and disasters: A window of opportunity for change? Analysis of organizational, institutional and political changes, formal and informal responses about mega-disasters. *National Hazards*, 55, 637-655. doi: 10.1007/s11069-008-9319-2

Brown, E. H. (1997). Improving organizational health by addressing organizational trauma. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 10, 175-178. doi:

10.1108/09534819710160835

Bunker, K. A., & Wakefield, M. A. (2005). *Leading with authenticity in times of transition*. Greensboro, NC: Center for Creative Leadership.

Cameron, K. S., & McNaughtan, J. (2014). Positive organizational change. *The Journal of*

- Applied Behavioral Science*, 50, 445-462. doi: 10.1177/0021886314549922
- Cameron, K. S., & Plews, E. (2012). Positive leadership in action: Applications of POS by Jim Mallozzi, CEO, Prudential Real Estate and Relocation. *Organizational Dynamics*, 41, 99-105. doi: 10.1016/j.orgdyn.2012.01.003
- Cautin, R. L. (2009). The founding of the Association for Psychological Science. Part 1. Dialectical tensions within organized psychology. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 4, 211-223. doi: 10.1111/j.1745-6924.2009.01120.x
- Choo, C. W. (2013). Information culture and organizational effectiveness. *International Journal of Information Management*, 33, 775-779. doi: 10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2013.05.009
- Comas-Diaz, L. (2012). Psychotherapy as a healing practice, scientific endeavor, and social justice action. *Psychotherapy*, 49, 473-474. doi: 10.1037/a0027820
- Cummings, N. A. (2006). *The APA and psychology need reform*. In N.A. Cummings, F. Farley, & B. Strickland, Psychology needs reform: APA presidents debate the 10 amendments. Paper presented at the 114th annual convention of the American Psychological Association, New Orleans, LA. Retrieved November 11, 2016 from <http://www.napp.prg/pdf/nickcumno.pdf>.
- Cummings, N. A. (2011). Gay science is all fake: How gays control psychology. 2011 NARTH Conference: Research and psychotherapy. Retrieved November 11, 2016 from <http://www.youtube.com>.
- Figley, C. R. (Ed.). (2002). *Treating compassion fatigue*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Fox, R. E. (2001). Impact of the Dirty Dozen and increased practitioner professionalism on the American Psychological Association. In R.H.Wright & N. A. Cummings (Eds.), *The practice of psychology: The battle for professionalism* (pp. 104-115). Phoenix, AZ: Zeig,

Tucker & Theisen, Inc.

Gillespie, N., & Dietz, G. (2009). Trust repair after an organization-level failure. *Academy of Management Review*, 34, 127-145. doi: 10.5465/AMR.2009.35713319

Gillespie, N., Dietz, G., & Lockey, S. (2014). Organizational reintegration and trust repair after an integrity violation: A case study. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 24, 371-410. doi: 10.5840/beq2014437

Gomez, J. M., Smith, C. P., Gobin, R. L., Tang, S. S., & Freyd, J. J. (2017). Collusion, torture, and inequality: Understanding the actions of the American Psychological Association as institutional betrayal. *Journal of Trauma & Dissociation*. doi: 10.1080/15299732.2016.1214436

Grohol, J. (2015). *The Hoffman Report after years of lies, who holds the APA accountable*. [WebLog] Retrieved on 10/2/16 from <http://psychcentral.com/blog/archives/2015/07/11/the-hoffman-report-after-years-of-lies-who-holds-the-apa-accountable/>.

Hatch, O. G. (1982). Psychology, Society, and Politics. *American Psychologist*, 37, 1031-1037. doi: 10.1037/0003-066X.37.9.1031

Herman, J. (1992). *Trauma and recovery*. New York, NY: Basic Books.

Hoffman, D. J., Carter, D. J., Lopez, C. R. V., Benzmilller, H. L., Guo, A. X., Latifi, S. Y., et al. (2015). Independent review relating to APA ethics guidelines, national security interrogations, and torture. Chicago, Ill: Sidley Austin LLP, Retrieved August 26, 2017 from <http://www.apa.org/independent-review/revised-report.pdf>.

Holden, C. (1988). APA likely to sell *Psychology Today*. *Science*, 239, 1090-1091. doi: 10.1126/science.239.4844.1090-a

- Hormann, S., & Vivian, P. (2005). Toward an understanding of traumatized organizations and how to intervene in them. *Traumatology*, *11*, 159-169. doi: 10.1177/153476560501100302
- Kahn, W. A. (2003). The revelation of organizational trauma. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, *39*, 364-380. doi: 10.1177/0021886303261954
- Kahn, W. A., Barton, M. A., & Fellows, S. (2013). Organizational crises and the disturbance of relational systems. *Academy of Management Review*, *38*, 377-396. doi: 10.5465/amr.2011.0363
- Kingdom, J. W. (1995). *Agendas, alternatives, and public policies*. New York, NY: Harper Collins College Publishers.
- Kleinberg, J. (2016). How organizational hunger may have contributed to the American Psychological Association's scandal over the ethics of torture. *International Journal of Group Psychotherapy*. doi: 10.1080/00207284.2016.1176482
- Lee, A. V., Vargo, J., & Seville, E. (2013). Developing a tool to measure and compare organizations' resilience. *Natural Hazards Review*, *14*, 29-41. doi: 10.1061/(ASCE)NH.1527-6996.0000075
- Lengnick-Hall, C. A., Beck, T. E., & Lengnick-Hall, M. L. (2011). Developing a capacity for organizational resilience through strategic human resource management. *Human Resource Management Review*, *21*, 243-255. doi: 10.1016/j.hrmr.2010.07.001
- Louis, W. R., Mavor, K. I., La Macchia, S. T., & Amiot, C. E. (2014). Social justice and psychology: What is, and what should be. *Journal of Theoretical and Philosophical Psychology*, *34*, 14-27. doi: 10.1037/a0033033
- McManus, S. E., Seville, E., Vargo, J., & Brunsdon, D. (2008). Facilitated process for improving

- organizational resilience. *Natural Hazards Review*, 9, 81-90. doi: 10.1061/ASCE1527-6988(2008)9:2(81)
- Medley, B. C., & Akan, O. H. (2008). Creating positive change in community organizations: A case for rediscovering Lewin. *Nonprofit Management & Leadership*, 18, 485-496. doi: 10.1002/nml
- O'Neill, P. (2016). Psychology in and out of the shadows. *Canadian Psychology*. doi: 10.1037/cap0000055
- Office of Minority Mental Health. (2011). HHS action plan to reduce racial and ethnic health disparities: A nation free of disparities in health and health care. Washington DC: US Department of Health and Human Services.
- Paige, R. U. (2005). Proceedings of the American Psychological Association, Incorporated for the legislative year 20024. Minutes of the meeting of the Council of Representatives July 28 & 30, 2004, Honolulu, HI. Washington DC: American Psychological Association, Retrieved March 17, 2017 from <http://www.apa.org/about/policy/parenting.aspx>.
- Patton, B. (2005). Posttraumatic growth in protective services professionals: Individual, cognitive, and organizational influences. *Traumatology*, 11, 335-346. doi: 10.1177/153476560501100411
- Plante, T. G. (2017). Making APA civil again: The efforts and outcomes of the Civility Working Group. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 48, 401-404. doi: 10.1037/pro0000163
- Pope, K. S. (2018). *Five steps to strengthen ethics in organizations and individuals: Effective strategies informed by research and history*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Powley, E. H. (2013). The process and mechanisms of organizational healing. *The Journal of*

- Applied Behavioral Science*, 49, 42-68. doi: 10.1177/0021886312471192
- Powley, E. H., & Cameron, K. S. (2006). Organizational healing: Lived virtuosness amidst organizational crisis. *Journal of Management, Spirituality, and Religion*, 3, 13-33. doi: 10.1080/14766080609518609
- Powley, E. H., & Piderit, S. K. (2008). Tending wounds: Elements of the organizational healing process. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 44, 134-149. doi: 10.1177/0021886308314842
- Rosenthal, L. (2016). Incorporating intersectionality into psychology: An opportunity to promote social justice and equity. *American Psychologist*, 71, 474-485. doi: 10.1037/a0040323
- Rozensky, R. H. (2013). Quality education in professional psychology: Flowers blooming, Flexner, and the future. *American Psychologist*, 68, 703-716. doi: 10.1037/a0033771
- Simola, S. (2016). Fostering collective growth and vitality following acts of moral courage: A general system, relational psychodynamic perspective. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 133, 1-14. doi: 10.1007/s10551-016-3014-0
- Smedley, B. D., Stith, A. Y., & Nelson, A. R. (Eds.). (2003). *Unequal treatment: Confronting racial and ethnic disparities in health care*. Washington D.C.: The National Academies Press.
- Smith, C. P., & Freyd, J. J. (2014). Institutional betrayal. *American Psychologist*, 69, 575-587. doi: 10.1037/a0037564
- Somers, S. (2009). Measuring resilience potential: An adaptive strategy for organizational crisis planning. *Journal of Contingencies and Crisis Management*, 17, 12-23. doi: 10.1111/j.1468-5973.2009.00558.x
- Sommer, S. A., Howell, J. M., & Hadley, C. N. (2016). Keeping positive and building strength:

- The role of affect and team leadership in developing resilience during an organizational crisis. *Group & Organization Management*, 41, 172-202. doi: 10.1177/1059601115578027
- Sonnentag, S., Niessen, C., & Neff, A. (2012). Recovery: Nonwork experiences that promote positive states. In G. M. Spreitzer & K. S. Cameron (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of positive organizational scholarship* (pp. 867-881). Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
- Stein, H. F. (2001). *Nothing personal, just business: A guided journal into organizational darkness*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Publishing Group.
- Stein, H. F. (2004). *Beneath the crust of culture: Psychoanalytic anthropology and the cultural unconscious in American life*. New York, NY: Rodopi.
- Suinn, R. M., Abeles, N., Arredondo, P., Greene, B., Haldeman, D., Hedayat-Diba, Z., et al. (2015). APA Presidential Task Force on Enhancing Diversity: Final Report. Washington DC: American Psychological Association.
- Suyemoto, K. L., Day, S. C., & Schwartz, S. (2015). Exploring effects of social justice youth programming on racial and ethnic identities and activism for Asian American youth. *Asian American Journal of Psychology*, 6, 125-135. doi: 10.1037/a0037789
- Tanner, B. (2017). APA Government Relations Office, Personal Community April 4, 2017.
- Tedeschi, R. G., & Calhoun, L. G. (2004). Posttraumatic growth: Conceptual foundations and empirical evidence. *Psychological Inquiry*, 15, 1-18. doi: 10.1207/s15327965pli1501_01
- Thomas, N. K. (2016). "We didn't know": Silence and silencing in organizations. *International Journal of Group Psychotherapy*, 66, 492-505. doi: 10.1080/00207284.2016.1176489
- Thompson, C., Hardee, S., & Lane, J. C. (2011). Engaging student diversity through a social

- justice learning community. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, 4, 106-119. doi: 10.1037/a0022726
- Tipton, C. (2017). APA Office of Division Services, Personal Communication May 24, 2017.
- Top Class Actions. (2016). APA practice assessment fee class action settlement. Retrieved June 4, 2017 from <https://topclassactions.com/lawsuit-settlements/closed-settlements/55001-apa-practice-assessment-fee-class-action-settlement/>.
- Vasquez, M. J. T. (2012). Psychology and social justice: Why we do what we do. *American Psychologist*, 67, 337-346. doi: 10.1037/a0029232
- Vivian, P., & Hormann, S. (2013). *Organizational trauma and healing*. North Charleston, CV: CreateSpace.
- Walsh, R. T. G. (2015). Bending the arc of North American psychologists' moral universe toward communicative ethics and social justice. *Journal of Theoretical and Philosophical Psychology*, 35, 90-102. doi: 10.1037/teo0000011
- Weick, K. E., & Sutcliffe, K. M. (2007). *Managing the unexpected: Resilient performance in the age of uncertainty*. San Francisco, CA: Josse-Bass.
- Wright, R. H. (2001). The rise of professionalism within American psychology and how it came to be: A brief history of the Dirty Dozen *The practice of psychology: The battle for professionalism* (pp. 1-69). Phoenix, AZ: Zeig, Tucker & Theisen, Inc.
- Wright, R. L. (2008). A 40-year history of the Association of Black Psychologists (ABPsi). *Journal of Black Psychology*, 34, 249-260. doi: 10.1177/0095798408321332

Table 1

APA versus the APAPO. What's the Difference?

	APA (a 501(c3) organization)	The APAPO (a 501(c6) organization)
Mission	<p>To advance the creation, communication and application of psychological knowledge to benefit society and improve people's lives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Promotes <u>psychology</u> • Goal is to advance research, education, and practice to benefit society • Political activity of any kind prohibited • Disseminates psychological knowledge • Promotes excellence and establishes standards (e.g., ethics, accreditation) • Advocates for public policy based on psychological science. • Limited lobbying on issues in its mission areas 	<p>To promote the mutual professional interests of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Promotes <u>psychologists</u> • Goal is to benefit the discipline and profession rather than society as a whole • Permits an affiliated political action committee to support or oppose candidates • Provides member-centric resources designed to benefit individual members • Advocates for psychologists' economic interests • Engages in <u>unrestricted</u> lobbying on issues in its mission areas

Table 2

C (3) and C (6) Organizational Functions: Percent of Members Who Believe APA, a C (3) Organization, Expends Resources on each of these Functions

Activity (Survey items were presented randomly but are listed here in order of their percent endorsement as an APA function)	Customary activity of C (3) and/or C (6) Organizations	% “YES” – respondents who see APA expending resources on this function
Disseminating psychological knowledge via educational activities, publications and meetings.	C3	95%
Developing ethical standards for psychologists.	C3	95%
Fostering psychological research and advancing psychology as a science.	C3	93%
Promoting quality in psychological practice (e.g., practice guidelines).	C3	92%
Providing educational opportunities for psychologists to enhance their knowledge and skills in psychological research, teaching and practice.	C3	92%
Determining standards for education in psychology.	C3	91%
Advancing the application of psychology to health, education, and other areas.	C3	90%
Advancing the application of psychology through advocacy at the national level.	C3/C6	86%
Promoting quality in graduate and professional education in psychology.	C3	85%
Advancing the application of psychology to public policy, social issues and human rights.	C3	84%
Enhancing job opportunities for psychologists.	C6	79%
Supporting policies that promote the careers of its members.	C6	78%
Protecting the interests of psychologists.	C6	78%
Expanding the scope of practice for psychologists to provide greater career opportunities (e.g., prescriptive authority).	C3/C6	75%
Developing and promoting model licensing laws.	C3	69%
Working to increase the pay and job status of psychologists.	C6	66%
Ensuring that the doctoral degree is required for independent psychological practice.	C3/C6	66%
Increasing the overall market for psychological services.	C3/C6	61%
Providing career enhancement opportunities for psychologists (e.g., administrative and management	C6	61%

tools).		
Promoting psychology as a core STEM discipline in the schools and to society at large.	C3	58%
Increasing market share for psychological services.	C6	47%
Advocating for psychology as an essential course for all college undergraduates.	C3	44%

ACTIONS TAKEN IN RESPONSE TO THE INDEPENDENT REVIEW

	ITEM	DATE ACTION TAKEN	STATUS
1.	Ethics Commission	Approved by Council in August 2015	<p>A call for nominations to the Ethics Commission was distributed in September 2015. In February 2016, 17 Commission members were selected to serve. The Ethics Commission began its work in April 2016 and held its first face to face meeting May 10-11. Subgroups were created to look at specific issues with the goal of creating recommendations that will be broadly disseminated for opportunities for feedback on a public comment site.</p> <p>An initial status report was given at the August 2016 Council meeting. A town hall was also held at the 2016 Convention. Preliminary findings and recommendations to the Board and Council will be provided in February 2017. It is expected that the Board and Council will receive a final report in August 2017.</p>
2.	Resolution to Amend the 2006 and 2013 Council Resolutions to Clarify the Roles of Psychologists Related to Interrogation and Detainee Welfare in National Security Settings, to Further Implement the 2008 Petition Resolution, and to Safeguard Against Acts of Torture and Cruel, Inhuman, or Degrading Treatment or Punishment in All Settings (NBI #23B/Feb 2014)	Approved by Council in August 2015	<p>Completed.</p> <p>Letters were sent to key federal officials to notify them of this new policy that includes a prohibition against psychologist participation in national security interrogations.</p> <p>The Ethics Committee was asked to consider pursuing an appropriate course of action in as expeditious a manner as possible to incorporate into the Ethics Code the following prohibitions surrounding psychologist participation in national security interrogations, as set forth in the Resolution (NBI #23B/Feb 2014). As a result, the Ethics Committee proposed changes to Standard 3.04 of the Ethics Code and a public comment period began in February 2016. The proposed changes were included in the spring 2016 cross cutting agenda. The Ethics Committee reviewed all comments received at its April 8-10, 2016 meeting and revised the proposed language as needed.</p> <p>Council approved the revision to Standard 3.04 at its August 2016 meeting. The change took effect on January 1, 2017.</p>

ACTIONS TAKEN IN RESPONSE TO THE INDEPENDENT REVIEW

	ITEM	DATE ACTION TAKEN	STATUS
3.	Conflict of Interest Work Group	Approved by Council in August 2015	<p>The Council Leadership Team (CLT) appointed members to the conflict of interest work group in November 2015. The work group developed two draft work products that were included in the spring 2016 cross cutting agenda: Proposed conflict of interest principles and procedures and a decision making model. The conflict of interest work group revised the documents based on feedback received and submitted them to CLT for review. CLT reviewed the documents at its June 2016 meeting. In an effort to remain consistent with the charge of the conflict of interest work group as approved by Council, CLT separated the COI Principles from the larger COI Procedures document and recommended that the procedures drafted by the work group be considered by the Board of Directors when it finalizes procedures for implementing the COI Principles.</p> <p>The COI Principles will be included on the fall 2016 cross cutting agenda for review by boards and committees. The COI Principles will return to Council for action at its February 2017 meeting.</p>
4.	Ethics Office Oversight	Approved by Board in September 2015	The CEO appointed Katherine Nordal, PhD as the Ethics Director providing oversight in the process of filed ethics complaints. The Ethics Commission will review the adjudication and investigative procedures, including the transparency and accuracy in the disclosure of current ethics practices.
5.	Board Emergency Action	Approved by Board in September 2015	The Board will discuss the implementing criteria and procedures for Board emergency action at its February 2017 meeting.
6.	CEO Internal Review	Approved by Board in January 2016	<p>Completed.</p> <p>The Interim CEO provided a report to the Board at its June meeting on work that was done to assess current processes and procedures and checks and balances to assure appropriate oversight by supervisors of staff with respect to professionalism, decision-making, communication, interpersonal interactions, financial management, and adherence to APA core values.</p>

ACTIONS TAKEN IN RESPONSE TO THE INDEPENDENT REVIEW

	ITEM	DATE ACTION TAKEN	STATUS
7.	Human Rights Curriculum Development	Approved by Board in January 2016	<p>Completed.</p> <p>The Board approved funding for the development of a Human Rights Continuing Education Workshop Series for Convention 2016.</p>
8.	Advisory Committee on Human Rights	Approved by Board in January 2016	<p>The Board approved funding for one meeting of the Task Force on Human Rights in 2016. A call for nominations was included in the spring 2016 cross cutting agenda. The Board approved nominations to the task force in June 2016.</p> <p>It is anticipated that Council will be asked to receive the report of the task force at its August 2017 meeting.</p>
9.	Organizational Policies and Procedures	Approved by Council in February 2016	<p>Council approved the establishment of a work group to review best practices in order to develop APA organizational policies and procedures. A call for nominations was sent to Council in April 2016. Work group members were appointed in May 2016 by the Board and CLT. The work group had its first conference call in late June. A progress report was included as an information item in Council's August agenda.</p> <p>A progress report is included on Council's February 2017 agenda and a verbal update will be given at the meeting.</p>
10.	Civility Issues	Approved by Council in February 2016	<p>Council approved the establishment of a work group to develop civility principles and procedures for all forms of communication within and on behalf of APA. A call for nominations was sent to Council in April 2016. Work group members were appointed in May 2016 by the Board and CLT. The work group will conduct its work virtually. The work group had several conference calls in June and July. A progress report was included as an information item in Council's August agenda. The group also provided Council with a verbal update at the August meeting.</p> <p>Council will be asked to receive the report and take action on some of the recommendations in the report at its February 2017 meeting.</p>

ACTIONS TAKEN IN RESPONSE TO THE INDEPENDENT REVIEW

	ITEM	DATE ACTION TAKEN	STATUS
11.	Guidelines for Council Resolutions	Approved by Council in February 2016	<p>Completed.</p> <p>The Guidelines for Council Resolutions were amended to include the extent to which the resolution is consistent with APA's core values, and the extent to which it addresses human rights, health and welfare, and ethics.</p>
12.	Strategic Plan	Approved by Council in February 2016	The Board and Council will prioritize ethics, human rights and social justice in all aspects of the next Strategic Plan.
13.	Task Force Selection Processes	Approved by Council in February 2016	<p>Council approved the establishment of a work group to develop guidelines that will reduce bias, increase transparency, and promote diversity in the selection of individuals serving on APA task forces. This system for task force selection should emphasize self-nomination, as well as nominations by, and consultation with, relevant stakeholders (e.g. Divisions, SPTAs, other affiliated groups). A call for nominations was sent to Council in April 2016. Work group members were appointed in May 2016 by the Board and CLT. The work group will conduct its work virtually. The work group had its first conference call in early June and its second call in mid-July. A progress report was included as an information item in Council's August agenda.</p> <p>The work group developed a Task Force/Work Group Selection Packet which includes a matrix template and a checklist that details a standard process for task force/work group selection. This packet should be used when appointing any APA task force or work group. Council will be asked to receive the report of the work group and approve a recommended action regarding selection of task force members at its February 2017 meeting.</p>
,14.	Conflict of Interest Policies	Pending	<p>Pending.</p> <p>The Board will wait to begin modifying conflict of interest policies until the Conflict of Interest Work Group has completed its work.</p>

ACTIONS TAKEN IN RESPONSE TO THE INDEPENDENT REVIEW

	ITEM	DATE ACTION TAKEN	STATUS
15.	Procedures for Appointing Task Force Members	Approved by Board in September 2015	<p>Pending.</p> <p>The Board will wait to look at developing procedures for appointing and making public the members of Task Forces, Commissions, etc. until the Work Group on Task Force Selection Guidelines has completed its work.</p>
16.	Expenses Related to the Independent Review	Approved by Council in August 2015	<p>Completed.</p> <p>Council requested that costs related to the Independent Review be made public. The costs billed from Sidley Austin, Wilmer Hale, and Powell Tate for professional fees and expenses in connection with the Independent Review are \$4.3 million through July 15, 2015. A final report will be provided once all of the costs have been billed. The costs will be paid from the net assets of the Association which were \$61.5 million on December 31, 2014, per the audited financial statements. Council was provided with updated costs in October 2015.</p> <p>In February 2016, Council was provided with additional cost information in executive session.</p>
17.	Website Disclaimer for Interrogation Vignettes Responses	Approved by Board in September 2015	<p>Completed.</p> <p>The following disclaimer was added to the Interrogations Vignettes Responses website:</p> <p>This document was rendered out-of-date and invalid following the adoption of two relevant policy resolutions by the APA Council of Representatives in 2013 and 2015. It is not an official APA policy statement and should not be relied upon for guidance pertaining to the role of psychologists in national security-related activities.</p>

ACTIONS TAKEN IN RESPONSE TO THE INDEPENDENT REVIEW

	ITEM	DATE ACTION TAKEN	STATUS
18.	Board Recognition of Members in Military Settings	Approved by Board in January 2016	<p>Completed.</p> <p>The following statement approved by the Board was sent to Division 19: The Board acknowledges and appreciates the valuable and ethical behavior of the members of the American Psychological Association who work in military settings who make important and honorable contributions to those they serve and to the greater society. We commend the services they provide to military members and veterans and their families, as well as to the organizations in which they serve.</p> <p>The Board is committed to working actively and collaboratively with military psychologists.</p>
19.	Open Meetings at Fall 2015 Consolidated Meetings	Approved by Board in September 2015	<p>Completed.</p> <p>An open meeting on the Independent Review Report was held at the September and November 2015 Consolidated Meetings.</p> <p>CLT solicited feedback on the motions related to the Independent Review submitted by Board or Council members from Council members, boards and committees, ethnic minority psychological associations, and divisions and SPTAs in fall 2015.</p>