**Agenda: PSA Women’s Caucus Meeting**

**Saturday, 17 November 2012 (San Diego)**

**7:00 – 8:40 am, Harbor Island III**

Attendance: Kathleen Okruhlik, Melinda Fagan, Letitia Meynell, Susan Hawthorne, Rose-Mary Sargent, Alisa Bokulich, Serfe Tekin, Inkeri Koskinen, Kathleen Creel, Irina Meketa, Melissa Jacquart, Sara Green, Sandra Mitchell, Jessica Pfeifer, Laura Perini, Janet Stemwedel, Sharon Crasnow, Nancy Cartwright, Lisa Gannett, Karen Swier, Quayshan Spencer, Michael Hunter, Michela Massimi, Roberta Millstein, Sarah Roe, Flavia Padovani, Anya Plutynski, Karola Stotz, Devin Gouva, Carolyn Brighouse, Susan G. Sterrett, Andrea Woody, Kristen Intemann, Inmaculada de Melo-Martin, Dana Tulodziecki, Rebecca Kukla, Laura Ruetsche, Nancy Hall, Lindley Darden, Angela Potochnik, Vanessa Bentley, Bihui Li, Miriam Solomon, Hannah Ribin, Sarita Rosenstock, Cailin O’Connor, Monika Piotrowska, Uljana Feest, Helen Longino, Joyce Havstad, Eleanor Knox, Katherine Brading, Doreen Fraser, Soazig Le Bihan, Janet Kourany, Joia Lewis Turner, Johanna Wolff, Rachel Ankeny, Jingjin Wang, Sindhuja Bhakthavatsalam, Marta Halina, Elizabeth O’Neill, Xuan Geng, Joan Roughgarden, Mazviita Chirimuuta

*1. Call to Order*

The meeting was called to order 7:15 AM.

Minutes from Nov. 6, 2010 meeting approved. (M/S/P by Longino/Solomon)

Discussion about keeping the junior/senior co-chair. Holly A. and Kathleen O. proposed that we continue the structure as it currently was working well. No objection and adopted by consensus.

Motion approved to thank Alan Richardson (donating on behalf of the STS Graduate Program at the University of British Columbia) and the PSA for donations supporting the Women’s Caucus breakfast. (Item 6 on the agenda)

*2. Recognition of Caucus Prize winners* Kristen Intemann and Inmaculada de Melo-Martin were recognized as the winners of the prize (awarded biennially for the best book, article, or chapter published in English in the area of feminist philosophy of science within the five years prior to each PSA). Kathleen thanked the prize committee.

A question was raised about whether we needed to raise more money and it was confirmed that we did as the prize is not yet endowed and that would be the goal. The women’s caucus currently has about $2300 available for first prize. Further discussion of how to raise the money was deferred till later, however, everyone was reminded that in the meantime donations in support of the prize can be made by sending them directly to the PSA Executive Secretary (clearly marked for the Women’s Caucus prize) or by checking the appropriate box on the PSA website when renewing membership.

*3. Approval of By-Laws* - Approved. (M/S/P by Rebecca Kukla/Andrea Woody; unanimous)

*4. Election of new senior co-chair* – effective January 1. Nominations: Roberta Millstein nominated. Motion to elect by acclamation (M/S/P).

*5. Secretary-Treasurer’s report* - The account is currently handled by the Executive Secretary/Treasurer for the PSA. This works well as we are not treated as a separate organization but a caucus of the PSA. The secretary-treasurer of the Women’s Caucus will be added as someone having access to the account.

*6. Motion to thank breakfast donors* – moved up on the agenda (see above).

*7. Reports on our website, listserv and blog* - Roberta M. invited people to get themselves added to listserv. She encouraged the use of these electronic tools for greater communication. Janet Stemwedel created a blog after the last meeting and noted that it is not currently being used and reminded everyone about it. There is also a Facebook page for the Women’s Caucus.

Sandra Mitchell encouraged that we be more proactive about the Women’s Caucus directory. There are 75 women on the directory. In addition to making sure that you are on it yourself encourage other women philosophers of science that we know to write to Roberta and get on the directory. One strategy is to get the list of women members of the PSA from Gary Hardcastle. Roberta said that she would do so. Everyone at the meeting was encouraged to check to make sure that you are actually on the directory. Susan Hawthorne offered to take over the directory from Roberta.

*8. Report from Andrea Woody on any gender issues re: PSA program* – Andrea passed out sheet with statistics about submissions and acceptances at this year’s PSA.

She noted that there had been 7 women on the program committee including herself – Alison Bokulich, Jill North, Kathleen Okruhlik, Anya Plutynski, Kristen Intemann, and Wendy Parker. Andrea thanked them and they were acknowledged. Several steps were taken to ensure greater opportunities for participation on the program. The committee used a two-step submission process with two different deadlines – symposia first, then contributed papers. Andrea asked for feedback on how that worked. Lindley Darden spoke in support of this idea and recommended that those planning to take advantage of this process get the 5000 word paper ready when they submit the abstract for the symposium so that they will be able to submit if the symposium is rejected. Acceptance for symposia is low and be aware of this.

Another way of improving opportunities for participation was a call for volunteers for chairing. An online system for chairs was used and 20 women were included as chairs as a result of this method. It seems that it too was a good idea. Because some departments will give support for chairs to travel this increased opportunities to attend the PSA as well.

Having information on the PSA submissions and acceptances was supported as useful, however, the governing board has to approve making information public. The information included percentages of submissions, acceptances, areas of philosophy of science represented by the papers, and other information. The percentages of acceptances in these areas were consistent with the percentages of submissions and Andrea said that she had worked hard to see that this was so. It was interesting to see that there were very few submissions in areas that were specifically tied to feminism. It was suggested that maybe we needed to make it better known that the PSA welcomes this kind of work. A discussion of how to effectively encourage such submissions followed. Roberta suggested that there were ways to organize so that this wouldn’t be a problem. Kristen Intemann suggested that the PSA should reach out to FEMMSS. There was discussion of partnering on a session or event. Letitia Meynell volunteered to be FEMMSS side of exploring this kind of partnership. Andrea noted that there is no explicit PSA policy on this sort of partnership, but there do seem to be more co-sponsorships than there used to be. It was agreed that both encouraging FEMMSS submissions and exploring the possibility of a collaborative session were good ideas. Helen Longino agreed to work with Letitia to explore the options.

Andrea did not have the most recent statistics on membership however it has been pretty steadily 15% women for many years. This year’s program had 22% women on the program and so women were overrepresented relative to membership this year.

Sandra Mitchell proposed that the Women’s Caucus should forward a statement from the caucus expressing concern about the representation of women and feminist work. Such a statement would go to the program committee chair for the next meeting (not yet chosen) and the board of governors. (M/S/P Mitchell/Woody) Helen Longino suggested it should be stronger – we want to increase the percentages of women in the association and the profession; and second, we want more feminist work on the program. A subcommittee was formed to come up with concrete suggestions for how the board should respond to these suggestions. The original motion was amended to instead form such a committee. The subcommittee volunteers were: Sandra Mitchell, Roberta Millstein, and Anya Plutynski. Kathleen asked that the subcommittee also encourage that the program chair to continue to collect information on submissions and acceptances as Andrea had done.

The caucus acknowledged Andrea Woody for her excellent job as program chair.

Miriam Solomon informed everyone that she was taking pictures and that people should inform her if they did not want their pictures taken.

*9. Discussion of child care arrangements* – Andrea discussed issues with creating a communal family room – a space to hang out. There had been miscommunication about this issue and it had been understood as a room for nursing. Ultimately, it worked out so that the room could be private if it was wanted for nursing but was available as a communal family room otherwise. But the question was raised as to whether there was a need. Rachel Ankeny suggested that families use the room, which currently was not particularly inviting, to indicate that this was something that was needed and used and then in the future it might be more inviting. Janet Stemwedel suggested that we needed to get further information on what the childcare needs of the members were. Rachel noted that climate survey should take care of this and quite a number of men had responded that they needed childcare.

It was also suggested that an online forum for discussing childcare and coordinating among members who would be travelling with children would be useful.

An action plan was proposed: collect information about needs and wants of the membership about “family room” and facilitate coordination. (Climate survey was a good start but more is needed.)

Rachel reported that HSS is considering putting together grants for people for childcare. These would be grants for any and all activities related to caring for children or others – to bring children, use at home, and so on. This would be another use of funds that we would need to get an endowment drive going for. Helen said that she would see if is possible to re-open the climate survey and to work with the governing board to gather more information.

Rebecca Kukla noted that many other organizations incorporate family activities planned around conference and that we should also think about this.

A subcommittee was formed to work on issues of childcare: Rebecca Kukla, Alisa Bokulich, Ulliana Feest, and Andrea Woody.

*10. Report from Michela Massimi re: gender survey* – The PSA governing board discussed the creation of report on status of women in philosophy of science. This was approved. The idea is to investigate gender climate, identify possible barriers, and make recommendations on how to address this issue. The first stage is to compile data (from climate survey). The questions need to be fine tuned and there may be another survey which addresses different stages of academic career and other factors including glass ceilings and so on. The model is a British philosophical association report. This report also includes case studies – stories of successful changes that have taken place – and recommendations for improving.

Letitia asked about efforts to collect data about other underrepresented groups.

Miriam discussed how the APA is working on this – across diversity areas, including disability, and we may be able to get some data from them on philosophy of science. Currently the only data collected is salary data collected by Chicago Press. Michela says that she will let Women’s Caucus know what next steps will be.

*11. Updates on Gendered Conferences Campaign* – Sandy M. discussed the Feminist Philosophers blog Gendered Conferences Campaign. Our last minutes show that we wanted to do something like this but it looks like it would be a good idea to piggy back on this campaign. The strategy is to identify philosophy of science conferences from Feminist Philosophers blog and then send the Women’s Caucus letter. One idea would be to be able to point the conference organizers to a directory of women philosophers of science. Sandy asked for someone to monitor the blog, pick out philosophy of science conferences, and send the letter. Susan Sterrett volunteered.

There was some discussion of how best to word the letter. Adopting the Gendered Conference Campaign strategy of “naming but not shaming” was endorsed.

*12. Update on possibility of an additional Prize* – Several possibilities were proposed and discussed, among them the possibility of a prize and lecture, where the lecture was given in conjunction with the PSA meeting. Something similar is done at the HSS. The body supported the idea of a second prize. The form that it would take was discussed.

Motion for the prize to be at each PSA and be a second form of recognition (M/S/P by Sandy Mitchell/Nancy Hall).

Motion that the recognition be lecture. Motion approved, contingent on structural requirements of the PSA program which will have to be further explored. Helen L. agreed to do so.

The body congratulated Helen Longino for being elected president of the PSA.

Everyone thanked Kathleen for her service as co-chair of the Women’s Caucus.

Janet Stemwedel moved to adjourned at 8:45.

Respectfully submitted,

Sharon Crasnow

Secretary-Treasurer, PSA Women’s Caucus