A Message from the Chair
By Jennifer Reich

I am excited to write this as the Chair of our section. Over the years, as my work has spanned many areas and topics, I have not always felt sure where I fit in the discipline. Yet, without question, S&G has always been my intellectual home. I have been a member since I was a graduate student and have served the section in a variety of ways—from organizing roundtables and sessions to serving on committees to being a member of Council. I have always felt a sense of belonging here. As we enter 2017 as the largest section of ASA, it seems clear that it feels the same to many of you. We have always maintained a big tent, welcoming to all kinds of research, and I am honored to support that into the next year. I also hope you will consider how you can help to support our community too.

Since we met in Seattle in August, our section has been busy. The program committee has worked through the suggestions for sessions we received at the business meeting and after to set the call for papers for our 2017 meeting in Montreal. Those sessions are listed in the newsletter. Thank you to our program committee members, Marla Kohlman, Emily Mann, Freeden Oeur, Leslie Salzinger, and Mary Blair-Loy, for their work.

We have also been organizing the call for nominations and committee rosters for our four section awards. Please consider nominating yourself or others you know whose work is deserving of recognition. Our section gives a book award, an article award, a graduate student paper award, and an award for exceptional work as a feminist scholar-activist. This latter award is our newest and is aimed at recognizing accomplishments in teaching, service, engagement, research, mentoring or other ways that have made impacts in addressing systems of inequality. This is not a lifetime achievement award but rather, a way of recognizing important work that has had broader impacts.

Our section is among the best run and best organized in ASA. We owe this to the hard work of past council members, chairs, and ad hoc committees that have examined our bylaws and worked to improve them. Our section leadership works all year and ensures we continue to have a rich intellectual home. Thank you to the outgoing council members Mimi
Schippers, Elizabeth Armstrong, and Sara Crawley, to our outgoing student council member Michela Musto, to the outgoing chair Allison Pugh and outgoing past-chair, Jessica Fields, and to everyone who served on committees and sessions this year.

Our section also works hard to communicate with our nearly 1100 members. This newsletter is an important way we do that. I want to especially thank Alicia Smith-Tran who has served as our newsletter editor. This is her last issue before she passes the editorship to our new editor Eli Alston-Stepnitz.

As we move forward, we need new folks to step forward to serve the section. Please consider nominating yourself or someone you know to stand for election in the coming year. Nominations can be sent to Allison Pugh (ap9cd@virginia.edu), who as past-chair heads the nominations committee. We also need a group of volunteers to help plan our reception for Montreal. Please email to me if you are able to help.

I hope the remainder of fall goes well. I know between a busy term, a contentious election season, and the seemingly chaotic schedules we all seem to keep, many days feel overwhelming. Yet, even among deadlines and grading and growing service demands, I feel lucky to work as a sociologist, to ask big questions, and to be a member of a powerful intellectual community.

Jennifer Reich
Associate Professor of Sociology
University of Colorado-Denver
Jennifer.reich@ucdenver.edu

---

Introducing our Section’s New Newsletter Editor!

Eli Alston-Stepnitz will be the next Newsletter Editor for the Sex and Gender Section of ASA. Eli is pursuing their PhD at UC-Davis and in addition to studying sex and gender sociologically, also dabbles in graphic design. Eli is the artist responsible for the section logo that was produced during Jessica Fields’ term as section chair and co-authored an essay on the logo with Tristan Bridges and Jessica Fields in the July 2015 issue of the section newsletter. We are excited to welcome Eli to the Sex and Gender team and looking forward to continuing our section tradition of a strong and professional newsletter.

Check out our section’s website for past newsletters and more information on the section!
https://asasexandgender.wordpress.com/
Looking Back: Photos from ASA 2016

Distinguished Article Award winners Laurel Westbrook (left) and Kristen Schilt (right).

Sally Hacker Graduate Student Paper Award winner Celene Reynolds.

Distinguished Book Award co-winner Asia Friedman.

Distinguished Book Award co-winner Kimberly Hoang.
Looking Back: Photos from ASA 2016 (continued)

A view of our section’s business meeting

From the session, “How Changing the Conversation Changed Sociology: Intersectionality’s Impact on the Discipline and Beyond.”

Pictured (left to right): Leslie McCall, Kimberlé Williams Crenshaw, Patricia Hill Collins, Adia Harvey Wingfield, and Joya Misra.

New Section Chair Jennifer Reich (left) with Past Chair Allison Pugh (right)
The Politics of “Evidence” in Transgender Healthcare

By stef m. shuster

While healthcare practices operate from the premise that doctors are informed experts, providers have debated what constitutes expertise and whether medical decision-making should be based on clinical experience or scientific evidence. My research in transgender healthcare is guided by the question of what happens when there is no scientific evidence and little clinical experience to help providers of trans medicine make medical decisions?

The lack of evidence in this medical arena directly conflicts with expectations for providers’ expertise and distinguishes the practice of trans medicine as an arena defined by uncertainty. Clinical guidelines are a common way that medical providers respond to uncertainty. Guidelines emerged from the Evidence-based medicine movement (EBM), which attempts to standardize healthcare decision-making through the use of “best” available scientific evidence. Sometimes referred to as “cookbook medicine,” clinical guidelines offer providers a standardized and formulaic decision-making tree when faced with uncertainty, and supposedly supported by “evidence.”

In a recently published piece in the Journal of Health and Social Behavior, I show how providers invoked two strategies for negotiating the existing clinical guidelines for trans medicine: 1) Some closely followed clinical guidelines to contain uncertainty; and 2) Others flexibly interpreted the guidelines to embrace uncertainty. Closely following the guidelines resulted in providers acting as gatekeepers, placing an impossible burden on trans people to be certain about medical interventions, and narrowly defining gender in binaries (women or men) to reflect the assumptions contained within the clinical guidelines. In contrast, flexible interpreters strategically used them to work within, and sometimes embrace, the uncertainty that distinguishes trans medicine. While these strategies for using the guidelines are not unique to trans medicine, and is similar to what others (e.g. Timmermans and Berg 2003) have found, one feature of trans medicine that cannot be glossed over is that this healthcare arena involves medical and mental health interventions for a gender identity, and not a biomedical illness or disease.

In spite of recent efforts in the medical community to standardize medical practice through clinical guidelines, my research shows how standardization efforts do not always translate to “best” practices in healthcare. This finding demonstrates how these medical artifacts, veiled under the authority of science, are social artifacts as providers actively negotiate clinical guidelines rather than taking them at face value. Furthermore, from Espeland and Sauder’s (2007) work on law school rankings where they demonstrated how standardized measures have unexpected consequences, including increased pressure to normalize practices and self-fulfilling prophecies, these social activities ultimately help to accrue legitimacy. Standards shape institutions’ expectations for behavior to conform to the criteria used to construct the standards in the first place. Clinical guidelines, like school rankings, come to take on their own regulating force in the everyday experiences of providers. Unlike law school ranking where potential students have decisions filtered through static metrics, in trans medicine – and in working with a population of people who represent a broad range of identities – the metrics themselves are ill-defined, and it is difficult to standardize treatment options and plans as they cannot take into account the multiplicity of diversity in (gender) expression.

The fetishizing of standards and “evidence” in trans medicine, and arguably across medical arenas, unnecessarily burdens trans people who do not fit within recognized models of care or medical knowledge regarding trans people’s ways of understanding their identities and bodies. My research demonstrates how “evidence” is a social artifact that is mobilized by providers to make medical decisions, but can become weaponized when used against people and their embodied experience with gender. Evidence-based medicine has been gaining traction in the medical and scientific community as “evidence” is conflated with objectivity. In examining trans medicine, it becomes clear that what is assumed to be objectively constructed “evidence” is actually built upon subjectively determined understandings of bodies, identities, and normalcy concerns. As social actors, medical providers think about social issues based on what information exists in popular discourse. What an everyday person knows about trans communities is actually quite a narrow understanding wrapped up in
myths that “trans” unequivocally is defined as people who desire to medically transition from one binary gender to “the other” rather than another gender. From a trans patient perspective, healthcare encounters might feel easier to negotiate if providers stopped emphasizing this narrow definition of ‘transgender’ and opened up more dialogue for their trans patients to describe how they understand their own identities and bodies.

One question that I have continued to come back to in my work in this medical arena is: what does it mean to “successfully” work with a trans person? Curing patients of disease is a success, or for other providers, simply offering resources and possible medical treatments for chronic illnesses is also a “success.” This lack of definition provokes tension between medical providers and trans people, as providers continue to invoke their typical ways of thinking about the practice of medicine within trans medicine. More broadly, not having clearly defined benchmarks for how to work with trans people (or define “success”) speaks to how some medical providers in negotiating uncertainty in healthcare encounters with trans people, may attempt to impose a medical model of disease, onto a gender identity. This feature of trans medicine is troubling as it symbolizes a way of not only simplifying the complexity of a gender identity, but – even subtly – also thinking of trans identities as similar to a “disease.”

Providers, aware of the past stigma and abuses by the medical community against trans people, continue to struggle with their role in “treating” transgender people and with whether a disease model is the “best” way to approach this population, or if alternate treatment models exist that might be employed to place trans people as active agents in their healthcare encounters. Taken collectively, my work in the politics of “evidence” in trans medicine refracts attention back onto more centralized dilemmas regarding the authority of medicine and science, and how to work in medical areas defined by uncertainty.

**stef m. shuster** is an assistant professor of sociology at Appalachian State University. Their scholarship on transgender medicine culminates from research interests in gender, the social aspects of science and medicine, social movements, and the politics of “evidence.” Their work on trans medicine and uncertain expertise recently appeared in the *Journal of Health and Social Behavior* and a forthcoming piece in the *Social Psychology Quarterly* (with co-author Celeste Campos-Castillo) utilizes a methodological innovation for examining how social movement activists use evidence to make claims about, and frame, social issues.

---

**References**


New Books by Section Members


In 1996, Congress overhauled welfare policy to promote work, marriage, and responsible fatherhood for American families living in poverty. This led to the creation of the federal Healthy Marriage Initiative—often referred to as marriage promotion policy—which has spent almost $1 billion since 2002 to fund hundreds of relationship and marriage education programs. I observed over 500 hours of healthy marriage classes, analyzed 20 government-approved marriage education curricula, and interviewed low-income parents who took classes to answer the following question: What does the implementation of healthy marriage policy reveal about political understandings of how romantic experiences, relationship behaviors, and marital choices are primary mechanisms of inequality?

Proposing Prosperity takes the reader inside the marriage education classroom to show how healthy marriage policy promotes the idea that preventing poverty depends on individuals’ abilities to learn about what I call skilled love. This is a romantic paradigm that assumes individuals can learn to love in line with long-term marital commitment by developing rational romantic values, emotional competencies, and interpersonal habits. Healthy marriage policy promotes skilled love as a strategy for preventing risky and financially costly relationships choices and, consequently, as the essential link among marriage, financial stability, and upward mobility. Central to this message is the assumption that upward economic mobility is teachable and that romantic competence and well-informed intimate choices can help disadvantaged families overcome financial constraints and deprivation.

Though healthy marriage policy assumes that developing relationship skills creates better marriages, which in turn lead to financial prosperity, the low-income couples I interviewed believed that marriage represents the culmination of prosperity, not a means to attain it. I describe how cultural and economic changes in marriage throughout the twentieth century have created a middle-class marriage culture in which low-income couples are less likely to marry for both ideological and financial reasons. Couples told me they could neither afford nor prioritize marriage until they were more financially stable. I detail their relationship stories to illustrate how financial challenges lead to curtailed commitment, especially when marriage between two economically unstable partners seems like a bad financial risk. Marriage educators responded to this by deliberately avoiding talk of marriage and instead emphasizing committed co-parenting as the primary resource parents have to support their children’s life chances.

Though parents frequently challenged instructors’ claims that marriage could help them, their children, and their finances, parents did find the classes useful. While couples’ economic challenges made it hard to practice the skills, participants experienced the classes as a rare opportunity to communicate free of the material constraints that shaped their daily lives and romantic relationships. Hearing other low-income couples talk about their challenges with love and money normalized parents’ intimate struggles and allowed them to better understand how relationship conflict and unfulfilled hopes for marriage are shaped by poverty. This finding suggests that publicly sponsored relationship education could be a valuable social service in a highly unequal society where stable, happy marriages are increasingly becoming a privilege of the
most advantaged couples. Yet, low-income parents’ experiences with healthy marriage classes point to how relationship policies would likely be more useful if they focused more on how economic stressors take an emotional toll on romantic relationships and less on promoting the dubious message that marriage directly benefits poor families.

Proposing Prosperity will be of interest to scholars of sex and gender because it reveals how state-funded relationship skills programs reflect broader issues of gender, governance, and social inequality. I specifically show how marriage education programs strategically employ gendered and heteronormative ideologies of parenting to promote fathers’ limited care of children. Classes taught that both mothers and fathers are necessary for children’s well-being. They also redefined marriageability for poor fathers by emphasizing how men could prove their commitment to their families in ways that do not require money. Once committed, marriage would presumably enable them to be more responsible workers, make more money, and pull their families out of poverty. Through the promotion of what I term marital masculinity, healthy marriage programs ultimately reinforce the stereotype of the hard-working married father who is worthy of higher wages and job advancement because of his gendered family responsibilities; this perpetuates the discriminatory ideas underlying the marriage premium in earnings for men and the tendency for more privileged men to capitalize on it.

I also show how healthy marriage programs’ focus on relationship skills obscures the insidious effects of institutionalized inequalities—specifically classism, sexism, racism, and heterosexism—on romantic and economic opportunity. “Skills” were often an ideological cover for normative understandings of intimate life that privilege the two-parent, heterosexually married family. Marriage educators presented a selective interpretation of research that deceptively characterizes the social and economic benefits of marriage as a unidirectional causal relationship without accounting for how selection and discrimination shape the connection between marriage and economic prosperity.

Among the book’s policy recommendations, I make a case for a broader sociologically informed relationship policy that recognizes the benefits and costs of marriage and teaches under what specific social and economic conditions marriage is typically beneficial. I argue that any policy with the goal of promoting family stability and equality must contend with the intimate inequalities that lead to curtailed commitments, especially those related to gender. Programs that link economic prosperity with marriage will likely only reinforce couples’ tendencies to make marital decisions based on the middle-class marriage bar and the male breadwinner ethic. Classist gender norms, such as those embedded in marital masculinity, make it harder for partners, especially men, to seem worthy of marriage. It is misguided for policy to focus on teaching couples to communicate and budget more effectively without also addressing the outdated gender ideologies and growing economic disparities that influence their romantic relationships. The most effective policy approach to proposing prosperity will not be grounded in expectations of self-sufficiency and men’s breadwinning, which tend to undermine, rather than promote, stable relationships among low-income couples. Instead, it will reflect how love and commitment thrive most within the context of social and economic opportunity and equal recognition and support for all families, married and unmarried alike.

Jennifer M. Randles is an assistant professor in the Department of Sociology at California State University, Fresno. Her research explores how inequalities affect American family life and how policies address family-formation trends. Proposing Prosperity is forthcoming in December 2016.


Cairns, Kate. 2016. “Connecting to Food: Cultivating Children in the School Garden.” *Children’s Geographies*. Published online: 17 August 2016. DOI: 10.1080/14733285.2016.1221058


Each issue we highlight graduate student members and their work. This issue, we feature Sarah A. Miller.

Sarah A. Miller is a doctoral candidate in the Department of Sociology at the University of Massachusetts, Amherst who studies sexualities, gender, youth, education, and new media. Her research focuses on the reproduction and disruption of multiple axes of inequality in educational institutions. Sarah’s dissertation, The Tolerance Generation: High School, Inequality, and the Anti-Bullying Era, is an ethnographic study of the effects of youth conflict and anti-bullying initiatives within a rural high school in the Northeast. Through two academic years of intensive fieldwork, concurrent observations of teens’ use of social media, and 127 in-depth interviews, she examines how sexuality, gender, class, and race shape the community’s experiences with youth conflict, anti-bullying initiatives, and their desired outcome: tolerance. She finds that anti-bullying policies and initiatives, initially intended to protect and integrate marginalized students, instead reinforce existing forms of inequality among youth and further the alienation of transgender teens, sexual and/or racial minorities, and those who are low income. She also documents the varying ways young people resist these outcomes at school and online, going beyond tolerance to find ways to get along, make sense of the unequal world they’re coming of age in, and work against inequality together.

Sarah’s other studies have investigated community debates over representations of adolescent sexuality in schools and young women’s experiences with slut-shaming and homophobia. Her article, “How You Bully a Girl”: Sexual Drama and the Negotiation of Gendered Sexuality in High School, was recently awarded the ASA Sexualities Section Graduate Student Paper Award and published in Gender & Society. Her research has been funded by the National Academy of Education/Spencer Foundation, the National Science Foundation, the Center for Research on Families, and the University of Massachusetts. Sarah is a committed public sociologist who has worked in interdisciplinary collaboration with scholars and youth advocacy organizations on sexuality education policy reform. Prior to graduate school, Sarah directed a sexual violence prevention program in Chicago.

Want to be included in next issue’s Graduate Student Spotlight? Email Incoming Newsletter Editor Eli Alston-Stepnitz at ecalstonstepnitz@ucdavis.edu.
Call for Blog Posts

Sexual Violence in Higher Education
ConditionallyAccepted.com — a weekly career advice column for marginalized scholars on InsideHigherEd (http://bit.ly/2e2vk0v) — welcomes blog posts about sexual assault, rape, stalking, intimate partner violence, and sexual harassment in higher education. We are especially interested in reflections on sexual violence as a manifestation of systems of oppression other than sexism (like racism, classism) and at the intersections among systems of oppression; in addition, we are interested in featuring essays on sexual violence perpetrated against women of color, fat and plus-size people, LGBTQ+ people, and people with disabilities.

See the full call for blog posts here: https://conditionallyaccepted.com/2016/10/04/sexual-violence/. Blog posts should range between 750-1,250 words and be written for a broad academic audience. We pay $200 per post (if accepted).

Please email pitches or full blog posts to conditionally.accepted@insidehighered.com.

DON’T FORGET TO FOLLOW US ON FACEBOOK!
https://www.facebook.com/ASASexandGenderSection

Congratulations!

- **Bandana Purkayastha** was awarded the 2016 Contributions to the Field award by the Asian and Asian American section of ASA. The Section on Asia and Asian America Contribution to the Field Award recognizes those professors who have worked to build up the fields of Asian and/or Asian American Studies within their institutions and the discipline at large. She was been invited by the World Health Organization to serve as an academic expert to review their policy initiatives on female migrants and refugees, human rights, and health during and after migration.

- **Jason Edward Sumerau** and **Lain A.B. Mathers** won the 2016 ASA section on Religion Distinguished Article Award this year for “Contemporary Religion and the Cisgendering of Reality” (Social Currents 3(3) pages 293 - 311) [also co-authored with Ryan T. Cragun].
**SOCIOLOGY OF SEX AND GENDER DISTINGUISHED ARTICLE AWARD**

Deadline: 3/1/2017

The 2017 Sex and Gender Distinguished Article Award Committee is currently accepting nominations of outstanding and innovative articles or book chapters published in 2015 or 2016. The award honors those who make a significant contribution to the field of sex and gender through an article or book chapter on the cutting edge of sociological inquiry. Authors need not be sociologists, and articles may be published in journals associated with disciplines other than sociology. Self-nominations are acceptable.

To nominate a particular article or book chapter for this award, please submit a one-page letter explaining why the article makes a significant contribution to the sociology of sex and gender, along with an electronic version of the article/chapter to the Committee Chair, Catherine Connell at cati@bu.edu. In the subject line of your email, please type NOMINATION FOR SEX & GENDER ARTICLE AWARD. Nominees must be current members of the American Sociological Association. While not a requirement, we encourage nominees to become members of ASA’s Sex and Gender section.

**SOCIOLOGY OF SEX AND GENDER SALLY HACKER GRADUATE STUDENT PAPER AWARD**

Deadline: 3/1/2017

Papers are currently being accepted for the 2017 Sally Hacker Graduate Student Paper Award in Sex and Gender. The paper should deal with a theoretical issue or empirical problem important to the field of sex and gender. It may be based on a dissertation that is still in progress or was completed and approved no earlier than February 2016. Papers based on master’s theses or other research are also eligible. Papers should be journal length (35 pages maximum) and may be published or in manuscript. All authors must be graduate students at the time of submission. Self-nominations are acceptable. Nominees must be current members of the American Sociological Association. While not a requirement, we encourage nominees to become members of ASA’s Sex and Gender section.

Please send a letter of nomination and an electronic version of the paper to the Committee Chair, Catherine Bolzendahl at c.bolzendahl@uci.edu.

**SOCIOLOGY OF SEX AND GENDER FEMINIST SCHOLAR ACTIVIST AWARD**

Deadline: 3/1/2017

The Sex and Gender Section seeks nominations for the Feminist Scholar-Activist Award, established in 2010 to recognize and honor scholars who have used feminist research and strategies to foster social change in public understandings and treatments of gender. Nominees may have contributed to a range of efforts, including (but not limited to) critically engaged pedagogy, community-based or participatory research, translational work, advocacy research, media campaigns, and grassroots organizing. Scholar-activist efforts may be local, regional, national, or international, and nominations may recognize groups or individuals at any point in their career. The committee will not consider self-nominations. Nominees must be current members of the American Sociological Association. While not a requirement, we encourage nominees to become members of ASA’s Sex and Gender section.

To submit a nomination for the Feminist Scholar-Activist Award, please send a letter of nomination, a copy of the nominee’s vita, one additional supporting letter, and any additional relevant supporting material to the Committee Chair, Jennifer Randles (jrandles@csufresno.edu).
SOCIOLOGY OF SEX AND GENDER DISTINGUISHED BOOK AWARD
Deadline: 2/1/2017

The 2017 Sex and Gender Distinguished book Award Committee is currently accepting nominations of outstanding and innovative books published in 2016, 2015, or 2014. This award honors those who make a significant contribution to the field of sex and gender through a distinguished manuscript that is on the cutting edge of sociological inquiry. Nominees must be current members of the American Sociological Association. While not a requirement, we encourage nominees to become members of ASA’s Sex and Gender section. Self-nominations are acceptable, and authors need not be sociologists – though the books must be relevant to sociologists. Edited collections are ineligible and nominations from publishers will not be accepted.

To nominate a book for this award: 1. Send a two-page letter via email explaining how this book makes a significant and innovative contribution to the sociology of sex and gender to the Committee Chair, Laurel Westbrook, westbrol@gvsu.edu, and 2. Notify the book publisher to send copies of the books by February 1, 2017 to the chair and all five of the committee members (6 copies, total). Contact information for all committee members is below. Please note that the nomination deadline for this award is February 1, 2017. No nomination letters will be accepted after February 1, 2017. Have publisher send books to EACH committee member listed below:

Laurel Westbrook
Department of Sociology
Grand Valley State University
2151 AuSable Hall
1 Campus Drive
Allendale, MI 49401-4903

Trevor Hoppe
3D Winslowe Drive
Albany, NY 12203

Theresa Morris
9215 Timber Knoll Dr.
College Station, TX 77845

Jessica Taft
Latin American and Latino Studies
UC Santa Cruz
Merrill Faculty Services
1156 High Street
Santa Cruz, CA 95064

Max Greenberg
43 Waban Hill Rd. N
Chestnut Hill, MA 02467

Asia Friedman
Department of Sociology and Criminal Justice
University of Delaware
328 Smith Hall
18 Amstel Avenue
Newark, DE 19716

Looking Ahead:
ASA 2017 in Montreal

SEX & GENDER SESSIONS

Struggles over Difference and Inclusivity in Higher Education (organizer: Tressie McMillan Cottom)

Doing Gender: 30 Years Later (organizer: Laurel Westbrook)

Feminist Perspectives on Science and Technologies (organizer: Emily Mann)

Gender, Politics, and Power (organizer: Jim Messerschmidt)

Gender and Social Justice in a Global Context (organizer: Rachel Rinaldo)

Conceptualizing, Measuring, and Operationalizing Studies of Gendered and Sexual Violence (organizer: Lisa Brush)

Sex and Gender Roundtables (organizer: Patti Giuffre)
SECTION LEADERSHIP

OFFICERS
Chair: Jennifer Reich, University of Colorado-Denver
Past Chair: Allison Pugh, University of Virginia
Chair Elect: Mary Blair-Loy, University of California-San Diego
Section Secretary/Treasurer: Kemi Balogun, University of Oregon
Newsletter Editor: Alicia Smith-Tran, Case Western Reserve University
Website Coordinator: J.A. Carter, Miami University-Hamilton

COUNCIL MEMBERS
- Kristen Barber, Southern Illinois University-Carbondale [2016-2019]
- Catherine Bolzendahl, University of California-Irvine [2015-2018]
- Tristan Bridges, SUNY-Brockport [2014-17]
- Cati Connell, Boston University [2014-17]
- Kimberly Hoang, University of Chicago [2015-2018]
- Sanyu Mojola, University of Colorado-Boulder [2016-2019]
- Fareen Parvez, University of Massachusetts-Amherst [2016-2019]
- Jennifer Randles, California State University-Fresno [2015-2018]
- Laurel Westbrook, Grand Valley State University [2014-17]

GRADUATE STUDENT REPRESENTATIVES
Chair: Kiera Duckworth, SUNY-Buffalo [2015-17]
Chair: Apoorva Ghosh, University of California-Irvine [2016-2018]

Please send any information about new books, articles, upcoming conferences, awards, or other news to Incoming Newsletter Editor Eli Alston-Stepnitz at ecalstonstepnitz@ucdavis.edu to be included in the next issue.