- Good afternoon, everyone. I hope that you have been enjoying the conference so far. My name is Dr. Yolanda Sealey-Ruiz, and I am an Associate Professor of English Education at Teacher's College Columbia University. This final talk for the day, Decolonizing Research Practices, will be presented by Dr.

Amanda Sullivan. Dr.

Sullivan is the Birkmaier Education Leadership Professor of Educational Psychology, and the Coordinator of the School Psychology Program at the University of Minnesota. She is also a Fellow of the Great Lakes Equity Center, Senior Editor of School Psychology Review, member of the Social Justice Committee, of the National Association of School of Psychologists, and Chair of the SSSP Early Career Forum. In addition to holding several other elected and appointed leadership positions related to advancing diversity, equity, and social justice in school psychology, her research concentrates on issues of equity and diversity and education, particularly those affecting children and youth with or at risk for special needs, as well as the intersections of ethics, law, and effectiveness in services provided to these students. This afternoon, she will be speaking on decolonizing research practices within psychology training. Her talk will be about 60 minutes long, and will be followed by a live Q&A session. Thank you so much, and let's welcome Dr.

Amanda Sullivan. - Good afternoon, everybody. So I appreciate that kind introduction. And I thank you all for choosing to spend your afternoon at this conference and with me. I also thank the conference organizers and Dr. Arora in particular for inviting me to contribute to this event. Despite the title of the conference, as you'll notice, I've entitled my talk, Developing and Advancing Anti-Racist Scholarly Practice. The reasons for which will be apparent as we move throughout the presentation. Before we begin, I really wanna recognize the complex emotions that many of us are bringing to this space, myself included. I'll be fully transparent, that given everything that's going on, particularly in Minneapolis where I'm based, it's really hard to show up here fully. And so I wanna send love to all of my black and brown folk who are especially affected by it. More murders by police as we share, and our collective grieving for Daunte Wright, and Adam Toledo, and the losses to their families and communities, as well as the other losses of black and brown boys and men whose lives have ended via state violence in the last few weeks. I know those of you who hail from Minnesota, Chicago, and Hawaii are feeling acute losses and anger right now. Love to tour Asian, indigenous, queer, trans, and otherwise minoritized, marginalized, and traumatized people who are choosing to be here, and trying to engage, even though our humanness and right to just be are constantly under assault. So I'm here with you today like all of you, even though part of me doesn't want to be here. But recognizing that sentiment as we'll touch on later is just a small part of my own anti-racist practice and bringing my own full humanity to this space and not pretending that I am unaffected, and not pretending that I can set aside my feelings when I enter these professional spaces. So in preparing my remarks, I reminded myself repeatedly that while the ubiquity of white supremacy and colonialism are alive and well in everything, I have a chance to hear today hopefully, to help others start to change their work and disrupt it. Next slide please. So my goal today is to provide a frame that you can apply in your scholarship and related activities regardless of your career state. Since I know the conference participants are relatively evenly split among students, faculty, and clinicians. My remarks here today are intended to support cultivation of an anti-racist orientation and practice among the producers, consumers, and gatekeepers of the scholarship of psychology. And with that in mind, my focus is on providing an introduction to salient concepts and identifying some key learnings to support shifting our perspective and action as we engage in a variety of different types of scholarly work. I will not be providing on specific methods or approaches or discrete actions, but instead will offer some very broad recommendations. I also wanna be upfront from the start that I haven't targeted my presentation to scholars who are already doing this work, and there are

many, including the professional associations that the other speakers have mentioned. For better or worse, my remarks are primarily geared toward white scholars who do the most to reinforce white supremacy in their scholarship and in their work related to the scholarship of others and who have the most work to do to stop that. Next. So just a little about me. As noted, I'm a Professor of School Psychology at the University of Minnesota, and I've been involved in a variety of capacities regionally and nationally in leadership, technical assistance, and advocacy to support civil rights and non-discrimination in schools. I wanna be transparent about my role here, and particularly that I'm speaking from a place of discomfort because I don't view myself as an expert. I'm very much a learner. And as the organizers know, I was really torn on whether to present at all, particularly because I don't think I've done the real deep work around decolonizing my own scholarship yet, let alone contributing to the decolonization of psychology. So I come to you very humbly in all of this. My own graduate training was very, very mainstream and very conventional. Very white Eurocentric. So Popper, Kuhn behaviorism. The developmental ecological framework was really emphasized, but the focus was largely on the microsystems. And that often contributed to my sense of marginalization and disconnect, because my lived experience, and then also the professional relationships and experiences I saw beyond my school psychology training were very different. Luckily I found a home with other scholars of color in and out of psychology and school psychology, but I do give a special shout out to my school psychology black academics, who've really been instrumental in creating the community that I needed to stay in this field. So as I mentioned, I'm a psychologist and identify as such, but as you'll get a sense today, I draw really frequently from a broad literature and knowledge base as I approach my work. Next. So I'll get us started with a well-known quote from one of my favorite humans. And I really appreciate these words generally, but to me, they also resonate professionally. Again, I'm a psychologist. I am a school psychologist. I do identify as such, but I have no blind allegiance or faith in the field, frankly. Instead, I insist as a member of this professional community on the right to criticize it perpetually. And I do so in the hopes of contributing to a better future. Next. So what followed this quote is less well known, but I think really salient in the context of this conference and important for us to kind of hold as scholars and learners. We must treat all aspects of our knowledge base, all aspects of the field, our theories, or principles or methods, findings as suspect and open to modification and even polarization. Because to me, when we talk about decolonization or anti-racism or social justice, that will necessitate in some cases, pulverizing certain aspects of the field. Next. So one thing I also really like about this statement is the importance of letting one's moral center be the guide. And I would argue that field wide commitments to anti-racism or decolonization require an explicit alignment with this moral center in all that we do, and should guide our professional activities and serve as a basis for critiquing, and modifying, and dismantling various aspects of our profession, including our own scholarly work. That that moral center really has to be our anchor and everything else is suspect. Next. So I know that some of our other speakers have touched on it but I also recognize that for many attendees, discussion of research and morality might be confusing or uncomfortable, but I would remind you that all action is political. Even an action or supposedly neutrality, which I'll return to later are political, and that they maintain passive acceptance or allegiance to the status quo. Denial of such is a reflection of privilege, the luxury to be apathetic, if you will. Now many of us don't have that luxury, but within psychology, many of the gatekeepers, many of the leaders do. But this stance means that all scholarship is also political. And as Jane Conoley, a member of the school psychology community has pointed out, our identities as psychologists or social scientists are not distinct from our identities as citizens. So it's our duty to respond to injustice with all of our available talents. That includes our scholarship, and however else we show up professionally. Next. So that brings me to what I hope will be this afternoon's key point. Our opportunity for reflection and action. So whether we're talking about

anti-racist scholarship or decolonizing scholarship, it needs to start and rely on personal reflection and growth. I would ask that all the scholars and attendees here today really interrogate their moral center, really think carefully about what they mean, the nuance of it, and then apply it consistently, broadly, and also articulate it very precisely. And so we'll talk about more of that in the slides to come. Next. So in talking about this moral center and identifying that, particularly within the context of efforts that we've seen within the field at the macro level around anti-racism or even decolonization, I think it's really helpful to be clear on a few terms as they are often used interchangeably, even though they're not comparable. And often, particularly when white leadership and scholars use these terms, they do so without consideration of the underlying norms and ideals. So for me, this graphic represents one way to conceptualize diversity, inclusion, equity, anti-racism, and decolonization, and the relationships among them. Within the context of our field, I think of them as somewhat of graduated efforts that can subsume the previous one. Next. So at the most basic level to me, and again, this is just my own take. I recognize fully that there are many different definitions, but I'm responding here and reflecting on how they're commonly used. At the most basic end, our diversity and inclusion efforts which generally are concerned primarily with presence or representation. But as Dr Mena mentioned, diversity isn't always approached with an eye towards disrupting or replacing oppressive systems. Next. Equity is often addressed in terms of outcomes or processes, but along with diversity and inclusion, don't generally or necessarily engage the nature of that work, meaning that these can be pursued and even achieved without substantively changing or disrupting white supremacy or colonialism. As mentioned by the other presenters, it's possible for a context to be diverse, and perhaps even equitable on a given outcome with it, but while still maintaining racism and white supremacy and requiring of
 other members. And any student or scholar of color can affirm that you can be represented somewhere without authentic engagement, voice, or power, or experiencing any kind of openness from the organization to change the ways that it is marginalizing and harming people. And so that's one reason DEI efforts have been criticized for not changing the lens with which we view things and the fundamental way that we engage. Next. So as we kind of think about moving the needle towards anti-racism and decolonization, this can subsume those proceeding efforts, but what makes it distinct to me is that it's really about confronting or changing the basic fabric of society. And these are processes, whereas the others can often be treated as goals. And here though, when we think about decolonization or anti-racism, usually the focus is more around it being a journey and a continual process. Next. So there are many definitions of anti-racism and anti-racist scholarship that exists. But I particularly like this one, which I borrowed from an anthropologist. But I think it's really powerful because it emphasizes that it's not just the general stance, but an epistemological grounding that recognizes the structures and systems and processes of society at every level that are based on white supremacy, and that have led to the 500 year appropriation of every aspect of what we do in order to form a basis for how reality is perceived, and that where difference is violently punished. And we've seen that in many ways in stark relief in a lot of what's happening right now around the country. But then engaging in anti-racist scholarship then, involves questioning the very fabric of knowledge and knowledge production, and the challenges, that that challenges the very Gibbons of what we know. So I wanna be clear again, that while much of my presentation is geared towards white people, that is an intentional decision because dismantling white supremacy is really the job of white people. It's a product of white mess, and they have the responsibility to end it. I also have a lot of reservations at targeting a presentation to scholars from minoritized backgrounds because despite the recent fervor around anti-racism and decolonization, this isn't new. People have been doing this work for many, many years. But it is new to a lot of folks from dominant identities. And so that is who I speak to in a lot of this because in so many ways, they are still the gatekeepers who are keeping a stranglehold on how the field develops and grows at a high level. Next. I also think it's important or worth

recognizing what anti-racist scholarship is not. Now in and of themselves, any of these actions here often are regarded within the realm of diversification, but by themselves they're not, they don't comprise anti-racism unless they are specifically part of broader efforts that are approached from an anti-racist lens. I'll also say that if you came to this presentation hoping for a checklist, or specific actions, or simple steps, you're gonna be disappointed. These actions, though are important, and they should be part of what we do. So engage in the work of scholars from minoritized backgrounds, engaging them in our efforts, all of that is really important, but that alone is not anti-racist. Particularly again, as some of the other speakers have mentioned, if we're bringing them into deeply white supremacist organizations that are committed to maintaining that, doing this work, and also if our scholarship is advancing white supremacy, even if we do any of these actions in and of themselves, we're not actually advancing anti-racism. Next. So again, there are many definitions for these things, but I think of decolonization as a process of unlearning and of becoming that really rests on learning about the colonial history that has and continuous to subjugate indigenous and black people. And that is also about creating space and support for indigenous people and indigenous ways of knowing and of reconciling and recreating for the colonial harms of past and present. This includes critically engaging issues of racism and anti-blackness, which is why I consider it to also subsume anti-racism. Next. So my scholar, Linda Tuhiwai Smith has published similar works, and I know that some of these have been shared in the chat, but I really appreciate the way that she collaborated with Eve Tuck and Wayne Yang have described the work of decolonization, and particularly in emphasizing that triadic focus around settler colonialism, borders, and anti-blackness, and noting the requirement for this work and supporting reparation and abolition. And I fully support these aims, but I am not knowledgeable enough to speak to these or to fully enact them myself. And so that's why I've based my remarks today around anti-racism too, because I think the description of the conference to me really reflected that, and not necessarily as much decolonization. So I apologize to those of you who wanted to speak specifically and deeply about decolonizing scholarship. I may have dropped the ball here, and I would love to have that conversation, but I need indigenous scholars to lead us, as well as others who are farther along within that journey of whom I recognize there are many. I'm just not there yet, so I defer to those folks, and I also welcome critique of my work, and I thank you in advance for helping me grow. Next. So the reason my talk is titled as it is, and why the remainder of the talk will focus around anti-racism and racism in particular is as previously noted, that precision of language is really important. And given my current status of knowledge and action, I'm not comfortable speaking to decolonization and settler colonialism, or the relationships with land and space. And in particular, I will not use that term until I can because these scholars have reminded us of the centrality of indigenous people and indigenization of knowledge within decolonization, and that it can not be used to describe other efforts. Next. So this next quote really reflects the basis of my caution. So Tuck and Yang pointed out, that when metaphor invades decolonization, it kills the very possibility of it. It recenters whiteness, it resettles theory, it extends innocent to the settler, and it entertains the settler future. It cannot be grafted onto these other frameworks, even if they're critical, which I hope my work is, even if it's anti-racist, which I hope my work is, and even if they're justice frameworks, because that easy absorption, adoption, and transposing of decolonization is another form of settler appropriation. So this really resonates with me and is why I can't claim to speak today or elsewhere about decolonizing research. I may engage in anti-racism work, and I certainly hope I'm contributing to efforts to advance social justice, but I haven't begun to systematically cast off settler colonialism. Next. So with all this in mind, I characterize my current status, my moral center, if you will, as anti-racism. And I'm gonna be speaking today primarily about anti-racist scholarship, while recognizing that I do hope to move my moral center as I continue to engage and learn and unlearn. And each of us has to identify ourself that moral center, and wield it again, precisely and consistently as possible. Next. And so

too, I'm using the term scholarship very intentionally here because often within the academy, scholarship or research is used to mean studies, empirical studies, and particular types of studies in particular, but all scholarship is not necessarily that kind of research. And I would really like, again, for thinking about the folks in places situated to act as gatekeepers, to think of scholarship more broadly. So not just the discovery that so many universities in particular emphasize, but the critical role of theorization, integration and synthesis, translation, and then application and engagement within communities, so use of this knowledge. Scholarship has been described as encompassing a broader and more fluid curiosity and openness. So thinking of it as less bounded and less siloed in a discipline or topic area, as well as more flexible and reflective application. Simply put, when I'm talking throughout the rest of the session today, I mean much more than empirical works because I value more than empirical works and enriching discipline and application. And we need it all. Next. So given these concepts, as we think about our scholarship, my second key point is that the nature of anti-racist practice or decolonization has to be foundational or transformational. It cannot be additive or adjunctive to our current work because so much of that work is rooted in white supremacy. So much of the way the discipline has emerged and continued in the work that we do within academic institutions in particular are rooted in that fundamentally. And so if we treat anti-racism or decolonization as attack on, we dilute it and undermine it. Anti-racist scholarship starts with learning and changing perspective. It's not this piecemeal process of picking up a method, or a particular phrasing, or adding a couple sentences to a conclusion or a paper, because that invariably leaves white supremacy intact. Next. So I'm sure some of our attendees might be asking, isn't something better than nothing? But I would offer you this quote on why we have to approach this work in a more sweeping fashion. Racism is so universal in this country, so widespread, so deep-seated, that it is invisible because it is so normal. Right now, we are being battered near daily with some of the most conspicuous manifestations of systemic racism. But these are proceeded by, bolstered by, and have been normalized by the less conspicuous manifestations. So that's why we have to assert again and again that black lives do matter. That's why other
 minoritized groups, that we have to insist that they have the right to live and love and exist. It's all of these invisible offenses that open the door to the ones that actually get the attention of white people. So as we adopt as a field a commitment to anti-racism or decolonization, it's critical that we start with acceptance of certain premises. And first is the ubiquity of systemic racism, which applies as surely within psychology and schools as outside of them. We, as scholars are not above it, most of us are of it, and that is why good intentions and any kind of haphazard fragmentary action are not enough. Next. And for many people, it's easier to look outward to identify racism than to look inward and to consider the ways our community, our discipline, our work that we do ourselves furthers harm. Yet because it is systemic, we always have to consider how it's in our systems and our field, and as has been mentioned by some of the other presenters, there's a deep history here. And just given the time constraints today, it's really hard to go into that, but I would ask that we have so many participants here today, if you could just take a minute to consider the different aspects of psychology that you can identify that center white supremacy, that perpetuate racism. And if you're so inclined, please put them in the chat. I'm hoping we can take like a brief crowdsourcing just to canvas the broad array of ways that this shows up in the work that we do. And I can't actually see that, but I will keep an eye on time and give you all a minute. For those of you who are less familiar with this, or who haven't maybe thought as deeply as how it shows up in research, I'm hoping that you can help each other to recognize those ways. Well, thank you all. So now I said, I can't see the chat, but my hope is that among all of us, we were able to offer a broad swaps of example, other examples. So to me, in thinking about Ms. Chisholm's words and all the others who've noted the totality of systemic racism, it's important to recognize that it pervaded so many dimensions of what we do and must be rooted out. So it really plays out in every aspect of scholarship from what we

do to why we do it, how we do it, who we engage, and where the scholarship plays out, as well as all of the values, assumption, and aims that permeate them. And because all aspects of our work can be sites for the reproduction of white supremacy, they are also all opportunities for anti-racist scholarly practice. Next. So again, because it's so widespread and normalized in both visible and invisible ways, anti-racist scholarly practice encompasses far more than just an area of study or a method. You don't have to study racism or anti-racism to engage in anti-racist scholarly practice. Instead, you can engage in this work both in the scholarship that you do, that is the subjects, the methods, the approaches to your scholarship, the ways that you accomplish this work, that is your behavior and relationship to others, and also the ways that you engage in other scholarship as a reader, instructor, advisor, mentor, reviewer, editor, and so on. And so when any of us says we're committed to anti-racism, I sincerely hope that we bring it to all domains of our scholarly activity and engagement. Next. So anti-racist scholarly practice requires examination and understanding of the racist history and present of our field. So I would encourage scholars who haven't yet thought deeply about this to engage in some different, these different questions. These are broad questions, but I also think that everybody needs to think carefully within their sub-discipline and their specific areas of work, such as understanding how scientific racism has shaped scholarship, whether we're talking about the methods, the instrumentation, the theories, the definition of constructs. And we have today, I think, if I recall correctly, over 10 different sub areas of psychology represented. And so we also need to think about, not just at the broad level of our discipline, but within each of our sub areas, what can we discern about the role of racism, colonialism, eugenics, and shaping those areas, and how that really reverberates around what we see today. Again, we can't go into this because of time, but these are difficult questions, and these are deeply uncomfortable questions. I think back to my own training in the history of psychology, and these got glossed over, even though these are deeply necessary questions that we have to engage in as we figure out what of this field, what of our work do we keep, and what do we need to modify or disregard and replace as we move forward? As Dr.

Mena mentioned, we need to think about what it means that the pioneers, our forefathers as they're commonly described, and that is incredibly loaded language in and of itself. But of psychology, of statistics, of behavioral science, so many of them were motivated by, or at least personally if not professionally committed to advancing racism, to committed to advancing eugenics. And their scholarship was informed by white supremacist views and oftentimes designed specifically to advance those political aims. So how can we interrogate the roles of white supremacy and colonialism and reconcile them with the contributions of people like Fisher, and Pearson, and Galton, and Cattell, and Erikson, and others? What does it mean to continue to use derivations of their supposedly innovations without considering what they were designed to do, or the very ideas that they engaged within their practice? Engage in these broad practices or these broad questions is preparation for that more personal work of considering how it shows up, often in unintentional ways, in the way we do our scholarship, in the way we write both in our explicit usage and the implicit assumptions. Next. And I view this work as necessary for understanding how so many of the differences and disparate outcomes that we see are predictable and systematic on every scale, that these are outcomes of intentional action. In addition, as has been mentioned in this recent book, which I would encourage people to get, and I do think of it as critical to the work that we do, so much of this is just the system working according to how it was designed, where whiteness is so normalized and universalized that the cultures and people of color are demonized, exotified, and erased. This statement is as true in psychology and each of our respective sub-disciplines within it as anywhere else. Next. So as a case in point, I encourage you to consider the common pejorative of Mesearch. So this is how scholarship of individuals from minoritized background, the scholarship of black indigenous scholars, other scholars of color is often exotified or erased. Particularly among these scholars, this term is used to dismiss or question the

value and rigor of their scholarship when it is related to their personal identity or experience. Whiteness and objectivity are equated, and on the converse, minoritized status and subjectivity are. Really, it's rooted in the idea that minoritized individuals can't possibly study a topic of personal relevance, but what it signifies is that what they mean when they say that is we can't possibly study it the way cishet white male would, right? And so this has deep effects within the field. First and foremost of marginalizing, or excluding, silencing different knowledge and methods, but it also has a number of other effects, from denial of admission into programs, denial of advancement, hiring, promotion, tenure, funding and awards. And it operates so that we deal with it certain topics and legitimize others. And reproducing that subordination of minoritized communities and scholars, while in expecting that that objectivity, that distance, that dispassionate approach to scholarship is somehow better, and that our work then we see is often rejected by advisors, reviewers, and editors because we dare to offer a different perspective because we dare oftentimes to decenter whiteness. Next. So in many cases Mesearch simply denotes scholars from marginalized backgrounds who are rejecting that white centering. But the centering is so pervasive, and so implicit that to do otherwise is subversive and marginalized. Yet how is research that assumes the objectivity of a white researcher gaze, the universality of concepts, of measures, of findings, not the very epitome of Mesearch when a white scholar perceives and seeks to shape the entire world in their image. And so I would encourage folks to remember that this assumption reflects the delusion of objectivity and points to a broader need for recognition that all scholarship is subjective. Next. So that brings me to my next key point that anti-racist scholarly practice and all scholarship really necessitates ongoing reflexivity. Next. Although largely discussed as an expectation of qualitative scholars, anti-racist scholarly practice necessitates reflexivity in all scholarship because of the ways in which our individual cultures, experiences, and identity influence how we engage as scholars and how we shape knowledge in that role. The relative and visibility of white normativity and the lack of reflexivity among scholars and quantitative scholars in particular creates the illusion that white subject matter is universal and universally interesting or relevant. And ironically, the scholars limited by such a perspective would benefit from taking this technique that comes to us from black feminists, and really is something that all scholars, regardless of background, should be aware of and open about how their social position and personal biography influences their assumption and how they do their work. Next. So as a primarily quantitative researcher, I wanna emphasize that reflexivity is not just for qualitative scholars. It's especially important for scholars who engage in, and produce, and use quantitative research, and who've often been told and convinced that this work is objective, as if reliance on numbers somehow removes our personhood from the scholarly process, even though it does not. So I hope that we can put to rest the common reframe that numbers don't lie, or data don't lie, which to me is just used to defend the supposed objectivity of the one wielding those numbers. And for those of you who engage in quantitative scholarship I really encourage you to engage in the scholarship that addresses the racialization of statistics and measurement, and the roots of that. White Logic, White Method is great book that comes to us from sociology. I would also hope that folks doing quantitative work are engaging critically around quant crit. And I call out Earnestyne Sullivan here, because although she's not a name that's associated with a lot of the articles that you see, it was her dissertation work that preceded that scholarship, and I think it's important to recognize that. Next. So again, just a reminder that given that all scholarship is political and all scholarship is subjective, regardless of the type of work somebody does, our scholarship is indivisible from our positionality. Just as readers of qualitative research are primed to consider the importance of who is doing research beyond credentials, name, affiliation, we all need to do that in our work and describe our positionality relative to what we are studying. Next. So this brings me too to my next point. Anti-racist scholarly practice requires that we name and de-center whiteness and other dominant perspectives in our scholarship. We have to stop

allowing them to be invisible and make them explicit. Next. So how do we get there? For many people who haven't engaged in this kind of reflection before, it begins with reflection about how the field and individuals within our own work have implicitly centered whiteness as a standard for development, for standard of wellness, education, including treating it as a race neutral or normative construct. Engaging the work of critical scholars and cross-cultural scholars, as well as those who explicitly do anti-racist and decolonial scholarship is especially useful. In my own work, which often concerns treatment of disability in schools, as I delve more deeply into quant crit and dis crit, I find myself revisiting my past writing and wanting to reconceptualize my work and really undo some of it, but instead I just take it as an opportunity to pause and work through my own work to bring my thinking and my writing more in line with my underlying aim. So if you're like me, you're probably gonna go back and wish you could just change so much, but instead I give myself the permission to slow down, to engage more deeply with the critical literature, and particularly work outside of psychology and education, and then do some major reworking or even scrapping things altogether when it's not consistent with what I want to be contributing. And so many people have criticized psychology for drawing heavily from European and American samples, non-representative of the global majority or local diversity. And yet the generalizability of that work is still often assumed rather than questioned because again, of that invisibility of racism and white centering. Instead, when findings are presented, they could and should be discussed as a psychological dispositions of a particular racial group, often white people, rather than projected as universal psychological processes. We can think too, about just the way we describe what we do. Scholars from minoritized backgrounds often identify explicitly the populations or context of interest, yet rarely, if ever, we do see white scholars in particular who describe their work along such lines. I think, when was the last time that we saw someone state that they study a particular psychological or educational process with a focus on predominantly white, suburban, urban, high SES, middle SES contexts. Again, this is because the interest and experiences are so normalized as to be universalized and are often treated as invisible. Yet we can start to disrupt that and borrow a lot of the practices and just the norms from folks who've been doing qualitative work, from folks who've been doing that work that was historically labeled "Mesearch" around really being explicit and decentering those perspectives, or at least making them as visible as possible. Next. So this de-centering and recentering also necessitates that we zoom out to ensure that we're not oversimplifying structural issues or identity, for that intersectionality provides an invaluable frame. But compared to other fields as a whole, psychology has been slower to take it up, and where it is used, including in the most recent APA multicultural guidelines, it tends to be largely flattened with a focus on personal identity that doesn't meaningfully engage the systems of oppression related to those aspects. Yet keeping in mind the structural nature of identity and the structural nature of oppression is key. And so given the constraints, I'd really encourage you to see a recent issue of the Journal of Social Issues. I believe it was Volume 76 that addressed applications of intersectionality in particular. And it's just, it's an amazing compilation of work. For a lot of people, and I actually just came from another presentation before this where there were questions about intersectionality relative to disproportionality in special education, thinking about how to use that and how it relates to the research of folks who come from primarily dominant statuses in particular, I find an analogy offered within feminist literature helpful. Matilda, you can go to the next slide. And so Marilyn Frye described as others have, the proposive structuring of opportunity with interrelated and mutually reinforcing systems. So she pointed out that the experiences of people who are subject to the oppression within these systems is not accidental, or occasional, or avoidable, but rather the system has been structured in a particular way to penalize and restrict. We can go to the next slide. And what I find especially helpful, isn't, she goes to liken these systems and the work that scholars can do as to a cage, and emphasize that if our conceptions of what we see is based on this myopic focus on just like

one aspect of it, an individual wire of the cage, we miss so much more. And to me, this is akin to what many psychology scholars do when they focus on a singular dimension of identity at the exclusion of other intersecting ones, while also trying to make sweeping claims about applicability and meaning. Go to the next slide. It's only when we take a step back and look at the wires all together, taking that macroscopic view, that the whole cage becomes obvious. And while I don't think there's such a fatalistic perspective as appropriate at the individual level, I think this depiction is really helpful in understanding the intractability of oppression under interlocking systems that can be elucidated really clearly through applications of intersectionality, and helps us to see how limitations to understanding of identity and social status and location within systems can really be expanded and deepened if we take that macroscopic view, if we zoom out so to speak. Next. So as such, the next key takeaway that I'd like to offer is the importance of taking a macroscopic intersectional view. Again, in all of our scholarly work, not just the products we choose to provide, but the ways in which we engage in our discipline more broadly. And we can't isolate our scholarship from those macrosystemic and chronicsystemic factors, but instead have to engage in a way that contextualizes it as related to those systems. And as a school psychologist, in particular, where the ecological frameworks gets invoked so often, I find it really helpful to adopt a sociological orientation in which those most distal systems are emphasized. Next. So we've also tended in psychology to emphasize person verse language, but I think it's also important to orient around system-centered language when we speak about issues related to race or racism, or other social statuses related to systems of oppression. And I wanna thank Dr. Malone for first bringing this approach to my attention. This means, for example, being really clear about how and why we speak of race in our scholarship. Oftentimes we mean, or should mean, to use it as a proxy for exposure to racism. In that case, naming it as such and speaking to that is really important. It also means that instead of writing about or speaking about vulnerable populations, or at risk populations, we should be speaking about groups that are made vulnerable, or populations that in groups that are systematically exposed to differential opportunity, trauma, and so on. Because again, the precision of meaning is really important. Next This speaks to the need to unpack in our work and our engagement with others work, how we understand, frame, and describe research problems. So I encourage everybody to think about within their individual area of work, how are the issues and the focus of study understood? Whose voices have been privileged in the mainstream and most visible knowledge and literature? What world views, values, and aims have informed their works? And again, for this, we often have to go back to original work. So particularly when we're dealing in areas where we rely on distillation and extrapolation from so-called seminal figures, I really do encourage people to go back to their original writings and engage with how the ideas around race, and gender, and ability, and disability show up there. And think about how does that continue to shape the way that we then use it in our current work? We need to also engage in thinking really critically about what kinds of knowledge, who's knowledge has been considered meaningful in our particular area of scholarship. And related to that, what methods have been considered valuable, and which ones have been silenced and dismissed? And how has that been shaped? What findings matter? This gets right to the typical treatment of scholarship at the margin and by scholars from minoritized groups, wherein common excuses for not engaging their work, and not elevating their work, not accepting it, promoting, or advancing it, usually gets reflected in comments about why it's not a good fit, why somebody isn't a good fit for a program, or isn't a good fit for a role, or when work gets rejected by journals, or by committees because it's not perceived as relevant, or not theoretical enough, not rigorous enough, not generalizable enough because it doesn't speak to white groups in particular. That often that it's not broad enough. And then one of the most damning dismissals is that it's not psychology enough, or it's not school psychology enough, or clinical counseling enough. Engaging in anti-racist scholarly practice necessitates reflecting on these assumptions and evaluating the barriers to engagement that are rooted in white

supremacy. And again, I'm speaking primarily to white scholars here. But our goal as a field, I believe, should be to cultivate epistemic diversity, not the exclusion that we've been known for for so long. Next. So on that point, I implore you as scholars to be undisciplined. This phrase came up recently in a webinar that Elizabeth Cole was doing. And a lot of us are familiar with her and for her work on around intersectionality and psychology. In this, she was discussing the opportunity she had because her academic home was in African-American studies, and that gave her the chance to do undisciplined work that then she took back to psychology. But I would argue, let's not make it so that people have to actually leave psychology as like their academic unit or their home to do that. We can all be undisciplined in our work. Yet so much of psychology's efforts have around solidifying itself as a scientific discipline means that it's really been very narrow at the systemically and methodologically, in order to present itself as legitimate. And a lot of that work has often has operated to silence, and exclude, and push out scholars who bring different things. But for me, my thinking about psychology isn't distinct for my engagement with other areas of knowledge and other literatures. There aren't any boundaries, there aren't limits. And so I would ask conference participants, and particularly folks who've really taken a very constrained approach to their own work, to read broadly. Engage in multiple media types. Let's not be reliant on the articles that show up in the most prestigious journals, or the books that come from certain publishers or authors. And this is why, too, I'm not going into today's specific methods because the substantive and methodological implications on what it means to be undisciplined are gonna vary by area. But it's really important, I think, to read and engage, listen broadly in terms of across fields, but also across the full range of media outlets out there. Next. So this engagement outside of psychology literature is part of our personal and collective work to enrich and change our scholarship, to me is really central to cultivating anti-racism. And I find this quote especially powerful because as Audre Lorde noted, each of us has built into us, the blueprints and expectations and response these old structures of oppression. And these have to be altered at the same time as we alter the living conditions that are the result of those structures. In particular, we'd have to unroot the racist and colonial expectations and responses that for many of us have been ingrained by virtue of our training and continued participation in the field. Next. So in this same essay, she wanted to emphasize that this is essential to revolutionary change. And to me, when we talk about anti-racism or decolonization within our field, we're talking about nothing short of revolutionary change. And it will be through exposure to others who are different, that we grow and sharpen our work, as she notes. So again, with that in mind, I think we have to cast off those disciplinary boundaries, commit to being undisciplined, go up side of kind of those typical disciplinary norms of who we listen to, what kind of knowledge is considered meaningful to support that change and growth at the individual and system level. Next. And because
we're talking about revolutionary change in ourselves and our field, this is gonna require some deep and substantial long-term unlearning and new learning to grapple with those expectations and responses that are rooted in those oppressive systems, and then to really replace them with something else. So we can go to the next slide. So much of what I've discussed thus far is about the work that we do, so like the scholarship that we produce, and how we engage other scholarship in supporting those efforts. But I wanna speak to, in the time that we have left, about how we do that work, how we engage with others in our respective settings. So next slide. So I said earlier that I wouldn't be giving a checklist or discrete steps that can be taken in this effort, but these are really common, and I've screenshotted here for you just one of them. And I don't mean to dismiss this entirely, but as I stated earlier, to me, these efforts go so far beyond just diversity and inclusion that's commonly invoked in this lists, to really question how we do that work. And there's a lot to unpack here in just these 10 rules that they've provided, and there's a lot of room for action and change within each of them. And this requires considering how white supremacy culture shapes the way we engage in scholarship. How we do it with collaborators, partners, students, and

others. And I thank Dr. Malone for getting us started in considering how professionalism itself, like that basic notion that we have, operates as a means of reproducing white supremacy by socializing and forcing really, all scholars, but particularly scholars from racially and culturally minoritized backgrounds into these white norms. Next. So one frame I've found useful and accessible in my own scholarship, but also in just general engagement and like the administration I do here at the University of Minnesota but also the service, is Kenneth Jones and Tema Okun's work on white supremacist culture in organizations. So in it, they articulated several features that pervade most settings, that have implications for how we operate as researchers, writers, mentors, instructors, and the other roles that we practice as we engage in our scholarship. And so I would invite participants, and again, particularly participants from majority identities to reflect on how the work in their settings operates as a vehicle for non-blackness in particular, but broadly how it operates to maintain and reproduce white supremacy in these professional settings in ways that inhibit diversity, inclusion, equity, anti-racism, and decolonization. A major part of any effort to do these works needs to be shedding these expectations for what professionalism is, because so often those are used to both shut out and push out scholars who are not white, or who will not comply with white Eurocentric, white supremacist expectations. When we consider the changes implicated to kind of the discussion we've had in the session, but across the other presentations here, it's really easy to me to see how these features inhibit meaningful change. Urgency, for example, and the need to constantly produce or maintain adherence to timelines and deadlines, and the concurrent emphasis on quantity and presumed perfectionism can make it really difficult for many who need to do this work most to invest the time and energy required to do it. So we have to push back against these internal inclinations, as well as the external ones. Working to undo this is why I joke that I'm a terrible collaborator, because when my colleagues or friends ask me to contribute to projects, I invariably find myself reading, reflecting, talking through, and taking things in a direction that wasn't expected. And I can't help it. I also won't be rushed. And I realize part of that is the privilege I have as a full professor, as with tenure, and the relative untouchability that provides. But I do make every effort to hold healthy boundaries with my time, encourage it with others, and not ever ask it of others. Next. So other features include the reliance on hierarchies and power hoarding. And these are things that we need to give away. So leadership, voice, contribution, shouldn't be conditioned on credentials, titles, seniority. This will necessitate in many settings, changing how we conceptualize socializing people into the field, so that we're not silent chasing, or marginalizing the best funds of knowledge that they bring as scholars who are new to it. That newness doesn't mean they don't have so much to give. And especially in efforts to decolonize or practice anti-racism, many of us have so much we can learn to these new folks and from these like these supposed outsiders, because they haven't yet been constrained by the very conventions of thought and practice that many of us are working to break now. And a lot of what I've talked about this afternoon really is too, about disrupting this tendency towards binary thinking. And that applies just not to how we engage information, but how we relate to others and the kinds of communication that we elevate. Next. These additional features are also important to be mindful of as well in how they show up differently or create or amplify barriers for minoritized scholars. Something we have to work through as a field, when we think about accreditation and different ways that we evaluate professionalism and professional dispositions, is that a lot of those frameworks are to me, fundamentally incompatible with our goals around anti-racism and decolonization, because in so many ways they actually reflect this white supremacist culture. And I will own fully that this is something that I'm struggling with in my role as a leader in my program, because to me in so many ways, the licensure and accreditation structures are barriers to some of that work that we have to work to get around. Next. But again, this shows up in a variety of ways, and this is a recent like viral exchange that happened this week. And I really appreciate in particular, the comment about abelist productivity death cult

that we live in, because so much of professional culture implicitly encourages productivity and progress at any cost. And often those costs are highest to folks who come from non-dominant backgrounds. And this is why when you think about within our institutions often, we glorify those people who work like machines, or power through no matter what. And that's why 13 months into a pandemic, we're still pushing back and struggling to recalibrate around the fact that nothing about our current reality is business as usual. Next. And I really appreciate the others who've pointed out how this work has shown up now in the pandemic, and the fact that white supremacy culture takes no days off. Like, there is no breaks from this, even with like, for many of us, the most destabilizing experience. Yet so many still expect people to be okay, to still be producing, that somehow the fact that many of us have the privilege to work from home means more access, more availability, more productivity. Just no. And that's to say nothing about the multiple ways that this situation has been uniquely challenging and traumatizing for individuals and communities from racially and minoritized background, or culturally minoritized backgrounds. Next. So again, I really appreciate Lorde's words. I feel like they're especially resonant now because the urgency and lack of boundaries are exploitative. And we really need to cast that off and put ourselves first. And this means not putting off rest, relationships, starting families to advance one's scholarship or others' work. And all of these things are very routine within academic context currently, but they shouldn't be, because that is white supremacy. And I know I'm getting really close to time, so we'll go ahead and move on to the next slide, please. So just to summarize my recommendation. So we've got kind of those broad elements that I've recommended for scholars, but I also wanted to include just a couple of notes here. When we're operating in a consumer roles, as like readers and reviewers, we need to expect more from scholars. So transparency and the what and why and how they did their work. Better integration within and outside of psychology literature and media. Again, precision of language and meaning. And I would love to see the expectation that all scholars are articulating that reflexivity and contextualization. To gatekeepers, so speaking specifically to faculty editors, others in those kinds of evaluators and authority roles, my biggest recommendation would be just to get out of the way. Don't be the ones that are reinforcing epistemic exclusion and marginalization of scholarship that de-centers whiteness. Stop policing knowledge. Reflect on how our own perceptions of fit and rigor may reproduce racism. And please stop asking for what control groups or discussion of generalizability to like white populations, even if you don't say that explicitly. Again, apply that reflexivity to your roles too, not just as a producer of scholarship, but as a gatekeeper to scholarship. And consider how your positionality affects your engagement with and support for scholarship that is otherwise unfamiliar. That means knowing your limits, but not imposing them on others. Instead, elevating others, listening and learning, and using your roles to facilitate and not exclude. Next. So I would leave the folks who are new to this work, again, and not to the folks who've been doing it, but the folks who are are new to this, are you really ready? And what are you prepared to change? What are you prepared to give up? What will you give away? And how will you modify, pulverize even, and replace different features of psychology as we know it? Next. For white folks in particular, I wanna remind you to expect discomfort and to
 be prepared for this process to be uncomfortable and painful even. But you can't shy away from it, and you can't let it stop you. Next. So when that discomfort sets in, I implore you not to let it slow you down. When that aversion sets in, when you're tempted to set it aside because of some kind of more urgent or supposedly urgent professional or personal demand, I would remind you of some other words that Baldwin offered, and that ring in my ears so often now, as I hear different messages coming from our professional associations, from our universities without change attached to it. And he said, "You always told me it takes time. "It's taken my father's time, my mother's time, "my uncle's time, my brother and my sister's time, "my nieces and my nephews' time. "How much time do you want for your progress?" And so I'd ask you to treat this with the importance that it deserves, and not let, again, the depth of work that it will require be an excuse to not

engage in that work. Since we couldn't include videos in this presentation because of copyright issues, I have some recommended homework. This is particularly for white scholars. Again, I apologize to those of you who this is not new, but I encourage you to engage with this and think about how all of this relates to what we've been talking about all day here to our understanding of these systems, to our own positionality, and to the feelings and the motivations that we bring into our scholarship. I think that's all I have. - Wow, I honestly adopt, Sullivan, that I need a moment to take in the brilliance that you just imparted. I was backstage, both listening and nodding, and amening, and doing my best, right, to try to come up with some very brief comments before we do spend some time, but please let me just thank you so much for your powerfully honest and clear presentation on decolonizing research practices. Your brilliance modeled with humility invites everyone at this conference, on this conference, to take a look at themselves and to engage in what I refer to as an archeology of the self. And this is work that is most important for educators, for psychologists, for counselors. Those in the humane helping professions. You de-mystify obstacles to diversity, equity, inclusion, and belonging work. You make it very clear that anti-racism must be centered. You bring us to the doorstep of Ibram Kennedy's statement when he says in his book, How to Be an Antiracist, one either believes that problems are rooted in groups of people as a racist, or locates the roots of problems, in power, in policies as an anti-racist. The clarity and clarion call of your presentation says quite frankly, as Allah Grad once put on their Instagram, "White supremacy won't die "until white people see it as a white issue "that they need to solve, "rather than a black issue "that they need to empathize with." I am so grateful to you that you bring in the work of brother K Wayne Yang and sister Eve Tuck in their 2012 work, Decolonization is not a Metaphor, drawing on the power of the fields of settler colonialism and how it can help us understand and round ourselves in historical literacy to understand the deep receipts that this country has a 400 plus, 500 plus years of dehumanization that has impacted every system that interact with, and probably most notably, healthcare and education. The learning and unlearning you talk about is a move that a songwriter, Rhymefest has taught us, that the new thing is to unlearn everything, and that as we build this historical literacy you talk about, about how deeply racist, and sexist, and built on patriarchy our fields in the academy are, that it is important that we learn this historical literacy of our fields as well as our society, right? And specifically the field of psychology, the harm that it has done, that it continues to do, but you invite, you invite us to deep thinkly about what are the ways individually and collectively this reality can be dismantled. And so thank you also for bringing in ancestors, Audre Lorde, my favorite. I don't know, you must know me deeply, although we just met, who I call affectionately, Uncle Jimmy, James Baldwin, bringing in my father's neighbor in Christchurch, Barbados, trail blazer, politician, activist, TC alum, Shirley Chisholm. You bring in, this was so incredible as you draw from different fields and you bring in present day scholars and ancestors to specifically focus on the fields of psychology and to talk about what your fellow psychologists, Dr.

Beverly Daniel Tatum speaks to this smog of racism that we're all under. And how can we unlearn? How can we interrupt? How can we change the oppressive systems that exists and have persisted? I'm going to end as we get, I wanna save some times for the questions that are coming in, but I wanna tell you that your provocative and yet simple question about what visible and invisible ways a white supremacy systemic racism present in your psychology research gave me the permission and the opportunity to think about my fields of literacy and education, and to reflect on the work that I hope to do in dismantling these practices. You present this as scholarship as resistance, scholarship as protest, scholarship as a pedagogy of refusal for accepting the status quo in a field that has deep historical roots. You laid bare the ways that racism and bias is baked in and manifests in psychology. And you lead us to think about, at least I thought about, the APA, the American Psychiatric Association's apology after 175 years admitting to their role in

upholding and perpetuating structural racism. Your metaphors, your examples, your illuminations, your thoughtful reflection questions invites us, no, I wanna say it demands those in your field and the others of us, to find our accountability in this. I cannot thank you enough for what you presented and how you challenged us this afternoon, asking all, inclusive of our oppositionality. How has your scholarships centered whiteness as a standard for wellness, development, health and education? How do you treat whiteness as race neutral and normative? And I imagine, 'cause I'm always imagining with my ancestors, who I affectionately call TT Toni Morrison would be so excited to engage in conversation with you as you talk very deliberately about de-centering whiteness and centering BIPOC gays, brown and black gays as we think about these systems and how we can be healed. And in the end, how you honestly ask the question, are you really ready? And then you bring in Uncle, Jimmy James Baldwin, again, to remind us that it is time. I can say more, but we need to transition to Q&A. I thank you so much. Let me turn to one or two questions that's here in the chat. Okay, how can we use our expertise in psychology? I think you've handled this very well, but to change major laws and policies that harm black people in the criminal justice system? - Oh gosh. - Great question. It's so important, and you certainly have opened up a space for that to be considered. - I mean, I think we can use it as a way, both to understand why they need to, why we advocate for these changes, right? But I think we can also bring to bear the knowledge on how we do it, right? We have so much work from social psychology, organizational psychology like these different areas on actually how to affect change, how to change people's attitudes, how to change people's behavior. And so I think as much as we bring the expertise of psychology to why these laws and policies need to change because of the harm they cause, we can also use that to think about how we actually go about that work. But we have, sadly, a wealth of information that comes from our field and others, so not just psychology on the ways in which these laws and policies create contexts that harm people. And so we can bring all of that knowledge to bear in the way that we communicate, in the way that we try to help folks understand, really the broad base impacts of these policies. So again, like encouraging people to take that macroscopic view on the effects of all of this, not just in the criminal justice system, but within the educational systems and the health systems, and really every system that we talk about in society. - Thank you so much for that, for bringing in and reminding us the interconnected nature of these systems, sociology, foster care, you know, health care, all deeply entrenched in racist ideology. So here's something about mental health, and I think this might be a great question based on what you just shared and thinking about those who have been labeled a particular way, who are in the incarceration system. The question is, how can we create revolutionary change through the mental health care industry to prioritize black kids, de-stigmatize mental health, and provide mental health support to formerly incarcerated folks? - Oh gosh. Well, so first I think oftentimes scholars look at this context as like a problem to be solved. But I would turn it around and ask those formerly incarcerated folks or incarcerated folks to help us understand the problem, right? So I think we need to kind of get out of our expert role and shift into, I mean, when we think about anti-racism or decolonization, I think turning it around and letting them be, take our cues, rely on them to help us understand it, and instead of thinking that we know, or have, or will create all of the answers for these groups. - Hmm, hmm. Yeah, I just love what you just said because in your answer is this the de-centering of white supremacists approach anyway, of having all of the answers, and not in community, right, with the folks who are most affected by it. Just two more questions, I'm hoping that we can fit in. How do you understand the processes by which therapeutic modality becomes evidence-based as shaped by the very system that we are trying to dismantle, if at all possible? - Yeah, I mean, I think first and foremost, we need to push back against kind of the usage and engagement of evidence and evidence-based practice as a noun, as opposed to a verb. And I get so frustrated and disappointed when there's a focus on what's supposedly been established through gold standard research, even though we know how exclusionary that is. And so I would recommend, and I think Dr.

Mena spoke to this and probably some others, although I wasn't able to engage in all of the sessions. We need to emphasize it as a process that includes the best available evidence, but we need to be really critical about what that evidence is, right? We can't always reduce everything down to RCTs because that eliminates so much of the knowledge that is essential to doing this work. But remembering too that clinician and site capacity are features, but most importantly, those client with community needs and preferences and values. And so I think if we just, if we recenter around starting with those, that knowledge, those needs, those preferences, and shift away from engaging in primarily like quantitative research first and foremost. And I'm a quantitative researcher, or much of my work, I use quantitative methods, but I think that we need to, within practice, kind of do away with reliance on that as the end all be all in understanding what good practice is and shift back to the first and most important piece of it is a client or community. And I usually think of the community level as a school psychologist. So that's what I would emphasize first and foremost. And thinking about too, what kinds of, when we think about what is evidence-based? What are the different types of knowledge there? What kinds of, where is that knowledge? Where is that information taken from and that kind of thing. But I don't, I think this is, so with a lot of this, I don't know personally, given my own state in this journey, I'm not sure what pieces are salvageable of what we do. And I don't know what other things are gonna need to be scrapped. And it might be that evidence-based practice or evidence-based interventions are one of those things. - Wow. This last question I wanna, before we turn to Dr.

Prerna Arora for closing remarks, I do want to ask it because it seems to be, you know, a little bit inclusive, as you were talking many points in your presentation specifically to white psychologists, white folks, but certainly not excluding BIPOC, but let me question and please share your thoughts. If white people need to change what they developed, what does that mean for black student psychology education and whites who do not want to give up power and provide space? (audio feedback) Amanda, right? (audio feedback) - I mean, just throughout, so I think about our field, like so school psych in particular, right, it's what, 90 plus percent white. There are gonna be people who don't wanna change. They're gonna be people who are gonna double down on their commitments to all of these ideas, and assumptions, and ideals. I think those with the most power need to use that to help change. And so I think about, like my role within the journal that I'm affiliated with. And like, I see that as fundamentally a space where I need to create space for others, that I need to help create that opportunity, and undo, really the history of that journal, and being one of, one of many, but one of the important vehicles for why within our field the dominant narrative and the primary areas of scholarship that have been elevated are so narrow. And so I'm there specifically to break down those barriers. And I think for other folks who have that authority, that power, they need to create the space and elevate others, and really give that power and privilege away. And use it as much as possible. So again, like I come to this space, like I know that as a full professor, I have privilege that a lot of my colleagues don't have. So I have to use that, right? Like I have to put myself on the line for others. And so that's what I would- I think it's a lot more complicated than that, but first and foremost. - But you hit a very important point. It makes me think of course, about Dr. Bettina Love as she invites folks and conspirators and says very specifically, something on the line for some. With that, I thank you for the privilege of being able to moderate your session for your brilliant presentation. I'd like to thank the conference participants for your wonderful questions and invite Dr.

Prerna Arora back to the stage to offer closing remarks. I wish everyone a great weekend, and Dr. Amanda Sullivan, thank you for all that you give to us today. - Thank you. - Thank you Dr.

Sullivan for your incredible talk on decolonizing research practices, and Dr.

Sealey-Ruiz for your beautiful reflections and for facilitating the Q&A session. Earlier today, I shared our goal for this conference, to translate knowledge on the topic of decolonizing psychology training into actual resources for educators, researchers, supervisors, and students who seek to critically examine and decolonize their practices. To this end, we have heard from four expert speakers who have provided us with some of the tools to pursue these objectives. From the decolonizing clinical supervision talk by Dr.

Carol Falender, we heard about the state of the current supervision science and potential directions for growth as it relates to multicultural practices. From the decolonizing mentorship talk by Dr.

Celeste Malone, we learned the critical need to quote, disrupt and decolonize psychology by uncovering hidden assumptions and ecological frameworks present in mentorship practices. From the decolonizing curriculum talk by Dr.

Jasmine Mean, we gained extensive tangible and thoughtful recommendations for decolonizing our pedagogy and curriculum. And from the decolonizing clinical research practices talk by Dr. Amanda Sullivan, a scholar who I am lucky to acknowledge is one of my mentors and who I credit with my remaining in my current field of study, we obtained an honest genuine reflection of her approach to research. As this conference comes to a close, I will pose one final question to our audience. Where do we go from here? With over 5,000 participants registered for today's conference, interest in this topic is apparent as many of us are actively searching for resources and support as we seek to decolonize our practices. We are already seeing people build communities via the live chat as part of today's conference. Participants have shared additional questions, resources, and ways to keep connected and move this work forward. It is my hope that we will be able to respond to critical issues surrounding diversity, equity, and inclusion, and achieve common objectives as a result of the ideas and tools shared today. We are all at different stages in our pursuit for decolonized psychology training and practices. In our respective roles, I hope each of us is able to meaningfully translate today's learning into intentional practice, and in the end, enact change within ourselves, our training programs, and in the field as a whole. Yet in order to bring about such change, we must also examine our larger society, and the systems in which we operate. We may consider our roles of active agents of change beyond our field. We are aware that this work is not easy, and we may face resistance in our efforts. However, if there is a collective effort made by all of us listening today, we may be able to achieve meaningful and sustainable change. Before we end for the day, Olivia Khoo, another doctoral student that I'm lucky to work with, and whose efforts were critical in the planning of today's event, will share some final information. - Thank you Dr.

Arora for your closing remarks. This concludes today's conference events. To all attendees, you will be receiving a link to a post-conference evaluation form immediately after the conference via email. You may also access this evaluation through the link on the YouTube description, as well as in the chat. We greatly appreciate your input on today's events and future needs as they relate to decolonizing psychology practices. You will also be able to access all conference recordings using the same YouTube link as today. Recordings will also be uploaded under the Resources tab on the conference website within the next week. We will also be sending out the recordings by email to all registered attendees. On behalf of Dr.

Arora, Kayla Parr, and myself, we would like to take this opportunity to thank the community that came together to make this event a success, including our speakers, Dr.

Carol Falender,  Celeste Malone, Dr.

Jasmine Mena, and  Amanda Sullivan. Today's moderators, Dr.

Marie Miville, Dr. Mark Gooden, and Dr. Laudan Jahromi, and Dr.

and Dr. Yolanda Sealey-Ruiz. The Teacher's College Office of College Events, Teacher's College Office of External Affairs, Teacher's College Department of Health and Behavior Studies, the American Psychological Association, Board of Educational Affairs, and our wonderful Tech Director, Solely Esteves for today. To all conference attendees, today has been a long educational day, and we appreciate your active participation throughout. I thank you once again for your attendance at the Decolonizing Psychology Training Conference and wish you all good health and safety. Thank you.