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As I write this column we are entering my favorite time of year in upstate New York. The days are getting shorter, the air is a little crisper, and the trees are beginning to change giving us a kaleidoscope of colors. This is also my last column as President. First, I want to thank the Division 16 membership for giving me the opportunity to serve the Division as President. I have been honored and humbled to serve in a position that was previously held by people such as Jack Bardon, Joe French, Irwin Hyman, Tom Oakland, Walt Pryzwansky, Jane Conoley, Sylvia Rosenfield, Jon Sandoval, Steve DeMers, Cindy Carlson, Randy Kamphaus, Jim Paavola, Deborah Tharinger, Beth Doll, Rick Short, and Jack Cummings. While I certainly don’t consider myself in a league with those names, I have been privileged to hold the same office.

I have also had the pleasure of working with a number of hard-working, dedicated individuals. The Executive Committee (EC) of Division 16 gives so much of their time and energy year after year for no remuneration. They do it solely to help the profession and ultimately to benefit the children that we all serve. I do not have the space in my column to thank everyone who has served over the past year for the benefit of the Division and School Psychology, but there are a few people I want to single out. Jack Cummings left huge shoes for me to fill when he stepped down as President on January 1, but he also made my job so much easier. He was always available to answer questions, provide guidance, and offer support. Jack has also worked tirelessly over the past 18 months organizing the upcoming Future’s Conference and he gives to the profession in so many ways. The Division is so fortunate to have Jack. Deborah Tharinger is another person who does an amazing job for the Division. She has done so much for the Division over the past decade. She has served as Secretary, President, and Vice President for Professional Affairs, in addition to serving on numerous committees and task forces. I have developed a tremendous respect for Deborah and am in awe of the amount of energy she has. We also have two representatives to APA Council who are without peer. Steve DeMers and Cindy Carlson ably represent School Psychology and our interests within APA, and school psychology is the better for it. The rest of the EC, including our SASP representative, have helped make this year an enjoyable experience. Thanks Elaine, Michelle, Sharon, Colette, Frank, David, Robyn, and Gena. I also want to thank Ron Palomares, Assistant Executive Director for Policy and Advocacy in the Schools in the APA Practice Directorate. Ron works tirelessly for the benefit of children, schools, and school psychologists. He is a great voice for school psychology in APA and throughout the country. He has assisted me this year in more ways than I can count, and I am greatly appreciative.

I have had a number of valuable experiences this year. The executive committee mid-winter meeting in New Orleans, the Convention in Chicago, and I am looking forward to the Futures Conference in Indianapolis. I thought the convention this year was a great success and the convention chair John Hintze and co-chair Angeleque Akin-Little did a fabulous job. Getting to the convention center and then walking around its cavernous interior was sometimes daunting, but the program was excellent. Although initially anxious, I really enjoyed giving my presidential address. I addressed the issue of overscheduling of children and youth, a growing problem that we as school psychologists should recognize and we should provide an appropriate response.

While I have enjoyed my year as Division 16 President I have had to manage and react to several controversial issues. I felt strongly that these were issues that needed to be addressed directly. I have detailed these issues and my view in my previous columns. Although I knew that I risked offending some, I did feel it was my duty as president to offer candid opinions. My positions on these issues were governed by what I believe are in the best interests of Division 16, its members, and the children we serve. My positions on these issues have at times come into conflict with NASP’s position. I disagree with their positions on certain issues and, considering the responses I received on my last two columns from Division 16 members, many of you agree with me.

I want to make it clear, however, that I have a great deal of respect for NASP and its leaders. I
The purpose of this paper is to discuss the integration of school psychology, clinical psychology, and neuropsychology as they related to the challenge of working with multi-handicapped youth in a special educational setting. School psychology, neuropsychology, and clinical psychology each informed the model of assessment that was employed for this project. Specifically, a developmental model of neuropsychological assessment including administration of the Rorschach Test was used to expand understanding of the learning and behavior issues of these students. The goal was to use the results of the evaluations to expand the menu of interventions for this particular group of students. These were students whose education required that the school psychologist be able to work flexibly within the school framework integrating neuropsychological and psychodynamic understanding in an attempt to provide proper formulation and remediation. These students had serious cognitive and social-emotional needs that required a school-based neuropsychological approach to assessment and intervention, in which intervention reflected the depth and range of neuropsychological deficit, including impact on personality functioning. They were challenging students who were at risk for school failure, involvement with the legal system, and for dropping out of school.

The work of Rothenstein and colleagues (1988, 1999) is an example of how neuropsychology, school psychology, and clinical psychology can come together to create a working model for assessment, diagnosis, and intervention that addresses the learning needs of multi-handicapped students. The idea of neuropsychological evaluations for students with learning and behavior problems has a basis in the writing of several neuropsychologists including Reitan and Wolfson (1992). As recently as November 2001, in the Pennsylvania Psychologist (Fair & Ball, 2001), neuropsychology and school psychology were discussed as mutually informative disciplines. Thus, there is a literature base relevant to school psychologists for working towards a synthesis of assessment strategies with students whose cognitive, behavioral, and social-emotional needs pose diagnostic and intervention challenges in educational settings.

### Characteristics of the Student Population

These challenging and at-risk high school students were referred to The Aston Occupational School. The program was later moved and renamed The County Alternative High School. The Aston Occupational School was an alternative educational program for high school students operated by the Delaware County Intermediate Unit in Delaware.
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County, Pennsylvania. Students were referred because multidisciplinary teams in their home school districts had recommended more restrictive placement. The referrals primarily resulted from behavior problems. When students transferred to the Aston Occupational School/TCA (a therapeutic program with academic, vocational, and mental health components) a small group of students continued to struggle and were not helped by the existing menu of interventions. In an educational setting, remediation implies a controlled interaction between the impaired learner’s abilities and the demands of the environment. Thus, effective remediation requires a clear clinical understanding of the types of cognitive difficulties, perceptual errors, and ineffective learning strategies interfering with academic progress (Gaddes & Edgell, 1993).

Neuropsychological Assessment

To improve clinical understanding of the students, neuropsychological evaluations (a clinical model, not a research model) were completed for 24 students at the Aston Occupational School and The County Alternative High School during a three year period from September of 1995 to June of 1998 to refine diagnoses, assess cognitive status, and to provide direction for educational and treatment planning. The neuropsychological evaluations were scheduled for students who had not demonstrated improvement in the alternative educational setting. The tests that were administered are listed in Table 1.

Improvement was defined as consistent progress in the five main program components: academic subjects; vocational training; counseling; attendance; and compliance with the behavior management system. It is important to note that the alternative educational program was structured so students could achieve small consistent successes for work completion, time spent on task, spending time with a counselor, or permitting intervention during a period of emotional stress. The students who did not improve were often off task, out of class, engaged in inappropriate verbalizations, and were resistant to redirection and other interventions. Of approximately 120 students in the program, fewer than 10 or between seven and eight percent each year did not show improvement based on those criteria. Each of those students received a neuropsychological evaluation that included a Five Axis Diagnosis using the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, Fourth Edition (APA, 1994). The diagnoses were reviewed by the student’s mental health counselor and the program psychiatrist. In addition, the parent or guardian, the neuropsychologist and the student met with a pediatric neurologist for a comprehensive neurological evaluation. The diagnoses were confirmed again, and additional medical diagnoses were given, which are noted in Table 2.

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case #</th>
<th>ADHD</th>
<th>LD</th>
<th>ODD</th>
<th>DD</th>
<th>IED</th>
<th>CD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Positive neurological evaluation, slight right hemiparesis)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Posttraumatic Stress Disorder (Chronic))</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Blank, “disconnected staring episodes)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Asperger’s Disorder)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Antisocial Personality Disorder)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Bipolar Disorder)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Fetal Hydantoin Syndrome, Borderline Intellectual Functioning)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Avoidant Personality Disorder, R/O Marfan’s Syndrome)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Chiari I Malformation)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>66.6</td>
<td>91.6</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>70.8</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. ADHD=Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder; LD=Learning Disorder; ODD=Oppositional Defiant Disorder; DD=Depressive Disorder; IED=Intermittent Explosive Disorder; CD=Conduct Disorder.

Clinical Findings

Based on the five axis diagnoses most of the students were considered multi-handicapped. This meant they had a combination of learning, attention, and emotional disorders that negatively impacted their ability to benefit from traditional interventions. Sixteen students (66.6%) were diagnosed with Attention Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD),
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Combined Type). Twenty-two (91.6%) were diagnosed with learning disorders (LD), and 15 students (62.6%) had co-morbid diagnoses of ADHD and LD. Seventeen students (70.8%) were diagnosed with a depressive disorder, and 10 of those (58.8%) were also diagnosed with ADHD and LD.

The students for whom this clinical model was used had entered the program primarily classified as students with emotional and/or behavioral disorders. While it was possible that these students were making inappropriate behavioral choices, it also seemed reasonable that neurocognitive weaknesses or problems with learning, attention, and executive functioning had compromised the ability of the students to benefit from interventions. Behaviors consistent with weaknesses in executive functioning, problem solving, and general coping ability frequently resulted in consequences, usually within the behavior management system. The Rorschach Test was included as part of the neuropsychological evaluation to assess emotional functioning and to provide additional information about cognitive functioning, self-image, and interpersonal variables relevant to personality assessment.

The Rorschach Test

During the 1995-96 academic year, Pamela Lunardi, a student in the doctoral program in Clinical Psychology at Immaculata College in Immaculata, Pennsylvania, completed a testing internship at the alternative educational program. After administering the Rorschach Test to five students (other students enrolled in the same program), Lunardi (1999) commented on the similarity of the scores, an observation that led to her selection of a dissertation topic. Results of the evaluations were consistent with Lunardi’s impression that the students represented in her study had emotional and learning disorders. Lunardi used the Exner Comprehensive Scoring System (1995) and developed a descriptive analysis of the Rorschach test scores. The students had coping deficits and difficulty managing emotional stimulation. As Lunardi had hypothesized, the students tended to have feelings of low self-worth, social isolation, and difficulty coping with normal social demands. In addition, they had inconsistent problem solving styles and strategies, and tended to interpret environmental stimuli in an unconventional manner. The students who struggled with emotional and learning disorders tended to have global processing styles and also tended to limit the amount of environmental stimuli that they processed.

Illustrative School Based Example

One student actually referred himself for neuropsychological evaluation. He came to the psychologist’s office and said that his friends had told him that some students were being given a lot of tests to find out how to help the students who were having trouble in school. He was told that the testing involved eight to ten hours. He said that was fine. He continued by saying that no one had ever known why he had so much difficulty in school and he really wanted to know what was wrong. When asked what he thought was wrong, he said that he couldn’t read and he couldn’t write. He also said that he and his family thought that he had an attention deficit disorder. He was the fourth eldest of a large family. His family had a strong work ethic and the older children helped with the care of the younger children. The older children obtained part time jobs when they were old enough, and did not get into trouble in school or in the community. While he functioned very effectively at home and did not get into trouble within the community, school had been very difficult. His parents supported his participation in the school program, the school rules, and supported him.

During the evaluation, the student struggled to sit still and remain focused during the many hours of testing. While he required frequent breaks, he was cheerful and cooperative during the evaluation. His test results were consistent with the results of the 24 students who had neuropsychological evaluations.

The student’s DSM-IV diagnosis included a Reading Disorder, a Disorder of Written Expression, Attention Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder (Combined Type), and Depressive Disorder, Not Otherwise Specified. On the Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale-Revised, he scored in the Low Average range with a 10-point differential between his verbal and performance scale scores in favor of the performance scale score. Although his scaled score for reading was 70 compared to a scaled score of 77 on the Verbal Scale IQ of the WAIS-R, his basic reading and reading comprehension skills were at the first percentile and approximately second grade level when measured with the Wechsler Individual Achievement Test (WIAT). Projective testing indicated that he tended to be perceptually inaccurate to the point of sometimes distorting reality. On the Rorschach Test, he had four positive scores (5 is significant) on the Depression Index, and three positive scores on the Coping Deficit Index (four is significant). Even though the neuropsychological model was a clinical
model rather than a research model, it appeared that with high-risk students who had not responded to traditional interventions, neuropsychological evaluations that included projective testing helped to clarify diagnoses and to permit more specific interventions.

**Problems with Executive Functioning**

These students had been referred to a therapeutic program because they were considered to have behavior management problems. While it was true that they seemed more emotionally reactive, less cognitively flexible, and more inclined to engage in inappropriate verbalizations and behaviors than other students, it was equally true that they struggled with a combination of learning, attention, and emotional disorders. Specifically, the students had problems with executive functioning. Exner (1995) described the Rorschach as a problem-solving task. In the present study, a review of Rorschach results suggested, in general, that students demonstrated needs in the areas of cognitive flexibility, perceptual accuracy, affect, and aspects of self-image and interpersonal relations. These personality variables influence executive functioning by imposing limitations on flexible response options, self-monitoring, and goal-directed behavior, which are hallmarks of executive processes.

The difficulty with behavior management was consistent with weaknesses in executive functioning. For example, the need for support with behavior management resulted from impulsivity, difficulty with affect modulation, limited capacity for self-control or self-regulation, cognitive and behavioral rigidity, difficulty making shifts in attention and behavior, and difficulty planning and carrying out goal-directed behaviors. Those particular behaviors are associated with deficits in executive functioning and are common in adolescents with Attention Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder as well as in adolescents with learning disorders (Barkley, 1998). At least 30 to 40 percent of people diagnosed with ADHD also have learning disorders (Barkley, 1998). Conversely, at least 30 to 40 percent of people diagnosed with learning disorders also have ADHD. This "comorbid group" with the combination of disorders tends to have more deficits in executive functioning than either the ADHD only or LD only group (Barkley, 1998).

**School Based Interventions**

Because of the multiple handicaps and previous lack of success of these students, program changes that were influenced by the evaluation results included the development of a small, structured classroom with a special education teacher, a full time teaching assistant, and a full time mental health counselor.

In summary, considering the results of the neuropsychological evaluations, it appeared that the learning, perceptual, and processing deficits identified in these students comprised different aspects of their overall adjustment. The Rorschach findings reflected deficits in areas of personality functioning that supplemented the neuropsychological findings. Personality and neuropsychological factors are intertwined. Deficits in reasoning, spatial skills, and memory, for example, can influence anxiety management and the quality of social exchange, and setbacks in social situations can affect anxiety management and efficiency of cognitive operations. The personality needs of this particular group of students were supported by a descriptive analysis of Rorschach scores of adolescents with emotional and learning disorders completed by Lunardi (1999).

From a developmental perspective, the very personality development of these students had been shaped by those deficits. In addition to any other learning problems, the students had weaknesses in executive functioning, problems solving, and coping strategies.

Neurocognitive or cognitive interventions such as problem solving strategies, impulse control strategies, anger management training, conflict resolution skills, and social skills training appeared relevant to the needs of this particular group of learners. However, because of their learning and processing deficits, they required daily small group and individual instruction. They were helped by presenting new information in small amounts with frequent trials and repetitions, comprehension checks, simultaneous presentation of visual and verbal stimuli as well as guided practice generalizing new skills. It was, therefore, the integration of school psychology, clinical psychology, and neuropsychology within the framework of special education that supported the process of providing accurate formulation and intervention.
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A search for Associate Editor of The School Psychologist (Division 16 Newsletter) will begin immediately. The newly elected Associate Editor serves for 3 years beginning September 1, 2003 and then is expected to assume the role of Editor in September of 2006 for a 3-year term. Thus, the Associate Editor must be willing to make a commitment to serve for 3 years as Associate Editor and 3 years as Editor.

The Associate Editor will work closely with the Editor-Elect, Linda A. Reddy. The Associate Editor is responsible for soliciting and reviewing newsletter contributions, assisting in publication procedures, and undertaking other special assignments at the discretion of the Editor. The Associate Editor is expected to become familiar with all newsletter operations and provide input for the editorial decisions.

Applicants for the position should have demonstrated skills in writing, editing, and public relations and be willing to donate an average of approximately 1 to 2 days per month to newsletter work.

Interested persons should send: (1) a letter detailing relevant experience as well as goals and expectations for the newsletter, (2) three letters of reference, and (3) a recent vita by February 1, 2003 to:

Vincent C. Alfonso, Ph.D.
Chair, Search Committee
Fordham University
Graduate School of Education
113 West 60th Street
New York, NY. 10023
212-636-6464 (w)
212-636-6416 (fax)
Alfonso@fordham.edu

The selection of the Associate Editor will be made in March 2003. Additional questions can be forwarded to Vincent Alfonso (see above) or Linda Reddy at Reddy@fdu.edu or 201-692-2649.
The Need for Revision

Some school psychologists appear to use the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children-Third Edition (WISC-III; Wechsler, 1991) in their current test batteries based on precedent and a comfort level with this measure. In addition, the current environment of lawsuits and adhering to local, state, and federal evaluation regulations could cause some school psychologists to continue to use the same assessment approach regardless of the referral question or ineffectiveness of their data for instructional planning. It is this author’s belief that if cognitive ability assessments would be revised to meet the theoretically and empirically based knowledge regarding the structure of intelligence, then they should be more valid in inferring strengths and weaknesses in specific areas of cognitive processing. Furthermore, if the revised intelligence test batteries are more accurate in predicting and substantiating possible areas of learning difficulties, then the resulting data should be more useful to teachers and psychologists in assisting in the development of Individualized Education Programs (IEPs).

According to McGrew and Flanagan (1998), Flanagan, McGrew, and Ortiz (2000), and Flanagan and Ortiz (2001), school psychologists do appear to be able to construct assessments in a way that covers all of the major cognitive abilities by utilizing different intelligence test batteries in a systematic and empirically supported method. However, some school psychologists attempt to infer processing deficits from the WISC-III that should relate to certain achievement problems, although without empirical support (Kamphaus, 1993). Therefore, in an attempt to satisfy legal and regulatory requirements for reliable and valid cognitive assessment, some school psychologists appear to use the WISC-III solely based on its clinical tradition (Kaufman, 1979, 1990, 1994) instead of utilizing methods of assessing cognitive abilities that are more theoretically and empirically defensible. In fact, clinicians are opening the door for more lawsuits and questioning from professionals and parents when they do not use an empirically and theoretically defensible method of intelligence testing.

Utilization of theoretically and empirically supported cognitive abilities assessment such as Cattell-Horn-Carroll (CHC) Cross-Battery Assessment (McGrew & Flanagan, 1998) should further increase the value that school psychologists’ assessments have in fully interpreting cognitive processing strengths and weaknesses and how they relate to academic strengths and weaknesses. The assessments should then have a significantly increased value in assisting in the development of goals and objectives in IEPs and in assisting the teacher and student in daily instructional and performance strategies. The proper use of intelligence and achievement assessment has been of long-standing concern among educators (Salvia & Ysseldyke, 1995), was required under Public Law 94-142, and is required under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act Amendments of 1997. However, many standardized tests have been ineffectively used when held up to a report on the implementation of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (U. S. Department of Education, 1994). Utilizing assessment methods through a comprehensive CHC Cross-Battery approach to cognitive assessment should bring school psychologists further in line with updated research and with federal, state, and local laws and regulations.

A Revised Approach

CHC theory is a recent synthesis of the Cattell-Horn Gf-Gc theory (Horn & Noll, 1997) and the Carroll three-stratum theory of cognitive abilities (Carroll, 1993, 1997). CHC theory is a hierarchical framework of human cognitive abilities that consists of three strata: general intelligence or g (stratum III), broad cognitive abilities (stratum II), and narrow cognitive abilities (stratum I). The broad cognitive abilities include crystallized intelligence (Gc), fluid intelligence (Gf), auditory processing (Ga), short-term memory (Gsm), visual processing (Gv), processing speed (Gs), and long-term retrieval (Glr). Approximately 70 narrow cognitive abilities are subsumed by these broad cognitive abilities (McGrew & Flanagan, 1998).
When I started performing reading disability reevaluations in an urban middle school in 1998, I quickly became uncomfortable with using the WISC-III to measure cognitive abilities in students due to the high degree of cultural loading in many of the subtests. Flanagan and Ortiz (2001) provide an excellent chapter that discusses the challenges in working with culturally and linguistically diverse students and the need for valid assessment with these students. I was aware at the time that finding one or more cognitive processing deficit(s) that could relate to a reading deficit was part of the definition of a specific learning disability. However, I was also aware of the high culture loading on many of the WISC-III subtests that could put many of the students I was reevaluating at a disadvantage due to the cultural diversity in the geographic area. Therefore, I reevaluated the students utilizing subtests that covered all broad cognitive ability areas previously shown to be related to reading achievement through research and according to CHC Cross-Battery principles outlined in McGrew and Flanagan (1998).

Results of the reevaluations were included in a recent study titled "Utilizing Cattell-Horn-Carroll Cross-Battery Assessment to Predict Reading Achievement in Learning Disabled Middle School Students" (Miller, 2002). Results from the study generally supported previous studies in this area, such as McGrew (1993), McGrew, Flanagan, Keith, and Vanderwood (1997), and Keith (1999). Results at least partially substantiated the hypotheses that crystallized intelligence (Gc), processing speed (Gs), auditory processing (Ga), and short-term memory (Gsm) would be significant predictors of basic reading skills and reading comprehension in middle school students with learning disabilities. However, hypotheses that long-term retrieval (Glr) and fluid intelligence (Gf) would be significant predictors of basic reading skills and reading comprehension in these students were not substantiated (Miller, 2001).

The subtests used in the reevaluations are listed in Table 1 with corresponding broad and narrow ability classifications according to McGrew and Flanagan (1998). Subtests were administered from each of the following four intelligence test batteries: Woodcock-Johnson Tests of Cognitive Ability-Revised (WJ-R; Woodcock & Johnson, 1989); Differential Ability Scales (DAS; Elliott, 1990); Stanford-Binet Intelligence Scale: Fourth Edition (SB:FE; Thorndike, Hagan, & Sattler, 1986); and WISC-III (Wechsler, 1991).

### Table 1

**Broad Abilities, Narrow Abilities, and Subtests Assessed in the Reevaluations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Broad Ability</th>
<th>Narrow Ability(s)</th>
<th>Subtest(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Auditory Processing</td>
<td>Phonemic Coding*</td>
<td>Incomplete Words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resistance to Auditory Stimulation Distortion</td>
<td>Incomplete Words (WJ-R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phonetic Coding*</td>
<td>Sound Blending (WJ-R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crystallized Intelligen...</td>
<td>Language Development*</td>
<td>Similarities (DAS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lexical Knowledge*</td>
<td>Similarities (DAS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General Information</td>
<td>Picture Vocabulary (WJ-R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short-Term Memory</td>
<td>Memory Span*</td>
<td>Memory for Words (WJ-R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Recall of Words (WJ-R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-Term Retrieval</td>
<td>Associative Memory*</td>
<td>Visual-Auditory Learning (WJ-R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meaningful Memory</td>
<td>Visual-Auditory Learning (WJ-R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Free Recall Memory</td>
<td>Recall of Objects (DAS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Processing Speed</td>
<td>Perceptual Speed*</td>
<td>Visual Matching (WJ-R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rate of Test-Taking</td>
<td>Visual Matching (WJ-R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perceptual Speed*</td>
<td>Symbol Search (WISC-III)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rate of Test-Taking</td>
<td>Symbol Search (WISC-III)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluid Intelligence</td>
<td>Induction*</td>
<td>Matrices (SB:FE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sequential Reasoning</td>
<td>Analysis-Synthesis (WJ-R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quantitative Reasoning</td>
<td>Analysis-Synthesis (WJ-R)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = Previously found to be related to reading achievement.
as well as insufficient representation in the short-term memory area (Gsm) according to CHC Cross-Battery principles. According to Snow, Burns, and Griffin (1998), assessment of reading in schools is often characterized by different instruments that may be redundant and incomplete with regard to assessing abilities necessary for reading proficiency. In addition, two of the subtests stated by the WISC-III authors (Wechsler, 1991) to measure visual processing (i.e., Picture Completion and Picture Arrangement) also were found to measure crystallized intelligence (Gc), a higher culturally loaded broad ability, in McGrew and Flanagan (1998) and, more recently, not classified empirically or logically in the Culture-Language Matrices in Flanagan and Ortiz (2001) due to the mixed ability representation.

As a result of the reevaluations, the teachers appeared very interested and excited to hear about possible newly uncovered broad ability areas that could be classified as strengths for their students as well as a more specific picture of broad ability weaknesses that helped to explain the specific learning disabilities in reading more clearly. The parents appeared equally pleased in understanding that more cognitive ability strengths could be identified from the reevaluations by using subtests that were not as highly culturally loaded, as well as having a more clear understanding of the reasons for their children’s reading disabilities through possibly seeing other broad ability areas that were weaknesses, while not comprised of culturally loaded material. In fact, the parents of some of the students expressed that they had previously questioned learning disability diagnoses based on culturally loaded subtests.

Evaluating with Sensitivity Toward Culturally Loaded Material

Since that study, I have recently compared the culturally loaded material the students experienced in their initial evaluations with the CHC Cross-Battery reevaluations. Using the Culture-Language Matrices available in Flanagan and Ortiz (2001), I explored the degree of cultural loading on the WISC-III subtests the students completed as part of their initial evaluations. With regard to broad ability areas related to reading, two subtests measuring processing speed (Gs) and one subtest measuring short-term memory (Gsm) were in the low culturally loaded degree range. Four subtests measuring crystallized intelligence (Gc) were in the high culturally loaded degree range. For the reevaluations, I knew that, in choosing subtests according to CHC Cross-Battery Assessment, I would explore more comprehensive abilities that were not as highly culturally loaded. However, at that time, I did not have the Culture-Language Matrices available.

In order to demonstrate the advantage with regard to the breadth and depth of cognitive abilities assessed in the reevaluations, consider the following breakdown of culture loadings. With regard to low culture loading, two processing speed (Gs) subtests were identified, in addition to one short-term memory (Gsm) subtest and two fluid intelligence (Gf) subtests. With regard to moderate culture loading, two long-term retrieval (Glr) subtests, two auditory processing (Ga) subtests, and one more short-term memory (Gsm) subtest were identified. Thus, three broad ability areas were identified at the low culture loading level and an additional two broad ability areas were identified at the moderate level without assessing crystallized intelligence (Gc). The two crystallized intelligence (Gc) subtests were again at the high culture loading level. These results reflect how, due to the specific nature of my reevaluation population, I was able to assess additional cognitive abilities related to reading achievement problems while excluding crystallized intelligence (Gc) variables due to the high cultural loading of those subtests.

Based on the reason for referral, school psychologists need to be able to construct assessments that properly evaluate cognitive variables related to students’ reading difficulties, while at the same time not compromising validity by using high culturally loaded subtests. In addition, understanding the relationship between crystallized intelligence (Gc) and reading development, school psychologists need to be careful to insure that the definition of specific learning disabilities in reading among culturally diverse populations needs to include cognitive processing weaknesses that are separate from the crystallized intelligence (Gc) factor.

Assessment of culturally and linguistically diverse populations for other types of academic problems as well as behavioral/emotional problems need to be carefully planned the same way. Gopaul-McNicol and Thomas-Presswood (1998) provide an excellent account of innovative educational approaches when assessing and providing intervention for culturally and linguistically diverse children. In addition, Kamphaus and Frick (2002) provide important guidelines for assessing children from diverse backgrounds and for assessing acculturation as part of evaluating child and adolescent personality and behavior.
Evaluating with Sensitivity Toward Linguistically Loaded Material

In the same way we should pay attention to the cultural loading of tests and subtests, we should be cautious about the validity of assessment materials with high linguistic loadings. Flanagan and Ortiz (2001) also discuss this related area in more depth.

In Gallaudet University’s School Psychology Program, my colleagues and I teach assessment in a way that is always cautious about the validity of linguistically loaded subtests being administered to the deaf and hard of hearing population. English directions and test items need to routinely be translated into American Sign Language (ASL) or supplemented with different versions of Signed English for administration. The Verbal Scale of the WISC-III (Wechsler, 1991) is not considered to be a valid measure of deaf and hard of hearing students’ crystallized intelligence (Gc). However, school psychologists experienced in evaluating deaf and hard of hearing students could provide information regarding students’ levels of verbal English abilities when compared to their hearing peers. Proper documentation needs to occur when interpreting results and writing reports to reflect the validity effects present when adapting English crystallized intelligence (Gc) questions into an ASL equivalent. Moores and Sweet (1990) and Geens and Moog (1989) provide information regarding criterion related validity of the WISC-R (Wechsler, 1974) Verbal Scale subtests with deaf and hard of hearing adolescents, while Blennerhassett and Traxler (2000) provide information regarding WISC-III Verbal Scale utilization and accommodation with deaf and hard of hearing students. In addition, Maller (1996, 1997) provides information regarding the use of verbal tests with deaf children. As I alluded to in the previous section, knowledge of the social context, including the family, the language, and the effects of specific cultural values and beliefs, needs to be taken into account among the deaf and hard of hearing population similar to other culturally and linguistically diverse populations.

Interestingly, recent research in the Cued Speech area has related the effectiveness of Cued Speech for conveying English at the phonemic level and developing deaf children’s reading abilities (LaSasso & Metzger, 1998). Future research in this area could have an impact on the conceptualization of phonological processing as a broad cognitive ability among deaf and hard of hearing students that is present, but that has not, as of yet, been fully assessed.

Summary

Research in this area continues to explore relations between measures of CHC cognitive abilities and reading achievement at different age periods (Evans, Floyd, McGrew, & Leforgee, 2002). As more school psychologists become aware of the advantages of CHC Cross-Battery applications, increased numbers of evaluations will hopefully be conducted according to CHC Cross-Battery principles and can accordingly be reviewed for cognitive variable relationships with different achievement areas. Educators could then increase the number and variety of instructional strategies to help students acquire and retain reading skills through increasing the number and relevancy of assessed abilities available in evaluations. In addition, school psychologists can identify a broader picture of strengths and weaknesses among cognitive abilities through CHC Cross-Battery Assessment that in turn can lead to increased instructional recommendations for educators.

The value of using CHC Cross-Battery Assessment can also be applied toward working with culturally and linguistically diverse student populations. School psychologists are becoming increasingly aware of the diverse cultural and linguistic groups that are represented by entire school systems, individual schools, and individual students in classrooms. Practitioners could avoid using subtests in evaluations that had high culturally and linguistically loaded material or at least document that caution needs to be used when interpreting those subtests. Evaluation using standardized testing needs to follow the same guidelines and cautions used when evaluating culturally and linguistically diverse populations using more qualitative assessment, such as interviews and observations. Sattler (1997) provides valuable guidelines to consider when interviewing culturally and linguistically diverse populations. The flexibility of using CHC Cross-Battery Assessment to guide the assessment and meet the needs of the individual child while at the same time being sensitive to the unique cultural and linguistic makeup of the child appears to be an extremely important variable in guiding school psychologists’ evaluations in the future.
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Comprehensive Evaluation of Cognitive Abilities with Cultural and Linguistic Loading in Mind
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Climbing Out of the Ivory Tower by Making the Swap:
An assistant Professor Exchanges Roles with an Experienced Local School Psychologist for the 2002-2003 Academic Year

Betty DeBoer
University of Wisconsin-La Crosse

Identifying the Need for Gaining More Experience in Schools

When I interviewed for the position of assistant professor at the University of Wisconsin-La Crosse, one original question the interview committee asked was something like, "What do you see as an area you would potentially need to work on in order to fulfill your role here to the best extent possible?" Without hesitation, I responded "Full-time, hands-on, in-school, school psychology experience." (Okay, first I explained how all the wonderful experiences in my Ph.D. program at the University of Wisconsin-Madison, my pre-doctoral internship experience at the University of Wisconsin-Madison Hospital's University Affiliated Program, the Waisman Center, and two research and clinical postdoctoral experiences at Washington University in St. Louis and at Johns Hopkins Hospital's University Affiliated Program, the Kennedy Krieger Institute, more than prepared me well for the basics of this role.) The next question was whether I would be willing to look for hands-on, in-school experience once I was hired and settled into my new position. I said "yes." Inside, I was overjoyed with the realization that this university was committed to keeping their professors out of the ivory tower.

I have now been an assistant professor in the School Psychology Program at the University of Wisconsin-La Crosse for five years. I have taught or co-taught 4-6 classes per semester with no classes being the same within the same year. Needless to say, I have been "kept busy" with my "regular" teaching, service, and research responsibilities. I managed to work in some limited "hands-on experiences" intermittently in the last five years, but not enough to let myself believe I was close to meeting NASP's training standards for faculty. According to these standards, faculty members are to have at least two years of in-school experience as school psychologists. I have always assumed this meant two "full-time" years.

The reality is that at this point, I have had no full-time experience working in schools. The longer I teach, the more confident I am in the areas that I teach and the less confident and updated I feel in the areas that I do not teach. Beyond my practicum experiences as a graduate student, my experience working with children is primarily limited to hospital work with children with developmental delays or behavioral challenges. These were excellent and relevant experiences to have; however, they did not give me the diverse types of direct experiences that I am now requiring of my graduate students.

Addressing the Need

With the unswerving support of my Program Director, Dr. Milton Dehn, my Department Chair, Dr. Betsy Morgan, and my Dean, Dr. John Magerus, I considered various options to increase my experience. For reasons too lengthy to describe in this article, I finally decided to recruit a capable local school psychologist, Ms. Susan Wabunsee, for a one-year swap. Incredible barriers were anticipated from the school. Within a short time, however, Ms. Wabunsee and I were staring at each other in disbelief. The proposal was approved by the school board without a hitch.

The arrangement is that I remain employed and paid by the university and Ms. Wabunsee remains employed and paid by her school district. We are not officially employed by each other's place of employment. We are simply swapping duties for one year. Ms. Wabunsee's courses were selected to overlap with her experience, interest, and skills. Dr. Robert Dixon and Dr. Milton Dehn, the other faculty members in the school psychology program, were flexible in the assignment of their courses to help accommodate this one-year arrangement.

CONTINUED ON PAGE 137
Anticipated Benefits of the "Swap"

I expect that spending a full year working as a school psychologist will benefit my students, my department, and the school psychology program in the same ways it will benefit me. First, this experience will help me come closer to meeting the NASP standards for trainers. I will likely request a similar leave in the future to obtain the second year of required experience. Second, it will help me appreciate the daily culture and realities of schools. I will bring these realities into my examples in every lecture, and if needed, will update assignments to be consistent with those realities. Third, I will better understand current student, teacher, and parent concerns, and practice interviewing, assessment, and intervention approaches I teach. This will give me the opportunities to refresh and update my applied skills and to, again, bring these experiences back into the classroom as examples. Fourth, I will update myself on techniques in school psychology areas that I do not directly teach but that are used in the schools and on which I supervise students during their practica. I strongly believe that working in a school will improve my teaching in another important way: my students will respect my assignments and my opinions on topics even more, knowing that I have had this very recent applied experience. Finally, during the year I practice, I will develop and collect work samples that I can present to students. Ms. Wabaunsee will be providing students with rich examples from her own experiences in the courses she teaches.

The school district and Ms. Wabaunsee benefit also. The school district will have a very enthusiastic new person on board with new ideas and approaches to working with children. The parents and teachers will have access to someone with new perspectives as well. Ms. Wabaunsee will update her knowledge significantly and return to her position the following year more refreshed.

Preparation for the Swap

Ms. Wabaunsee and I are meeting regularly to prepare for this swap. We live a comfortable driving distance from one another and plan to continue to guide one another in our duties throughout the year. If there is interest by the readers, a potential future article could address how each of us prepared for the swap.
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HELP US OUT

Ms. Wabaunsee and I both anticipate an exciting and challenging year. We will happily report on issues that interest readers. Please feel free to email me with suggestions on topics related to this swap at miller.bett@uwlex.edu or at DeBoer.Bett@uwlex.edu. If this swap is successful, it may serve as a model for other trainers to follow in the future.
American Academy of School Psychology
Response to Report of the President’s Commission on Excellence in Special Education

The American Academy of School Psychology (AASP) consists of all holders of the Diplomate in School Psychology awarded by the American Board of Professional Psychology (ABPP). The AASP maintains a charge to promote the highest professional standards in school psychology. In so doing, the AASP strives to represent a balanced voice based on the views of very experienced professionals who are broadly trained to blend scientific evidence with clinical experience in school psychology practice.

The AASP is greatly concerned about certain aspects of The Report of the President's Commission on Excellence in Special Education (hereafter called the President's Commission Report or the Report) that propose drastic changes to the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). This position paper represents the views of the majority (92%) of members of AASP and its ad hoc committee on this issue. We seek to clarify these concerns and offer our recommendation about needed changes in IDEA.

The President’s Commission Report recommends that the special education identification process should be drastically changed, particularly in the area of learning disabilities. Although we agree with the Report’s emphasis on early intervention to prevent academic failure, we are concerned with the Report’s focus on the shortcomings of an IQ or composite score in identifying the core processes that cause learning problems. The Report’s perspective on this matter appears to reflect the thinking of only one constituency in a long, ongoing debate about the nature, diagnosis, education and treatment of students with learning disabilities.

We contend that there is definitive evidence that children with bona fide learning disabilities, as currently understood by most neurologists, psychologists and researchers, have problems with typical academic learning. These problems may be biologically-based and affect, in widely-varying degrees and patterns, the ability to process, remember, and produce information. Further, the diagnosis of disability and development of interventions in this area is complex and is dependent on the scientific knowledge and practical experience of skilled practitioners. For example, children with learning disabilities may have concomitant psycho-educational problems such as Attention-Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder, behavior management needs, and/or low self-esteem.

We contend that appropriately trained and knowledgeable school psychologists, often as part of a multidisciplinary team, are needed to assess children, adolescents, and young adults with potential learning disorders in order to determine the presence, nature, and severity of a disability. Specific knowledge gained from the assessment provides a scientific basis for recommended treatment and intervention plans. Assessment is a complex process that requires multiple sources of information, including standardized, norm-referenced tests, interviews, observations, curriculum-based assessments, and informed clinical judgment. Because of this, we believe that some of the delimiting statements in the Report will be damaging to the effective utilization of a comprehensive approach to the identification and education of individuals with learning disabilities.

Use Norm-Referenced Tests Appropriately in Learning Disabilities Assessment and Programming

The AASP believes that psycho-educational assessment, using psychometrically sound norm-referenced instruments, is an important part of school interventions. These are tests that have been nationally standardized on large numbers of individuals to derive a measurement tool that is dependable and accurate. Reliable and valid psychometric instruments provide documentation of both ability and disability, assist in identifying needed services and interventions, and provide the necessary benchmarks for yearly monitoring of academic performance. As part of a comprehensive assessment, reliable and valid tests are necessary for an objective understanding of the core psychological processes that influence learning. This is known as cognitive assessment.

Cognitive assessment provides useful information about an individual’s capabilities including, but
not limited to, an overall measure of general intellectual ability. Rather than testing solely to obtain an IQ score, cognitive assessments should more appropriately be used to identify the core processes or functions causing an academic problem that are amenable to intervention or that require educational accommodations. Importantly, norm-referenced documentation of limitations in cognitive processing is required for legal protections and the provision of a rationale for the need for accommodations. In addition, cognitive assessments provide the link between identification of special education needs and intervention plans. Students’ strengths and weaknesses in cognitive abilities are used to design specific academic interventions. Strengths and weaknesses in different cognitive processes are linked to identification and treatment of specific learning disabilities, including memory storage and retrieval, auditory processing, processing speed, attention, abstract reasoning, and language development. Finally, cognitive tests are useful for early identification of information-processing weaknesses (such as a delay in auditory processing or phonological awareness) that can lead to academic failure if left untreated.

Although not all referral concerns require norm-referenced assessment as a precondition of intervention plans or instructional modifications, in order to qualify for special education services, students should be evaluated on an individual basis and objectively assessed for the presence and severity of intra-individual differences in cognitive abilities, language capabilities, behavior, and areas of academic achievement. Additionally, a comprehensive evaluation should include multiple sources of information, including standardized, norm-referenced tests, interviews, observations, curriculum-based assessments, and informed clinical judgment. However, the core of a comprehensive evaluation is an accurate, norm-referenced assessment of student strengths and weaknesses in a variety of cognitive processes.

**Eliminate the Mandated Discrepancy Formula but Not Comprehensive Assessment**

Many Fellows of the AASP are senior school psychologists who share an historical perspective on the Education of All Handicapped Children Act (EAHCA, now IDEA). In 1975, when the EAHCA was first enacted, many states reported problems with establishing objective criteria for identifying a learning disability. With the goal of establishing objective criteria for identifying children for services, the criterion of a discrepancy between intellectual ability and achievement was suggested in an effort to help make a distinction between children with learning disabilities and those with other academic problems. From the outset, however, the concept of an ability/achievement discrepancy was controversial. The criterion has resulted in much dissatisfaction, particularly as it is interpreted in various state statutes and implemented by local education agency practices. Today, conceptualizations of the presence and nature of specific learning disabilities are changing. The concept of an ability/achievement discrepancy has outlived its usefulness and should no longer be used as a necessary condition for provision of special services.

**Broaden Rather Than Delimit the Tools and Techniques Available to Diagnose Learning Disabilities**

Based on the language suggested in the IDEA, many state regulations required that determination of a learning disability to be dependent on a specific degree of discrepancy between a child’s intellectual ability and achievement. In many states and local education agencies, this created a litmus test for identification of a learning disability. In some local education agency practices, the presence of a defined ability/achievement discrepancy was used as the sole, determining criteria for service provision. As a consequence, these local education agencies have been out of compliance with the intent of the federal legislation because they have been using a single score to drive eligibility decisions (An ability/achievement comparison between any two tests results in a single discrepancy score). In contrast, the IDEA [300.541 (a) (3)] requires that a variety of sources must be considered in making eligibility decisions. Thus, the sole use of a discrepancy score, despite claims that it represents results from two tests, violates the requirement that eligibility must not be based on a single test or procedure.

Consequently, the AASP recommends that the criterion of an ability/achievement discrepancy should not be viewed as essential to qualify a student for services. Many students with neurologically based learning disorders do not exhibit an ability/achievement discrepancy. A learning disability can affect intelligence test performance as well as achievement test performance. Scores on both ability and performance measures may be lowered by the disability to the extent that there is not a severe discrepancy between the two. Granted, however, an
School Psychology Related Articles in the APA Monitor and Monitor on Psychology, 1974-2002

Tom Fagan and Tim Allen
University of Memphis

The following list of references was compiled from a page-by-page search of the APA Monitor and Monitor on Psychology collection of Tom Fagan. Articles were selected that had relevance to school psychology and a copy was made of each article for archival storage. The project was undertaken in order to cull the most important items before discarding the remainder of the APA newsletter collection. The list is intended to assist school psychology researchers in identifying potentially useful items that appeared in the APA Monitor or Monitor on Psychology over the past 30 years. Though selective, the items pertain to many areas of school psychology, including assessment, ethics, roles and functions, training, and accreditation. A review of the list reveals that items specifically about school psychology were infrequent in the early years of the APA newsletter, but have increased in frequency in the past 15 years. This probably reflects the efforts of the APA Division of School Psychology to increase the visibility of the field and the ongoing activities of the Education and Practice Directorates. The items provide perspective on several events, including the Larry P. case, ethics revisions, comprehensive service provision, personnel shortages, and the perennial master’s issue within the APA.

To our knowledge, libraries do not maintain collections of association newsletters. The APA Archives has a complete collection of the APA Monitor and Monitor on Psychology (dating to the late 1960s), but they are accessible only by visiting the archives in Washington, DC. The publication changed its title and shifted from a newspaper to a magazine format in January, 2000 (Volume 31, No. 1). A single copy of the articles listed will be provided on request as per an agreement with the APA Permissions Office. For copies, contact Tom Fagan, 202 Psychology, University of Memphis, Memphis, TN 38152-3230. 901-678-4676, or tom-fagan@mail.psyc.memphis.edu. Except for postage, there is no charge for this service. Complete collections of the Division 16 (APA) and NASP newsletters are also permanently maintained and accessible.
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Council votes to scrub work on state licensing standards, approves two divisions. (1979). *APA Monitor, 10*(11), 1, 7.
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During Fall 2002, activities for the 2002 conference on the Future of School Psychology will be held, including a pre-conference webcast on Thursday, September 19 (2:00 p.m. EST) and the conference itself on November 14-16 in Indianapolis. It has been 25 years since school psychology last held a major conference to reflect on the profession and to develop an agenda for the future. School psychology has undergone a tremendous growth in terms of membership in our profession and the vision that we have for the work that we do. The 2002 future's conference will allow us to evaluate our field and develop strategic actions for the future.

About 65 school psychologists have been selected for on-site participation in the conference. However, we invite ALL SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGISTS to be active participants in the conference.

We conceptualize the 2002 School Psychology Future’s Conference as a multi-site collaboration. Keynote presentations will be webcast from Indianapolis, and web-based electronic forums will allow interaction across all multiple sites. Internet technology will allow numerous school psychologists from across the United States—and around the world—to contribute to the conference, be part of broad-scale activities for the future of school psychology, and develop local and state implementation of the action plans resulting from the conference.

There are many ways that school psychologists can participate, using the conference website at http://www.indiana.edu/~futures/:

Prior to the conference:
• Provide information about needs in your school district or organization and suggest directions we should take in school psychology. Visit the website and select “E-Forum” to submit your responses to the Focus Group Questionnaire or post messages to the E-Forum.
• Review keynote papers and other reading materials. Access these materials at the conference website www.indiana.edu/~futures/—select "Papers."

During the conference:
• Participate in "realtime" conference activities using one of two remote participation options. However, we strongly encourage the first option that involves gathering with a group of other school psychologists.
  • Universities, state agencies, and school districts with a distance education classroom outfitted with POLYCOM equipment can host a remote group site where local groups of practitioners, university faculty, or graduate students participate in all aspects of the conference. Remote sites will be strongly encouraged to participate in the webcast of the pre-conference keynote presentation on September 19. Participation in the pre-conference webcast will allow any technical difficulties to be resolved prior to the November conference. If for any reason a remote site experiences technical difficulties, the pre-conference address will be archived and available shortly after the webcast takes place. On Thursday, November 14 the first session of the conference in Indianapolis begins at 3:00 p.m. (EST), and the final session will conclude at 5:00 p.m. on Saturday, November 16. Remote group sites will view live webcasts of all presentations. When there are times for breakout sessions, participants at the remote sites will be able to engage in the same group tasks with the same materials as the on-site participants in Indianapolis. Through an electronic forum, remote sites will be able to interact with each other and with the Indianapolis site. If you are interested in hosting a remote group site, please contact Jack Cummings (cummings@indiana.edu) for more information.
  • A second, although less preferred option is for you to participate as an individual from your home or office computer by viewing live webcasts of conference keynote addresses and sending emails to on-site participants during the conference. You must be connected to the Internet in order to view the presentations. A DSL or a cable modem is recommended. For more information, go to the conference website, www.indiana.edu/~futures/ and click on "Remote Sites."
Progress was reported in Council in several domains. Following five years of work, Council approved the revision of the Ethical Principles of Psychologists and Code of Conduct. Within Division 16, appreciation is extended to Dr. Thomas Oakland for his work on the APA ethics revision committee on the behalf of school psychology, as well as to the ethics committee of Division 16 for the numerous drafts to which they have provided review and response over the years. Council also approved as policy Guidelines on Multicultural Education, Training, Research, Practice and Organizational Change for Psychologists. Finally, a new CEO-designate, Dr. Norman Anderson was introduced to Council. Although there appeared to be very strong support for the selection of Norman Anderson to replace retiring CEO, Ray Fowler, finalization of the decision awaits formal ratification by Council members via mail ballot. Dr. Norman Anderson is former head of the Division of the Social and Behavioral Sciences at NIH.

Council also approved several initiatives related to APAGS, the graduate student organization. These included support for a magazine devoted to graduate student issues, and approval of a bylaws change to permit a representative from APAGS to be a voting member of Council and a non-voting member of the Board of Directors. These by-law changes will need to be ratified by the entire membership of APA, so be aware that you will be asked to vote on these changes. Your Council representatives recommend approval of both measures.

Considerable Council time was devoted to an update on the financial picture of APA. Like many similar associations, APA is experiencing a significantly different financial picture than predicted prior to the events of the past year. To alleviate the financial stress, Council approved the following measures: a) a $10.00 increase in annual dues, and b) refinancing of the two buildings owned by APA.

Additionally, APA has engaged in a very successful voluntary resignation/retirement program to reduce staff costs, reduced APA Board meetings from twice to once for the year 2003, and cancelled several conferences including the Education Leadership Conference.

Council approved the following Division 16 nominations for fellow status: Mary Beth Doll and Thomas Powers. Our congratulations to both for their well-deserved honor.
ability/achievement discrepancy can sometimes be used to document a type of intra-individual variability that may have educational implications. Alternatively, other evidence of intra-individual variability in cognitive processing and academic achievement, such as evidence of specific processing deficits that contribute to lower ability and achievement scores, should be acceptable evidence toward documenting the presence of a learning disability.

As experienced school psychologists, we believe the development of effective interventions is dependent on a variety of approaches. Therefore, we are always looking to broaden our perspectives rather than to be bound by legislative mandates, which may reflect only one particular methodology or interpretation of research. We caution that any single, mandated method for assessing and diagnosing learning disabilities that excludes reliance on reliable and valid assessments will be inadequate. Although alternative identification procedures have been proposed (and we do not rule out their use to compliment other procedures), none has achieved general acceptance in education or professional psychology. None of the proposed alternatives meet the criterion of technical adequacy. Any alternative procedure that does not include an emphasis on technically sound assessment will necessarily produce unprofitable variability in service delivery due to reliability, validity, and administration problems. The alternative procedures may be more likely to deny services to students with specific learning disabilities while granting services to students who do not show evidence of special educational needs. Ultimately, less reliance on comprehensive, norm-referenced assessment procedures will lead to less specificity in regard to the nature of the learning problem and, consequently, greater inequities in service delivery.

**Recommendation**

The AASP recommends that the current IDEA regulations remain essentially unchanged. Most current disability classification categories in the IDEA are well-supported by psychological diagnostic criteria. Further, we support the use of norm-referenced cognitive assessments and complementary alternative measures for determining special education program eligibility and program planning. We also support the use of norm-referenced assessments of academic achievement and complementary alternative measures to provide the necessary benchmarks for yearly performance monitoring, as suggested in the Report. We recommend that the ability/achievement discrepancy formula should be eliminated as a mandate. Language should be included in the reauthorized legislation that discourages the use of an ability/achievement discrepancy formula as the sole or determining measure of the presence of learning disabilities. To wit:

**The American Academy of School Psychology** recommends that the current IDEA regulations be reauthorized with some amendments. In particular, we recommend that the current regulations on criteria for determining eligibility for students with specific learning disabilities [300.540, 541, 542] should be amended to discourage the use of an ability-achievement discrepancy formula as a sole or determining measure of the presence of learning disabilities.

September 17, 2002

American Academy of School Psychology Ad-hoc Committee on the Report of the President's Commission on Excellence in Special Education
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During my second year at Indiana State University, I had a unique opportunity to travel abroad. I visited many countries, and while visiting the Philippines, I came across a little boy covered with black dirt. He was directing traffic wearing only a pair of underwear. As he worked, he held out his hand in order to receive spare change from tourists. My heart sank at such a sight, and the pervasive thought in my head was that this child should be in school. My naïve thoughts shielded me from thinking that such a tragedy could happen in my own country.

Unfortunately, there are many other tragedies that children can face in this country. Like many of you, I have been challenged during my clinical experiences to advocate for those who cannot help themselves. I have seen how the effects of poverty impact a family’s access to mental health care. I have also confronted the devastation of abuse. While each of us can recite our battle stories, the truth is that we are supported by one another. Each one of us responded to a call to become a school psychologist, and in today’s world, I cannot think of a greater calling. In fact, I cannot think of a greater challenge.

Despite the odds, I do believe in what we do, and I have faith that we can make a positive difference in schools. As the needs of children change, our profession needs to change. This November, school psychology organizations and selected nominees will convene in Indianapolis to discuss a plan for service delivery. The Future’s Conference will address many issues regarding children, education, and mental health. If you have not already contributed to this conference by sharing your ideas, or having your university register as a remote site, please do so at http://www.indiana.edu/%7Efutures/home.html. This is school psychology’s opportunity to impact the lives of many children, and you are invited to participate in this monumental event.

As the SAP representative, I am honored to be attending the conference. This conference is considering input from a variety of perspectives, and like all of you, I wish for the student perspective to be presented. Therefore, it is important to receive your input. You may post your ideas on the SAP listerv, or you may e-mail me at hardt13@juno.com. I intend to collect everyone’s ideas, and construct a working document in order to prepare for the Future’s Conference.

In addition to participating in the Future’s Conference, you are also invited to partake in the many professional opportunities presented by SAP. This year, SAP will offer research and presentation awards. SAP will also offer publication opportunities and other venues in order to promote child advocacy, program evaluation, diversity, and leadership. Several members have already benefited from being actively involved in SAP. Three students received over $300 in order to fund their research; 21 students received support with travel expenses to APA; and 12 students presented at the SAP Convention. The edition of SAP News containing A. Alexander Beaujean’s interview with Arthur Jensen will be circulating among psychology programs in Asia and Korea. These opportunities are available to all students in school psychology, and it is up to each member to maximize the potential of these opportunities.

Additionally, SAP members will also benefit this year from a strong Executive Board. The officers are outstanding individuals committed to mak-
ing an impact in the lives of children. Therefore, if you are not yet a Student Affiliate of Division 16, I urge you to become one. If your university does not have a SASP chapter, you may establish one by completing an application. You may find applications on the SASP web site (www.saspweb.org) and in SASP News. SASP will assist you with the establishment and the development of your local chapter. SASP's purpose is to enhance the professional development of students in school psychology so that we can better serve the needs of children. However, SASP can only be as strong as its membership; hence, your contribution is important. True, academic schedules are rigorous and time consuming, but now is your time to make a difference and grow professionally. Make SASP part of your academic experience this year, and reap the benefits from your membership.

SASP 2002 CONVENTION CHICAGO

Denise Charles
Indiana State University

This past August, APA hosted its Annual Convention in Chicago “the city of neighborhoods.” The goals of the SASP 2002 Convention were to provide a forum in which students may present their scientific and scholarly work, to present a general program that would be informative and of interest to all attendees, to facilitate the exchange of experience relating to the applications of school psychology, and to provide a place where SASP business could be conducted efficiently.

SASP activities at APA consisted of our Annual SASP Convention, held on Friday, August 23, 2002 in the Division 16 Hospitality Suite. During the Convention, SASP members disseminated student research on topics such as School Psychologists and Program Evaluation: Introducing the Quality Improvement Toolkit (Roach & White, 2002) and Ethnic Minority Gay and Lesbian Adolescents: Challenges to Integrating Identity (Roach & Gibson, 2002). SASP members also presented on matters surrounding Grant Funding for Your Dissertation: Catching Big and Little Fish (Hazel, Gallagher, & Lerew, 2002), Examining the Culture of Girls: Issues and Interventions (Lasso & Pendry, 2002), and The Life and Scholarship of Arthur Jensen (Beaujean, 2002).

Our Distinguished Guest Speaker for the SASP Convention was Dr. Patti L. Harrison from the University of Alabama. Dr. Harrison presented information on the upcoming Future’s Conference, which will be a historical opportunity for student input on critical issues facing the field of school psychology. During the SASP Convention, the Executive Committee awarded each student presenter a Travel Award. Research Award winners were also recognized during the SASP Convention. Dr. Harrison was honored for her overall contribution to school psychology and Dr. Ena Vasquez-Nuttall was awarded our Lifetime Service Award for her brilliant idea to begin a student organization within Division 16, later developing into Student Affiliates of School Psychology (SASP).

During the APA Convention, the SASP Executive Committee convened to welcome incoming officers and layout goals and objectives for the 2002-2003 academic year. An open invitation to our SASP Business Meeting was extended to all local chapters, SASP members, and interested students attending the APA Convention. The business meeting provided an opportunity to discuss student recruitment and membership incentives.

Overall the SASP 2002 Convention was a great success! As the SASP 2002 Convention Chair, I would like to take this opportunity to extend a big thank you to the wonderful student presenters, who truly reflect the high caliber of research and practice within the field of school psychology. I would also like to thank Dr. Patti Harrison for her insight and expertise, Dr. Ena Vasquez-Nuttall for her mentorship, Division 16 Executive Committee for their sup-
port, Dr. Tammy Hughes for her organization and assistance, Indiana State University and Mr. David R. Harden for their technology which enabled the SASP Convention to move into the 21st century, and the Psychological Corporation for feeding our mind and bodies.

Under the leadership of SASP President Gena Ehrhardt, SASP Convention plans for the APA 2003 Convention are underway. The APA 2003 Convention will be held August 7–10 in Toronto, Ontario, Canada. For additional information on the SASP 2003 Convention please contact Meredith Cohen, Convention Chair at cohen.me@neu.edu or visit the SASP website at saspweb.org.

**SASP: 2003 CALL FOR PRESENTATION PROPOSALS**

SASP Convention Affairs announces the “Call for Proposals” for the 2003 SASP Convention, which will be held during the 111th Annual APA Convention, August 7–10 in Toronto, Ontario, Canada. Convention activities this year will include a formal address by our keynote speaker, presentations, and a reception. Abstracts for proposed presentations or symposia will be considered for the SASP Convention if received by January 15, 2003. Selected presentations will receive travel assistance to the APA Convention. This “Call for Proposals” is open to all SASP members and graduate students in School Psychology.

**GUIDELINES FOR PROPOSAL SUBMISSION**

Types of Sessions: The following are descriptions of all of the types of sessions that can be held at the convention.

**Individual Presentations:**

Abstracts submitted to SASP will be grouped together by topic. Time allotments for presentations shall be determined by the division’s program chairperson in collaboration with the presenter.

**Symposia or Panel Discussions:**

A symposium or panel discussion is a focused session in which participants present their views about a common theme, issue, or question. This format consists of an introduction by the chairperson followed by the participant’s presentations, a discussion between participants and audience, and concludes with a summary by the chairperson. This format is not a paper-reading session. Participants should prepare well in advance so that the chairperson can prepare a coherent summary, highlighting the essential points.

**Poster Presentations:**

Presentations will be focused around an informative topic that is integral to the field of school psychology. Participants present their views about a common theme, related issues, or question. Poster sessions allow presenters and attendees to engage in extended discussions regarding the author’s presentation which is presented in illustrated format on a
poster board. If your submission is accepted for presentation in a poster session, SASP will send detailed instructions to assist you in preparing your materials in the required format.

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS FOR PRESENTATION PROPOSALS

- Submissions are classified as individual presentations, poster presentations, or symposia.
- A cover sheet, provided in this Call, must be submitted with a proposal.
- A summary on 8-1/2 x 11-inch paper, one side only, double-spaced, of the proposed presentation or program must accompany the cover sheet.
- Paper and symposia submissions should include five copies of a 300-500 general summary or abstract.
- Titles of presentations must not exceed 10 words.
- Accommodation request. Please indicate any accommodations for a physical disability that would facilitate your participation.
- Participants are reminded to adhere to APA's principles of ethics with regard to avoiding sexism, racism, and so forth in presentations. Specific suggestions for avoiding sexist language are on pages 50-51 of the Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association, 4th Edition.
- Notification of Proposal Status. With each proposal, include a contact's e-mail address. Presenters and discussants will be notified in this manner.

PRESENTATION PROPOSAL COVER SHEET

2003 SASP Annual Convention

Fill in all information requested below for all individuals. Submit any additional pages along with this form in order to provide SASP with complete information on all individuals. Information not appearing on this form and its attachments, including degrees and affiliations, will not appear in the Convention Program.

1. TITLE OF PRESENTATION: (Title must not exceed 10 words.)

2. PRINCIPAL (PRESENTING) AUTHOR: First name/Initial/Last name

Highest educational degree

Complete mailing address: Street/City/State/ZIP

Phone numbers: Office/Home

E-mail/Fax number Social Security Number: (For Funding Purposes)

Please check membership status: [ ] APA Member [ ] Division 16 Member [ ] Nonmember [ ] SASP Member

3. CO-AUTHORS (Please list in order):

Highest educational degree

Complete mailing address: Street/City/State/ZIP

Phone numbers: Office/Home

E-mail/Fax number Social Security Number: (For Funding Purposes)

4. ACCOMMODATION REQUEST: (please specify)

THIS INFORMATION MUST BE RECEIVED BY JANUARY 15, 2003

Send proposal to:
Meredith Cohen, SASP Convention Chairperson
48 Thomas Park South
Boston, MA 02127
cohen.me@neu.edu

CONTINUED ON PAGE 150
SASP: 2003 CALL FOR RESEARCH PROPOSALS

SASP Convention Affairs announces the "Call for Research Proposals" for the 2003 SASP Convention, which will be held during the 111th Annual APA Convention, August 7–10 in Toronto, Ontario, Canada. A total of $1,000 will be given to proposals that address the following areas: scholarship, methodology, contribution to school psychology, theoretical application, and empirical support. Selected research proposals will receive funding to support the cost of research and for travel to the APA convention. Abstracts for proposed presentations will be considered for the SASP Convention and publication in SASP News if received by January 15, 2003. This "Call for Research Proposals" is open to all SASP members and graduate students in School Psychology.

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS FOR RESEARCH PROPOSALS

- Submissions are classified as research paper presentations.
- A cover sheet, provided in this Call, must be submitted with a proposal.
- A summary on 8-1/2 x 11-inch paper, one side only, double-spaced, of the proposed presentation or program must accompany the cover sheet.
- Paper and symposia submissions should include five copies of a 500-1000 general summary or abstract.
- Titles of presentations must not exceed 10 words.
- Accommodation request. Please indicate any accommodations for a physical disability that would facilitate your participation.
- Participants are reminded to adhere to APA’s principles of ethics with regard to avoiding sexism, racism, and so forth in presentations. Specific suggestions for avoiding sexist language are on pages 50-51 of the Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association, 4th Edition.
- Notification of Proposal Status. With each proposal, include a contact’s e-mail address. Presenters and discussants will be notified in this manner.

RESEARCH PROPOSAL COVER SHEET

Fill in all information requested below for all individuals. Submit any additional pages along with this form in order to provide SASP with complete information on all individuals. Information not appearing on this form and its attachments, including degrees and affiliations, will not appear in the Convention Program.

1. TITLE OF RESEARCH PRESENTATION: (Title must not exceed 10 words.)

2. PRINCIPAL (PRESENTING) AUTHOR: First name/Initial/Last name

Highest educational degree

Complete mailing address: Street/City/State/ZIP

Phone numbers: Office/Home

E-mail/Fax number Social Security Number: (For Funding Purposes)

3. CO-AUTHORS (Please list in order):

Highest educational degree

Complete mailing address: Street/City/State/ZIP

Phone numbers: Office/Home

E-mail/Fax number Social Security Number: (For Funding Purposes)

4. ACCOMMODATION REQUEST: (please specify)

5. 500-1000 WORD SUMMARY: Your summary should address the following questions:
   • What is the theoretical premise of your research?
   • What is your methodology?
   • How can your research be empirically supported?
   • How will your research make a contribution to school psychology?

THIS INFORMATION MUST BE RECEIVED BY JANUARY 15, 2003

Send proposal to: Meredith Cohen, SASP Convention Chairperson, 48 Thomas Park South, Boston, MA 02127; cohen.me@neu.edu
APA DIVISION 16 SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGY

Objectives

The ultimate goal of all Division activity is the enhancement of the status of children, youth, and adults as learners and productive citizens in schools, families, and communities.

The objectives of the Division of School Psychology are:

a. to promote and maintain high standards of professional education and training within the specialty, and to expand appropriate scientific and scholarly knowledge and the pursuit of scientific affairs;

b. to increase effective and efficient conduct of professional affairs, including the practice of psychology within the schools, among other settings, and collaboration/cooperation with individuals, groups, and organizations in the shared realization of Division objectives;

c. to support the ethical and social responsibilities of the specialty, to encourage opportunities for the ethnic minority participation in the specialty, and to provide opportunities for professional fellowship; and

d. to encourage and effect publications, communications, and conferences regarding the activities, interests, and concerns within the specialty on a regional, national, and international basis.

MEMBERSHIP APPLICATION

Please print or type:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LAST NAME</th>
<th>FIRST NAME</th>
<th>M.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ADDRESS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CITY</th>
<th>STATE</th>
<th>Z</th>
<th>IP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PHONE

APA MEMBERSHIP NO.(IF APPLICABLE):

Please check status:

___Member $45
___Fellow $45
___Professional Associate $55
___Student Affiliate $30 (Complete Below)

FACULTY ENDORSEMENT

INSTITUTION                      EXPECTED YR. OF GRADUATION

Please complete and mail this application with your check payable to AP

Attn: Division 16 Membership
APA Division Services Office
750 First Street, NE
Washington, DC 20002-4242
Following the conference:

- View archives of the webcasts of conference keynote presentations and read additional conference papers on our website.

The following dates and times for conference keynote addresses will help you plan your schedule for remote participation in the conference. Go to the conference website and click on 'Remote Site' a few minutes before the scheduled time to view the webcasts live. Archives of the webcasts will also be available for viewing at a later date.

Pre-Conference Keynote Address Webcast

**Thursday, September 19, 2002, (2:00 – 3:00 p.m.)**

Thomas Kratochwill, Ph.D., Chair of the Task Force on Evidence-Based Interventions and distinguished researcher, will address research and practice integration.

Tentative Times for Conference Keynote Address Webcasts

**Thursday, November 14, 2002**

(3:00 – 4:00 p.m.)

Michael Curtis, Ph.D., a Past-President of NASP and noted researcher on professional issues in school psychology. Dr. Curtis will provide data on personnel shortages in school psychology in relation to training and practice and to outline possible effects of these shortages on the field and on services to children.

(7:30-8:30 p.m.)

Robert Sternberg, Ph.D., President-Elect of APA and noted researcher on schools and education. Dr. Sternberg will provide a context for school psychology’s role in addressing the needs of children, families, and schools and outline ideas on the needs and issues facing schools.

**Friday, November 15, 2002**

(10:30 – 11:30 a.m.)

Deborah Crockett, Ph.D., a Past-President of NASP and experienced practitioner. Dr. Crockett has been asked to outline critical issues children will face in the 21st century and to propose roles for schools psychology, given the constraints of the personnel shortage.

(12:45 – 1:45 p.m.)

Sandra Christenson, Ph.D., noted researcher on the link between families and schools in meeting the needs of children. Dr. Christenson will outline critical issues facing children in the 21st century, with particular emphasis on the role of parents in meeting the learning and mental health needs of children.

NOTES: (1) All times are Eastern Standard. (2) On-site and remote group site conference participants will participate in breakout and planning sessions before and after keynote addresses and all day on Saturday, November 16, 2002.

CONTINUED FROM PAGE 143

“Participate in the 2002 School Psychology Future’s Conference From a Remote Site—Or Your Own Computer”

believe Susan Gorin is one of the best executive directors in existence. She does a wonderful job and she is an extremely nice person. I have worked with two NASP Presidents during my presidency, both for whom I have tremendous respect. Charlie Deupree and Diane Smallwood have done a great job leading NASP and I feel I have had a good working relationship with each. In addition, NASP, as an organization, has done so much for the promotion of school psychology and the betterment of the profession and children. They are the main reason entry-level training standards have been raised to the specialist level. Their books and other materials are first rate, and their efforts on behalf of children and schools are enormous. I have been a member of NASP since 1983 and plan on maintaining my membership.

Finally, I would like to assure everyone that when I step down at the end of December, the Division will be in excellent hands. Elaine Clark will become President on January 1, 2003 and I am sure will do an outstanding job. We are fortunate to have someone of her capabilities taking over as President. Thanks again for trusting me with the leadership of Division 16 for the past year. I hope I have lived up to your expectations and represented the Division as well as my predecessors. I am proud to call myself a school psychologist and to be a member of Division 16. I will continue to do my best to be an advocate for children and psychology in the schools. My year as President may be just about over, but hopefully my contributions to school psychology will continue
People & Places
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Terry Stinnett reports that Oklahoma State University’s School Psychology Program and faculty are pleased to announce that Eric Mesmer, Ph.D., has joined their ranks as an assistant professor. Eric is a recent graduate of the University of South Florida and had been working as a consultant and research analyst in the Washington DC area. As an added bonus to the university, Dr. Heidi Mesmer, has also been appointed as an assistant professor of literacy in the School of Teaching and Curriculum Leadership.

At St. John’s University, Dr. Ray DiGiuseppe has become chair of the psychology department. Also at St. John’s, Dr. Mark Terjesen has become Director of the School Psychology program.

Lisa G. Bischoff reports that Dr. Alisha Ford, graduate of The University of Southern Mississippi’s School Psychology Program, has joined the faculty of Indiana State University as an assistant professor of school psychology. Jennifer Freeland, soon-to-be graduate of Mississippi State University’s School Psychology Program has joined the faculty of Indiana State University as an assistant professor of school psychology.

Dianne Friedman reports on an exciting experience. She is a professor of psychology and a graduate trainer in school psychology at Radford University (RU). She has been at RU since 1988, and last year (school year 2001-2002) she took a leave to work as the educational psychologist in the American School in London (ASL), an independent pre-K through 12 American-style school in London. She served the Lower School, which was pre-K through 5th grade, and after 13 years of teaching at the university level, she reports an amazing experience to be back in a school practicing. No federal laws mandate the provision of any special education, but ASL tries to be inclusive, and has 3 combination pull-out/inclusion classes for children with varying degrees of learning difficulties. She reports this was a very enriching and educational experience being back in the field working with children, their families, and school personnel. She also reports having a lot of new “war stories” and cases to use as examples in her graduate teaching. She teaches consultation and clinical interventions with children.

Dr. Betty DeBoer, University of Wisconsin-La Crosse, is participating in a new program with a local school psychologist, Ms. Susan Wabuansee, for a 1-year swap. The arrangement is that Dr. DeBoer will remain employed and paid by the university and Ms. Wabuansee remains employed and paid by her school district. They are simply swapping duties for one year (2002-2003). Ms. Wabuansee and Dr. DeBoer both anticipate an exciting and challenging year. They will happily report on issues that interest readers. Please feel free to email them with suggestions on topics related to this swap at miller.bett@uwlax.edu or at DeBoer.Bett@uwlax.edu.

The School Psychology Program at The University of Hartford is delighted to announce that Natalie Politikos, Ph.D., recently joined the faculty. Since receiving her Ph.D. from The University of Northern Colorado, Dr. Politikos has been working as a practitioner with the Poudre School District in Colorado. Tony Crespi, Program Director reports that Natalie brings a strong experiential base in cognitive and neuropsychological assessment to the program and has already become involved with the Executive Board for the Connecticut Association of School Psychologists. “We are thoroughly delighted that Natalie has joined the faculty. She has already initiated several refinements to our curriculum and is rapidly becoming an indispensable member of our core faculty.”

Please email information for People & Places to Angeleque Akin-Little at: alittle@albany.edu
2002 Convention Highlights

1. Ron Palomares, from the APA Practice Directorate, receives a presidential award from Division 16 President, Steven Little
2. Nina Deligatti and Krisis Drewes, Hofstra school psychology students, presenting a poster on violence prevention
3. AGS poster winners Mathew Jacofsky and Michelle A. Moskin from St. Johns University with faculty sponsor Mark Terjesen
4. Gary Stoner, Thomas Kehle, and Dan Olympia enjoying the convention
5. AGS poster winner Renee Shaver from the University of Memphis receives her prize money from AGS representative, Matt Keller
6. The two Steves (Demers and Little) enjoy a cold one
7. Frank Gresham following his invited address with some fans

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Assistant Professor in School Psychology (two tenure-track lines, Spring or Fall 2003). These positions are for teaching, research, and supervision of students in the School of Psychology’s Psy.D. and M.A. Programs in School Psychology. Requirements include an earned doctorate in school psychology from a NASP-approved and/or APA-accredited school psychology program, and evidence of, or potential for, research and scholarly achievement commensurate with the rank of assistant professor. Experience as a practicing school psychologist and ability to contribute to the School’s Ph.D. Program in Clinical Psychology (NJ- and/or NY-licensed or license-eligible) are also desired. The School of Psychology is located on the Metropolitan Campus of Fairleigh Dickinson University in northern New Jersey, near New York City. In addition to offering undergraduate and graduate (master’s and doctoral) programs in New Jersey, the School offers an undergraduate and a graduate (M.A.) program in clinical psychology at the University’s branch campus in Tel Aviv, Israel. Screening of applications will begin immediately and continue until both positions are filled. To apply for either of these positions, forward a cover letter, curriculum vitae, and the names, addresses and phone numbers of three references to: Dr. Ron Dumont, Director, School Psychology Programs (T-WH-1-01), Fairleigh Dickinson University, 1000 River Road, Teaneck, NJ 07666. Fairleigh Dickinson University is an Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Employer committed to a diversified workforce.

School or Child Clinical Psychologist. The Department of Psychology at Syracuse University invites applications for a tenure-track, open-rank position to join their APA-accredited School Psychology training program and contribute to a collaborative research and training theme focusing on the Psychology of Children at Home and School (POCHTS). We are seeking a scholar with a strong scientist-practitioner philosophy and commitment to graduate training, background in School, Child Clinical, or Educational Psychology, and an established program of research. Preference will be given to individuals with research interests in the assessment and treatment of childhood disorders, pediatric issues in school or family settings, school- or family-based interventions for children’s behavioral and academic problems, or home-school collaboration. Record of or potential to obtain external funding is also desired. The candidate will be expected to advise and teach undergraduates as well as graduate students in School and Child Clinical Psychology, direct student theses and dissertations, supervise clinical practica, and serve on departmental committees. Applicants should submit a letter of application describing their research and teaching interests, a curriculum vitae, representative reprints/preprints, and three letters of reference to Brian K. Martens, Ph.D., Search Committee Chair, Department of Psychology, Syracuse University, 430 Huntington Hall, Syracuse, NY 13244-2340 (ph: 315-443-3835; email: bkmarten@psych.syr.edu). Applications will be reviewed beginning November 1, 2002 and will continue until the position is filled. Syracuse University is an equal-opportunity, affirmative-action institution and does not discriminate on the basis of race, creed, color, sex, national origin, religion, marital status, age, disability, sexual orientation, status as a disabled veteran, or a veteran of the Vietnam Era. The Psychology Department is committed to enhancing the diversity of its faculty and especially encourages applications from women, members of minority groups, and individuals with disabilities.

Educational Researcher. The Duke University Talent Identification Program (TIP) invites applications and nominations for a senior research scientist for the organization. The position will be filled as early as September 1, 2002. Duke TIP is a national leader in identifying academically gifted children and adolescents and providing innovative resources, services and campus-based and distance education programs. Duke TIP seeks an educational researcher to direct research and evaluation activities and consult with program staff. The candidate should have an earned doctorate in educational psychology or a closely related field, with expertise in educational research, measurement, multivariate statistics and quantitative research methods. Preference will be given to candidates with strong computing skills, experience with grant writing, and knowledge of the gifted field. This is a full-time non-tenure position with a competitive salary commensurate with experience. There are opportunities for supervision of Duke students, collaboration with Duke and other university faculty, and university teaching. A description of the Duke TIP program can be found on the web site www.tip.duke.edu. Please send a statement of interest including previous research experience and current interests, curriculum vitae, representative reprints/preprints, and the names of three references to: Shonda.desir@duke.edu and careers@mc.duke.edu - Refer to posting #CAM21703. Duke University is an Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Employer.
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2002 Convention Highlights

A. Richard Woodcock and the Riverside gang. THANKS for the party!!!!
B. Karen Callan Stoiber gives keynote address at the 2002 Institute
C. APA President-elect, Robert Sternberg, address 2002 Institute attendees
D. Lisa Bischoff and Bonnie Nastasi enjoy the Riverside Publishing sponsored party
E. AGS representatives. THANKS FOR THE SUPPORT!!!
F. University of Utah’s Outstanding Dissertation Award winner, Kevin Fenstermacher, with his faculty sponsor, Sue Sheridan.
G. Tanya Eckert receives 2002 Lightner Witmer Award from Division 16 VP Frank Worrell
H. George Hynd receives 2002 Senior Scientist Award from Division 16 VP Frank Worrell
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