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CELEBRATING THE LIFE OF
Nadine M. Lambert
1926-2006
School Psychology Loses a National Leader:  
Dr. Nadine Lambert was a Pioneer in CASP, NASP, and APA

Milton Wilson, CASP Historian

Dr. Nadine Lambert, a UC Berkeley professor and pioneer in the field of school psychology, died April 26, when her car was struck by a truck while she was on her way to the UC campus. She was 79.

Nadine was born in 1926, in Ephraim, Utah, and grew up in West Hollywood. She earned her B.A. in psychology from UCLA in 1948, her Master’s degree in education from Los Angeles State University in 1955, and her Ph.D. in psychology from USC in 1965.

Nadine was the founder of the school psychology program at Berkeley, which she created in 1964 and led for 40 years. At first, she was one of only two women in the Graduate School of Education. Her program became a model for training school psychologists, and produced more than 160 graduates, many of whom assumed positions of leadership in CASP and NASP.

One of the founders of the modern view of school psychology nationally, Nadine was instrumental in advocating that school psychologists should work with teachers to improve the classroom environment and to help students be successful, rather than simply pulling them out of class for testing and counseling.

I knew Nadine. In many ways, we were real contemporaries. We both served as CASP (then known as CASPP) president, convention chairman, committee chairman, and newsletter editor, and as consultants with the California Department of Education.

Although she was two years younger than I was, I always thought she was older. Maybe that’s because she came across to me as a big sister. (But then, she often seemed to be everybody’s big sister.)

As I recall, Nadine joined CASPP the same year that I did – 1956 – although accurate membership records were not kept at that time. (In 1978, when I was Membership Chairman, I compiled a chronological list of all the known members of CASPP, from 1950 to 1968, and assigned a “Member Number” to each one, from 1 to 880. Nadine’s number was 453; mine was 456.)

Nadine served CASPP as President-Elect in 1961-62, President in 1962-63, and Past-President in 1963-64.

In 1962, she was hired as a research consultant by the State Department of Education, to conduct a project to establish and evaluate programs for students with educational handicaps. This research, funded by the U.S. Office of Education led to the first California legislation supporting educational programs for students with learning and behavioral disorders. (In 1963, the State Legislature passed Assembly Bill 464, which authorized school districts to provide state-funded special school programs for educationally handicapped students.)

In November, 1963, Nadine summarized the results of this project in a report published in CASPP Newsletter, “The Development and Validation of A Process for Screening Emotionally Handicapped Children in School.” The process combined the use of judgments by teachers, classmates, and students themselves, with parent support, and independent individual examinations by psychologists, psychiatrists, and social workers. Her report was one of the first in which the term “emotionally handicapped” appeared in the literature.

Nadine remained active in the American Psychological Association and Division 16 of APA during her entire professional life. She served as Division 16 Representative to the APA Council from 1980 to 1982 and on the APA Board of Directors from 1984 to 1987. APA
recognized her for Distinguished Professional Contributions to Applied Psychology in 1986, for Distinguished Contributions to Applications of Psychology to Education and Training in 1999, and again in 2005 with the Senior Scientist Award.

Nadine has been honored with numerous other citations and awards. One of the first was CASP’s coveted Sandra Goff Memorial Award, presented in 1985. [Please see the separate CASP Yesterday article on this award.]

Nadine retired from UCB in 1994, but she was rehired and continued to lead the school psychology program until 2004. After 2004, she continued to mentor graduate students and to conduct research. This year, she was serving as advisor to the UC joint doctoral program in educational equity. In 1998, she was the Legends in School Psychology featured speaker at the annual NASP Convention.

In 1999, Nadine published a controversial study showing that children with attention deficit hyperactivity disorder who were treated with stimulants such as Ritalin were more likely to smoke cigarettes earlier and more heavily, and were more likely to abuse cocaine as adults. Her findings, based on a 30-year study of 492 children from kindergarten into early adulthood—half of them with ADHD—documented the prevalence of hyperactivity and the various treatments and interventions for the disorder and raised questions about the risks of using Ritalin and similar drugs.

For over 40 years, I had a personal friendly feud with Nadine over the APA stand that professional school psychologists should have a doctoral degree. I joined APA in 1957 as an Associate Member—not a real Member—since I did not have a Ph.D. at that time. I argued that practically all school psychologists in California deliver services and function successfully with a Master’s degree, but she maintained that they would be even better psychologists if they had a Ph.D. degree (especially one from her program).

According to Carolyn Hartsough, current coordinator of the school psychology program at Berkeley, “She had an absolutely phenomenal energy level. She was always here.” Nadine was also a connoisseur of food and wine, and loved to travel and tell stories about her adventures. “She was a gigantic personality,” Hartsough said. She was a devoted fan of Cal’s football and basketball teams, hardly ever missing a game.

On May 23, 2006, a memorial celebration was held in Berkeley. More than 400 students, colleagues, and friends were in attendance. Among them were several colleagues from CASP, including Carole Swain, Lee Huff, Jonathan and Susan Sandoval, and myself. Jon Sandoval was one of the seven invited speakers. He presented an outstanding summary of his remarkable relationship with Nadine, from his role as her graduate student to becoming a practitioner and on to becoming a renowned trainer of school psychologists himself.

In her honor, the UC Graduate School of Education has established a Nadine Lambert Memorial Fund to support fellowships in school psychology. Contributions can be made payable to UC Regents, marked in memory of Nadine Lambert, and sent to the school’s Development Office, 3615 Tolman Hall, UC Berkeley, Berkeley, CA 84720-1670.

As I stated at the 1985 CASP Convention, on the behalf of the Awards Committee, “It is unlikely that any practicing school psychologist’s professional life has not been influenced by Dr. Lambert’s efforts.” Her spirit lives on.
A Woman with Vision and Drive: Remembering Dr. Nadine M. Lambert

Colette L. Ingraham, Professor of School Psychology
San Diego State University

Dr. Nadine Lambert was a very significant force in school psychology, organized psychology, and in my life. From the time I was a student at U.C. Berkeley (1977-84) until I last saw her at the March 2006 NASP convention, I was always impressed by her brilliance and visionary perspective on psychological research, policy, and practice. At the March 2006 meeting of the School Psychology Educators of California, Nadine was there, urging school psychology professors across the state to take a proactive position regarding some recent professional issues, just as eloquently and insightfully as she had done for decades! She was a compelling advocate, a persuasive influence on policy, and a quick thinker with exceptional professional foresight.

Throughout Nadine’s career, she was a powerful influence, promoting a preventive, comprehensive role for school psychology and assuring access to high quality mental health and educational services in schools. Through her unwavering leadership, she assured that school psychology was visible and had an active voice within the field of psychology, APA, and in the schools. She had a knack for knowing how to bring different parties together to work out solutions and move the agenda forward, past political or pedagogical chasms, in ways that promoted excellent services for children.

Here I will share three brief examples that illustrate Nadine’s exceptional professional vision and work ethic.

Sometimes Nadine engaged in projects that were almost before their time, for she was not one to be limited by the state of present technology or models of service delivery.

For example, over 25 years ago, she had an innovative idea for developing a research base and promoting best practices in local schools. Through her Special Education Information System Project, she organized a group of Directors of Special Education in her region in an effort to computerize the development and monitoring of student IEPs. This whole effort was long before the advent of laptop computers and Internet access, so her notion was to use a van equipped with a portable computer to be at schools during the development of IEPs and at IEP meetings. Not only would this allow for better monitoring of student progress, but it would also support the development of a University research data base that would include the IEP goals, objectives, and achievement outcomes for students across several districts. I had the privilege of working with Nadine on this project and was impressed with how skillfully she worked with the Directors and engendered their support. We developed a coding system for IEP goals and objectives and attained the collaboration of five directors. She even hired a computer programmer to develop the information storage and retrieval systems. Nadine had a clear vision of what she wanted to develop, and she worked with drive and focus to bring it to reality.

Another anecdote regarding Nadine’s drive and work ethic was when she had been meeting with her team of research assistants, pushing us hard to meet an upcoming deadline for her hyperactivity project. After working relentlessly for several hours, the team was somewhat relieved when Nadine said she had to leave for an appointment. However, within the hour, she was calling the lab coordinators from the beauty salon with another set of instructions. We were all so
Death always, and under all circumstances, is a tragedy, for if it is not, then it means that life itself has become one.

- Theodore Roosevelt 1900 letter

School psychologists, individually and collectively, mourn the death of highly valued colleagues but, in turn, are inspired by their successful lives and remarkable achievements. And so it is with Nadine Lambert. We mourn her untimely death but celebrate her legacy. Among the highlights of that legacy:

Nadine was a futurist who spoke, and wrote, frequently of her high hopes for the future of school psychology. But she understood that a thorough knowledge of the past and present were an important aid in interpreting what was needed in the future. She was equally insistent that hard work and sacrifice were necessary to build a better future. There was no room for the dilettante, the shirker, or the sluggard. All school psychologists had a part to play.

Through encouraging, impelling, and motivating professional and academic activities, Nadine also became a central figure in school psychology. She had a directing role, wielded commanding influence, and had a strong following in a number of spheres of school psychology. She achieved this leadership role by force of example, talents, and other qualities of leadership. She also recognized that the essence of leadership is the successful resolution of problems, and she had a strong hand in resolving school psychology problems. As the final test of her leadership, there now are many school psychologists with the conviction and will to carry on.

Nadine was a pioneer in the education and training of doctoral-level school psychologists. The program she established at Berkeley included, in the early years, a mental health consultation component. It was among the first doctoral programs in school psychology to include this emphasis. She additionally was a major contributor to the dramatic rise in doctoral school psychology programs in the 1970s and 1980s. She also played the “academic game” at Berkeley well, despite being a female in a largely male-dominated department.

Nadine was not only a prolific writer, she wrote well. As a consequence, many of her research publications and professional reports will continue to appear, or be cited, in the pages of school psychology history.

Nadine was a doer of deeds, and focus and discipline were important in her professional activities. She had a long history of direct involvement in organized school psychology groups, and in the American Psychological Association (APA). In her work in the APA, she was an opportunist in the best sense. For her, one goal was to maintain important relationships between the National Association of School Psychologists (NASP) and the APA.

The fullness of Nadine’s professional life was expressed in her endless capacity for mentoring students and collaborating with colleagues. Her personal charisma drew students to her, and the lucky ones for whom she became dissertation supervisor were assured of a demanding but supportive supervisor. In addition, she went out of her way to help young colleagues in the field, and she sometimes took them under her wing until they were ready to fly on their own. She also engaged in little deeds of kindness for her students and colleagues. For example, each graduating student was the honored guest at a reception and a dinner that she proudly cooked.

Now, and finally, a postscript that includes two personal notes and my overall impression of Nadine’s impact on school psychology. One time, at a group
meeting over drinks, Nadine introduced me to Maker’s Mark, which in her opinion was the best bourbon around. She also arranged for me to receive the distillery’s monthly leaflet updates for a year. Several years later, I, unfortunately, lost a bet with her and had to send her a bottle of that expensive bourbon. Needless to say, I never made another bet with her. On another occasion, Nadine asked me to garner support from several key school psychologists for a proposal she had put forward. I told her I couldn’t do that. Disappointed by my response, she, in jest, said, “Why not? After all, you’re regarded as the head of the Texas mafia in school psychology. So make them an offer they can’t refuse.” As to my overall impression, success has seldom settled on a school psychologist like it did on Nadine. She unquestionably stood on a promontory where few have stood.

A third example of Nadine’s vision and drive involves her work to lead an international group of psychologists interested in consultee-centered consultation. Based on psychologists interest in Caplan’s mental health consultation, in 1995, Nadine helped organize three international conferences on consultee-centered consultation in Stockholm and San Francisco. This resulted in her role as first author (with coauthors Hylander and Sandoval) of the 2004 book, Consultee-centered consultation: Improving the quality of professional services in schools and community organizations, in which an international group of authors describe models and practices of consultee-centered consultation in schools and communities. This decade of work led to a recent June 2006 conference in North Carolina for people involved in research and training of consultee-centered consultation. Upon Nadine’s tragic and untimely death, our group decided to continue working in her honor. We created a new Interest Group within NASP on Consultee-Centered Consultation, which was endorsed by NASP just two months ago.

I am proud to be one of the many, many students for whom Nadine Lambert was a mentor, model, and colleague. I feel fortunate to have experienced her warmth, passion, encouragement, depth, and of course, her keen intellect. She was a leader, teacher, scholar, and powerful advocate who will be sorely missed. Nadine, thank you for all you have taught us, shown us, and given us! Your vision will live on through our work.
Nadine Murphy Lambert was born October 21, 1926 in Ephraim, UT, a city today of about 3,400 people in central Utah, 60 miles south of Provo. At age 79, she died in a tragic accident on the way to work on Wednesday morning, April 26, 2006. Her parents were Rulon and Maude Murphy who had moved from Utah to Hollywood, California. According to Nadine, she was conceived in Hollywood, CA but born in Ephraim while her parents were on vacation visiting Nadine’s grandparents. Nadine lived in Ephraim only for her first 6 weeks of infancy and then moved back to Hollywood. She said that made her a native Californian (Personal Communication of Nadine Lambert, April 8, 1998).

Education

Nadine attended West Hollywood Elementary School and then Fairfax High School. She received her B.A. degree in psychology from UCLA in 1948, a M.A. in education from Los Angeles State U. in 1955 (thesis: The Development of Procedures for Selecting Superior Learners), and her Ph.D. in psychology from the University of Southern California in 1965 (dissertation: The Dimensionality of School Adjustment of 5th Grade Boys). Her areas of expertise were in measurement, evaluation, and psychometrics. Nadine received her Ph.D. at a time when a woman earning a doctoral degree in school psychology was uncommon as well as holding the directorship of a school psychology program. Although there were many females among training program faculty and some were program directors, the proportion in comparison to males was small. For example, of the 112 programs identified in Bardon, Costanza, and Walker (1971), only 19 (17%) had a female director. Like other eminent women of her era, Nadine earned her graduate degrees while holding employment off-campus and raising a family.

Employment

Before she took up her career in academic school psychology, Nadine was a kindergarten teacher and guidance consultant for Los Nietos School District, and later a guidance consultant for the Bellflower Unified School District (California). Nadine referred to the guidance positions as school psychologist positions because one had to hold a school psychology credential to be a guidance consultant. She served as a research consultant for the California State Department of Education from 1958-1964 conducting demonstration research programs for emotionally handicapped children in 16 school districts in southern California. There, she worked with Eli Bower to develop A Process for In-School Screening of Children with Emotional Handicaps (Bower & Lambert, 1961). Her work consisted of a series of reliability and validity studies for various subtests of the process such as The Class Play, Thinking About Yourself, and the Pupil Behavior Rating Scale. Bower (1981) referred to her work as a “determined attempt to do as clean a job of validating the screening process as is possible” (p. 92). Nadine was senior author on a publication that described these early efforts at mental health in education (Lambert et al., 1965).

She joined the faculty at UC-Berkeley in 1964 as an assistant professor, achieved associate professorship in standard time, and has held the rank of professor since 1976. She established the school psychology program at Berkeley in 1965 and served as director until recently. From 1983-1986 she was chair of the Division of Educational Psychology and from 1988-1994 was Associate Dean for Student Affairs. The Berkeley program is
among the most visible of the many training programs in California and for many years it was California’s only APA-approved program in school psychology. The fruits of her efforts at Berkeley can be observed in the success of her graduates. According to Milt Wilson, Nadine graduated more than 160 students in school psychology. As of 1985-1986, 14% of her doctoral graduates were higher education faculty (Lambert, 1986). In 1998 there had been 129 Ph.D. graduates of the Berkeley program. Among them were Jean Ramage (former NASP president), Jon Sandoval (first graduate in 1967), Deborah Tharinger, Jeff Braden, Frank Worrell, Craig Frisby, Abigail Harris, and Collette Ingraham.

**Professional Associations**

She was an active member of the California Association of School Psychologists (formerly School Psychologists and Psychometrists) serving as its president in 1962-1963. She became an associate member of APA in 1956 and a member in 1958 of the divisions for evaluation and measurement (5), educational psychology (15), and school psychology (16). She was a fellow of these divisions starting in 1973. She served as representative to APA Council (1976-1983), and with very few other school psychologists, she held the distinction of having been a member of the APA Board of Directors (1984-1987) and a nominee for the APA presidency. From 1992-1997, she was a member of the APA Commission for the Recognition of Specialties and Proficiencies in Professional Psychology (CRSPPP) and facilitated the process of school psychology being the first specialty in 1997-1998 to be reaffirmed by CRSPPP. She was always very proud of her service on the APA Committee on Professional Standards which allowed her major influence in the development of the 1981 Specialty Guidelines for the Delivery of Services by School Psychologists.

She was a long-time member of the NEA, American Orthopsychiatric Association, and the AERA. Nadine was not a NASP member until granted Honorary Membership in 1996. She attended only a few NASP conventions, including the most recent in Anaheim. I recall a meeting of the NASP Executive Board (January, 1984, Boston) which she attended with Richard Kilburg, an APA office staffer for the Board of Professional Affairs. At that meeting, Kilburg described the doctoral-nondotal positions of the APA and NASP as essentially strategic and tactical, respectively. The session taught me much about APA and NASP policy perceptions.

**Scholarly Pursuits**

When vying for the APA presidency, Nadine’s “field of interest and research” statement listed applied psychological measurement, adaptive functioning in childhood and adolescence, and educational and psychological interventions to promote mental health. She was interested in exceptional children, especially those with hyperactivity, mental retardation, and emotional disturbance; categorical selection procedures; and program evaluation. She was among those testifying in the widely known Larry P. trial in California. Over a 40-year period, she conducted several federal and state sponsored research and demonstration projects, and had an impressive list of publications and presentations, including her 1980 Spring Hill Symposium address (Lambert, 1981). She also was known to school psychologists for her authorship of the AAMR Adaptive Behavior Scales-School Version (Lambert, Nihira, & Leland, 1993). Over her career, Nadine had scores of publications in journals related to educational psychology, professional psychology, school psychology and special education. In addition, she served on the editorial boards of the American Psychologist, American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology, Journal of School Psychology, Professional Psychology, and the American Journal of Mental Deficiency.
According to comments from Milt Wilson, in 1999, Nadine published a controversial study showing that children with ADHD who were treated with stimulants such as Ritalin were more likely to smoke cigarettes earlier and more heavily and more likely to abuse cocaine as adults. Her findings, based on a 30-year study of 492 children from kindergarten into early adulthood, half of them had ADHD, documented the prevalence of hyperactivity and the various treatments and interventions for it and raised questions about the risks of using Ritalin and similar drugs (Personal correspondence from Milt Wilson, June 1, 2006).

Honors, Awards, and Credentials
Among the many honors she received were the Distinguished Service Award (1980) and the Senior Scientist Award (2005) from Division 16 (APA); election to the National Academy of Practice (1983); the Sandra Goff Award for outstanding contributions to school psychology in California (1985); an APA Award for Distinguished Professional Contributions to Applied Psychology as a Professional Practice (1986); the Dorothy Hughes Award from NYU (1990); and, in 1998/1999 she received from APA an Award for Distinguished Contributions of Application of Psychology to Education and Training. I suspect she is the only person in our field to have received two distinguished APA awards, and she shares with Tom Oakland the honor of having received both the Division 16 awards for service and senior scientist. She held the diploma in school psychology from the American Board of Professional Psychology (1970), was a licensed psychologist in California, and held a school psychologist's Life Diploma from the California State Department of Education.

Personal Recollections

APA-NASP Task Force. I knew about Nadine Lambert since the time I was in graduate school when she was becoming a household name in the field of school psychology, and I used her Class Play technique in my dissertation research. I first worked with Nadine when I joined the APA-NASP Task Force (later called the Interorganizational Committee) in the 1980s. She served on this committee from its inception in 1978 until 1994. When I first encountered her in Task Force meetings, I must admit to being somewhat in awe of this woman and her reputation. I was representing NASP policy and she was representing APA and Division 16 policy. As time went on, I learned that she had only the positive development of school psychology at heart and that we agreed on many more positions than those on which we differed. Once at a Task Force meeting, Nadine mentioned to me that she really didn't have any information on a particular topic that had come up. I jokingly said that I was surprised she didn't know about that since I thought she knew something about everything, whereupon she stated, "Oh Tom, I have vast areas of ignorance." That may have been, but I seldom observed them. We grew to respect each other, accept our differences of opinion, and to be friends. We both mellowed over the years and often called on each other for help and opinions.

Among my most vivid memories of the Task Force in the 1980s was when Doug Brown and a few others of the original Task Force membership were rotating off, and we went to dinner at Mr. K's on K Street in Washington, DC. In those days, all APA meetings were held in DC and reimbursement was done by charging all meals to APA's charge card and then billing NASP for its share. As I recall, the cost of the meal for the 10 people present was $750, including about $400 for wine. I must say it was the most elegant of Chinese meals I have ever had and well worth the $75. NASP was viewed by APA as being cheap because it then allowed only $10 for a dinner reimbursement, no matter in what town you were dining. It is only $17 now and the per diem total for three meals is still only $35. One can imagine the NASP Treasurer's response when receiving NASP's share of that dinner bill!
Family Life and Personal Style.

In 1956, Nadine Murphy married Robert Lambert (deceased in 1984), and they had two children, Laura (Allan) and Jeffrey. Her younger brother, Bud (Rulon) Lambert, lives in Park City, UT. I don't remember having the opportunity to meet her husband, or for that matter, hearing Nadine talk much about him or her family. I learned of her husband's death from someone else during a meeting in Washington, DC. When I mentioned to her how sorry I was to hear that, she expressed appreciation but said little. At least in the contexts where I socialized with her, she was quiet about family matters. Yet, when CDSPP/TSP/D16 had the recognition and roast of her and Beeman Phillips in San Francisco during the 1998 APA Convention I recall how proud she was of her daughter being in the band that played during the event at the Empress of China restaurant. I always thought of Nadine as ultraprofessional, kind of “to herself,” and conservative. Yet, there she was savoring the rock band career of her daughter. There were other times when I saw her “let her hair down” for fun. During the 1985 NASP Convention in Las Vegas, in the elaborate bathroom of the NASP President’s Suite, she posed sitting on the edge of the tub with her Vanderbilt friend Carl Haywood. A photo of the occasion, courtesy of Jeff Braden, was published in the NASP Communiqué (June, 1985, Vol. 13, No. 8, p. 4). Over the years I came to understand that behind that polished academic veneer was someone you just had to like. Yet, she was a very private person when it came to family and personal life. I have seen this in many other well known members of our field.

Her son, Jeffrey provided some additional background information:

My father, Robert Ernest Lambert, was born 7/11/18 in Whittier, CA. His father, Reese Lambert owned a Walnut Ranch in Whittier and the city wanted to build a road through it. They bought the house and some land from him, built the road and named it after him, Lambert Rd. today is a big road, complete with hookers and everything, according to my father. My father worked for Educational Testing Service in Los Angeles, when I was born in 1963, and the day that JFK was killed we moved to Berkeley, where the Western Regional Offices of ETS now are. He died 1/16/84 of a heart attack. His extended family have pledged to be at Forest Lawn on May 9th when we will bury mom next to her parents in a plot they purchased for her over 50 years ago at the Glendale branch of this huge cemetery.

Now, my mother knew all the names of all the UC Basketball and UC Football players, their grades and sometimes their scholarship status. I hate football and didn’t like going to those games mainly because she screamed so loud my ears were always hurting afterwards. I am not a complete sports idiot, preferring biking, running, hiking, and tennis, but each time at a basketball game when Berkeley scored a basket she would remind me: “Now that was 2 points.” Being fed up with this I once replied: “Mom - a mentally retarded girl on the 4th floor of Alta Bates Hospital knows that a basket is worth 2 points.” (Personal Correspondence of Jeffrey Lambert, May 1, 2006)

Nadine toiled in the vineyards of school psychology too long to have made only friends; but I don’t know of anyone who was a staunch enemy. She had her differences with others, including Jack Bardon over his suggestions about a psychology of schooling (see Bardon, 1982 and accompanying reaction papers). She also had a reputation for getting carried away on a topic of special interest to her, especially the 1981 Specialty Guidelines, which she seemed to grant biblical significance in clarifying issues of training and credentialing. She could also be very exacting and surely did not suffer fools easily. I remember how often she would sit in meetings and roll her eyes in apparent bewilderment at the commentary. No doubt she watched many wheels get reinvented during her career.

Dining. Nadine was a connoisseur of...
French cooking and wine. I don’t know if she was an excellent cook herself, but I suspect she was, and she was a knowledgeable consumer of gourmet food. When you went to a famous French restaurant with Nadine (she loved the Maisson Blanche in DC) and the cook personally came to your table and prepared a special dessert, you had to be impressed. According to her son, she was definitely a wine connoisseur. He said that he learned about California wineries starting from their parking lots where he waited while his parents were sampling wines during his childhood (Personal Correspondence of Jeffrey Lambert, May 1, 2006).

**Legends Address.** Nadine was very impressed with being named as the 1998 NASP Legends Address speaker. The paper (Lambert, 2000), described her personal perspectives on her career and the field of school psychology. The published speech provides an inside perspective on her career, woven through several stories and morals. Discussing how becoming a school psychologist is more than a degree and a credential, she concluded:

Becoming a school psychologist requires engagement in a process of acquiring a conceptual framework reflecting the scientific and professional knowledge that make up the foundation of school psychology practice. Once the framework for practice is acquired, school psychologists learn to share psychological knowledge in reciprocal exchanges with those responsible for the school age population—teachers, parents, community service personnel, policy makers, legislators—in real-world settings in ways that enlighten understanding of the learner among those with whom school psychologists work. (p. 134)

She had a message to deliver in her address but struggled with a title. She asked me to help her with a title, and after reading the paper, I offered the title she used, “School Psychology: The Whole Is More Than The Sum Of Its Parts.”

Perhaps the title says a lot about Nadine as well as her address. She offered a distinct Gestalt to our field in her many contributions, her sense of humor, her leadership, and her unceasing efforts to not only represent school psychology to the diverse APA arena of American psychology, but to try and bring the various pieces together, be they NASP or Division 16, trainer or practitioner, doctoral or non-doctoral. Nadine entered the field when there were only about 4,000 school psychologists, before there was a NASP, before APA offered the diplomate and accreditation in school psychology, even before there was something like what we know as FERPA and IDEA. The developments of the past five decades precipitated many conflicts and divisiveness in a field that is now much larger, more complex and regulated. Nadine will be remembered as among those who resisted such divisiveness and sought middle ground that would promote the status of school psychology for all its constituents.
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Remembering Nadine Lambert

Deborah Tharinger, Class of U.C. Berkeley, 1981

I wrote these words as I was flying home from attending Nadine’s memorial service in Berkeley on Tuesday, May 23, 2006. I wanted to try to capture some of the experience.

That Tuesday was a beautiful Bay Area day: sunny with clouds, a slight breeze, and in the 60s (a drop of 30 degrees from Austin). I had flown in yesterday—the morning of the service. As luck would have it, the plane flew a bit north of Oakland and then circled south west over Marin county—I could see the lovely homes on the hills and water that would be Sausalito—for a moment I thought I was in the south of France. Then the Golden Gate Bridge appeared, followed by the roundness of the San Francisco skyline, with the Bay Bridge fingering beyond. What a greeting! I was thanking Nadine for the privilege to once again take in the beauty—the beauty of the area she lived in and loved for over 40 years.

And I thank Nadine for taking me in—into her program and into her view of the world of school psychology and academia. As we all (her students) did, I took some in, fought against some, and left some there—some didn’t fit. But she knew that—and on some level understood it. I have always thought that Nadine, and my years at Berkeley, fed my desire to question and to seek meaning; to wonder what was underneath and what it might mean—be it underneath formal theory, the research questions being asked, the findings obtained, or the nature and motivation of human behavior (the levels of which have ended up fascinating me the most).

I also remember wanting more from Nadine when I was an advanced student—I wanted her to ask me to lunch and to talk to me as a professor and as a woman (i.e., a female academic). She did the former eventually but not the latter. I found that confusing at the time. I was looking for the integration of the masculine and the feminine. Nadine didn’t share that integration—not in words—but then how about the yearly luncheons at her home, she in a cute little apron? What about the cakes she baked for graduation parties and individualized gourmet dinners for each graduate? I still smile when I think about those occasions and now know that each of us has our own path of integration.

In some ways I am who I am now as a professor and a psychologist because of what Nadine gave me and what she did not. She was an academic before the road was paved or even grated for women, and she was extremely successful. She was comfortable being called “chairman” and didn’t want the last three letters dropped. I believe it is fairly easy now to be a
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NADINE M. LAMBERT: HER LIFE AND CAREER “The Whole Is More Than The Sum Of Its Parts”

*This article is based in part on the author’s introduction of Nadine Lambert at the 1998 Legends Address, Annual Convention of the National Association of School Psychologists. Appreciation is expressed to Jeffrey Lambert and Milt Wilson for their assistance.

**A memorial celebration was held in Berkeley on May 26, 2006. The UC Graduate School of Education established a memorial fund in her name to support fellowships in school psychology. Contributions should be made payable to UC Regents, marked in memory of Nadine Lambert, and sent to the UCB Development Office, 3615 Tolman Hall, UC-Berkeley, Berkeley, CA 84720-1670. A memorial session was also held during the 2006 Annual APA Convention in New Orleans, LA, and a moment of silence was observed during the APA Council of Representatives meeting.
relatively successful and nurturing female professor - gentle and supportive of students’ emotional lives (women and men) as they interface with their education and development. But in Nadine’s career, especially her early years in academia, it was a different time and context. I know I try to give my students what I wanted from her. And I now know that much goes into supporting the development of graduate students and future psychologists. I have been one of six fairly equally powered faculty in a school psychology program for the past 24 years; with six you can each provide different parts, and the students seem to take in and integrate parts of all or most of us into a new configuration. I now realize that Nadine, as a power of one (but with incredible and able assistance) did not have that option, and even more so needed to protect herself from being worn too thin.

Sitting at the memorial service, looking around at former and current students of Nadine, some of whom I knew very well and couldn’t wait to catch up with and some who I didn’t know at all—and most of them looked oh so young, I was struck with the connection we all shared—Nadine and what we learned from Nadine. Nadine gave her students a set of universals to consider as we developed and then lived our professional lives. These universals were convergent themes in the talks given at her memorial service—which I come to now.

Nadine modeled hard work, determination, persistence (in times of plenty and scarcity), sacrifice, the importance of being political, all things developmental, multi-tasking (before there was a word for it), and nurturance through food and entertainment (in ways that changed my palate forever). And most of all I think Nadine practiced love as loyalty: loyalty to her family, loyalty to her program, loyalty to her students, loyalty to school psychology, and loyalty to promoting healthy and happy children. Nadine, I salute your love and will do my best to live part of your legacy.
Of all the honors earned in her long career, Nadine Lambert undoubtedly valued the Division 16’s Senior Scientist award above the others. This is an award from the members of her specialty acknowledging her status and contributions as a scientist. Although she had many other accomplishments as a teacher and as an advocate for school psychology and professional psychology within APA, she wished to be thought of as a social scientist above all other professional roles. She spent 50 years studying issues related to the improvement of educational opportunities for children.

**Early Career**

Dr. Lambert began her career working with Eli (Mike) Bower on an ambitious project in California to identify children early who were having difficulty in school and to explore different programmatic options to address their needs. She had been recruited for the project because of her interest and experience in finding ways to involve teachers in using data about children for instructional planning. Outcomes of this project included legislation in California to provide a spectrum of programs for children with emotional and learning disturbance ranging from consultation and support for regular classroom teachers to self-contained classrooms for the most difficult to educate children; the development of a process for in-school screening for educational problems (Lambert & Bower, 1961, 1974); a commitment to the longitudinal study of children (Lambert, 1972); and a life-long interest in school-based consultation to teachers and administrators to promote mental health (Lambert, 1965; Lambert, 1974; Lambert, Hylander & Sandoval, 2004).

Lambert’s doctoral work at the University of Southern California, under the direction of J. Paul Guilford, gave her a thorough grounding in psychometrics and statistical methods. In addition to the development of screening methods (still useful today for identifying children for RTI or other early intervention), she worked on the development of scoring methods for the Bender Visual Motor Gestalt Test (1970, 1971), contributed to the culture fair testing movement (Lambert, 1964), and authored the Public School Version of the AAMD Adaptive Behavior Scale (Lambert, 1981a; Lambert, 1992; Lambert, Windmiller, Cole & Figueroa, 1975). She also developed measures for examining school psychologists’ functioning and service (Sandoval & Lambert, 1977) and a rating scale to help identify and monitor the progress of children with ADHD (Lambert, Hartsough & Sandoval, 1990).

Her interest in the diagnosis and instructional planning for children with mild retardation (Lambert Wilcox & Gleason, 1973) led to Lambert’s involvement with measurement of adaptive behavior and a concern for appropriate instructional planning for these pupils. When the Larry P. case arose in San Francisco, she brought her expertise in assessment to bear as a witness for the defense, arguing for the utility of cognitive assessment (Lambert, 1981b) in diagnosis and educational programming.

**Life Histories of Children Diagnosed with ADHD**

In the early 1970s, Lambert embarked on a research enterprise that engaged her for the rest of her life. She realized that children previously diagnosed as having neurological handicaps were being described as hyperactive (Lambert, 2000). Along with her research colleague, Carolyn Hartsough, she commenced a longitudinal study following community-identified hyperactive children and matched, non-identified control children from elementary school through
adulthood. The study continued up until the present day, and provides unprecedented information about the education, occupational choices, psychiatric status, and substance use history of individuals with ADHD. I collaborated on the early phases of the study which produced new information about the prevalence of the condition (Lambert, Sandoval & Sassone, 1978); the prevalence of treatments (Lambert, Windmiller, Sandoval & Moore, 1976); health correlates (Lambert & Hartsough, 1984); the extent of learning disabilities (Lambert & Sandoval, 1980); family expectations and interactions (Hartsough & Lambert, 1982); temperament characteristics (Lambert, 1982); and the persistence of symptoms over time (Lambert, 1988). When we started the study, the conventional wisdom was that ADHD was limited to childhood, that children would “grow out of it”, that the use of stimulant medications was benign and that stimulants had a paradoxical effect on children with the condition, and that response to medication was a diagnostic. Lambert’s studies helped dispel these myths.

Lambert’s investigations of the adult outcomes of ADHD have been particularly controversial and have led to attacks by many favoring psychostimulant treatment regimens for children. Her unexpected findings showed that children with ADHD as adolescents and adults are more likely to continue to use and abuse legal and illegal stimulants (Lambert & Hartsough, 1998). She discovered that children with ADHD symptomatology are twice as likely as controls to become tobacco and cocaine dependent as adults, and even more likely to become dependent if they had been treated with stimulant medication as children or adolescents (Lambert, 2002). Her subjects with ADHD also displayed more frequent criminal activity than controls (Babinski, Hartsough & Lambert, 1999). In spite of attacks on her conclusions, she continued to seek funding for her unprecedented longitudinal investigation up until her death, and to present a counterpoint to those who believe current medical practice with hyperactive children has benign outcomes.

**In Conclusion**

Nadine Lambert believed in the scientist-practitioner model for school psychology and that doctoral school psychologists were characterized by a range and depth of psychological theory and knowledge greater than that found at the sub-doctoral level. Part of this depth is developed through the life-long involvement in the research enterprise, as a contributor, a synthesizer, an interpreter, and as an advocate. She practiced what she preached.

Lambert’s research contributions have been numerous and important. She has been a leading proponent of longitudinal developmental research in school psychology, of the importance of data-based decision making based on sound psychological measures, and of the necessity of questioning conventional wisdom and practice using scientific method. She has been a pioneer in the research domain of school psychology and has left large footprints for those in the field to follow.
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A Tribute to Nadine Lambert

Thomas Oakland
University of Florida

I began working with Nadine Lambert in about 1979 after being elected Secretary to the Division of School Psychology. Before then, I am sure we talked briefly at Division receptions held yearly during APA conventions.

Nadine was well known within school psychology circles as a scholar, the director of the school psychology program at UC/Berkeley, an avid supporter for doctoral level preparation, and a staunch advocate for school psychology within APA. The number of nationally visible leaders in school psychology was small then, mainly Nadine, Jack Bardon, Ernie Newland, and Beeman Phillips. Thus, their efforts and contributions garnered considerable attention from others—and for good reason.

Their impact on school psychology was particularly important during the late 1960's and 70's, a period when the academic and professional foundation for our specialty was being laid. When one looks closely at our specialty, the thumbprints of these few key leaders on school psychology appear highly visible and important.

I would like to comment on some of Nadine's personal qualities in part to honor them as well as to suggest that those she displayed remain important to our profession and specialty.

Although we never discussed her Myers/Briggs profile, it clearly was introverted, intuitive, thoughtful, and organized. Nadine was true to her temperament.

Nadine displayed great self-confidence. There was little she felt she could not do. Her self-confidence was rewarded and reinforced through a highly successful lifetime of service through teaching, scholarship, and professional involvement.

Being introverted, Nadine was highly self-motivated and had an enormous reservoir of energy and stamina. For example, she typically arrived at the APA headquarters after traveling from San Francisco to Washington DC ready to work throughout the days and into the evenings.

At times, consistent with her temperament, Nadine could be perceived as being somewhat cold, dispassionate, distant, and single-minded. When engaged socially, she preferred to discuss substantive issues and generally avoided small talk.

Some people avoided her, given their beliefs that they were not her equal and their feelings that she could see through them and thus felt transparent in her presence. At times she may have seen these signs as rejection.

She set high standards for herself and, through modeling, encouraged high standards for others. Moreover, she was a workhorse, behaviors that were motivating to some and threatening to others. On occasion, I felt somewhat deflated, feeling I should have been more knowledgeable or articulate when conferring with her.

Nadine always was on the cutting edge of school psychology, a pioneer with great vision and intuition as to the next steps needed to maintain and advance school psychology and, at times, to ward off efforts from our colleagues in clinical psychology when they wanted to run roughshod over school psychology.

Those privileged to work with Nadine had a deep respect for her. Few considered themselves to be her equal. Thus, I often had the impression I was talking with a highly respected teacher who knew everything and whose self-confidence was contagious. We were willing to do almost anything Nadine requested of us.

Nadine's decision-making processes were crystal clear. She was objective, logical, principled, tough, and firm—
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minded. She displayed a penchant for analyzing tough problems, an asset we often admired. Nadine seemed able to distinguish between what was and was not important and to encourage us to focus our attention on reality and how best to shape it. To her, reality was malleable and thus subject to change and we should be engaged in shaping it.

She was not one to zip her lip in an effort to seek harmony. Instead, she relished responding to challenges and sought ways to resolve differences of opinion. Her firm belief in herself, in others, the power of reason, and the fruits of long and hard work compelled her to accept challenges and seek their solutions.

Nadine was highly organized. She had to be, given her many personal and professional responsibilities. She enjoyed working when everyone knew the tasks and were committed to addressing important issues. She enjoyed structure, knowing its importance to achieving long-term rewards.

Nadine was an architect of ideas. These features were most clearly seen in her vision for the American Psychological Association, its commitment to children, and for school psychology. Her goal to become APA president was not achieved.

Nadine was a private person. Thus, I know little about her personal life. She talked little about herself, her deceased husband, or her children.

However, to me, her personal values were clear: to be competent professionally and to be a good mother to her children. She worked tirelessly in her efforts to achieve competence. In addition, her love for her children was obvious, nurtured by spending time with them, especially while traveling together.

American psychology, including school psychology, has been highly enriched as a result of Nadine’s contributions through her important and stellar personal qualities as well as through her legacy of commitment to scholarship, teaching, and service. Her life helps set high standards for us all.
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Nadine Lambert, Senior Scientist


I first met Nadine when she was the featured speaker at the GASP school psychology conference in 1975—my first year as a graduate student in school psychology at the University of Georgia. I was frankly in awe of her command of our science. That never changed. I was even more impressed by her willingness to spend time and energy with a brand new student in the field at a university far from her own, and we became friends following that meeting and remained so. I invited her to speak at a conference in Nebraska when I was on faculty at UNL some years later, and was even more impressed when she correctly diagnosed a mechanical problem with my Vette (based on the engine sounds), as she rode with me to and from the airport! We compared the performance of Corvettes with Porsches and argued it for some years thereafter—at least when we were not debating food, wine, and restaurants, all while enjoying the same. And, then there was the time when she asked the wine steward for an off list bottle of wine at Maison Blanche in Washington, which he denied having available, but produced after Nadine mentioned that she recalled Bob Mondavi telling her he had left samples cases for the restaurant—she never ceased to amaze me in so many ways. By coincidence I had the privilege of chairing the Division of School Psychology Senior Scientist Award Committee the year Nadine was nominated for the first time and won. I had, naively, thought I was familiar with most of her work. Having the opportunity to review her myriad contributions in that context really awakened me to the true breadth and depth of her scholarship. Nadine was a champion of school psychology, but was so much more than that at so many levels and such a complex, caring individual. She will be sorely missed on many, many levels by many more than she knew.
A Study in Contrasts: 
Nadine Lambert Remembered

Frank C. Worrell, University of California at Berkeley
Class of U.C. Berkeley, 1994

A public figure, yet intensely private.
Deeply caring, but often perceived as aloof and remote,
Sometimes misunderstood and mistreated,
But having no time for or interest in revenge.
She charted the course of our field,
Bestriding school psychology’s childhood and adolescence,
But like a parent—or consultee-centered consultant—
Allowing the specialty and others to bask in the limelight of tasks accomplished.

Eighteen years ago, she entered my life,
A disembodied voice on a static-filled telephone line.
Our conversation ended with these words:
“We would really like to have you at Berkeley,
When you come, we will find you funding,
We do that for many students
Call collect if you have questions.”
As was her wont, I later learned,
She dismissed or ignored the complexities,
In my case, of visas and immigration officers
Even then concerned with keeping undesirables out of the US.
Her approach to life was simple:
If you want to achieve something, you find a way to do it.
Task difficulty is irrelevant.

I came, I saw, and like others before and since, I stood in awe.
I did not share the trepidation of other students,
The fear of going into her office to ask a question,
Despite the realization that you would leave her office enlightened,
Or at least well on the way to a solution.
I was awed at her capacity to multi-task before this word became an accepted verb,
I was amazed by the intellect that went straight to the nub of an issue,
I was floored by her capacity to contribute so much in so many spheres.

Coming to Cal in 1964, Nadine was a woman
In a world of men convinced of their liberalism—
After all, this was Berkeley in the 60s—
Yet as affected as any by the chauvinism of the times.
While others stridently proclaimed their status as female academics
With the right to be treated as equals.
Nadine refused to use a gendered adjective to describe herself.
She simply asserted her status as a scientist and scholar,
Outpublishing her peers,
Developing a unique program,
(Thus reflecting the unique character of the institution),
Giving more of herself in service, not only to UC,
But also to the fledgling discipline of school psychology
And to its only home at that time, the American Psychological Association.

Nadine did these things alongside her role as a parent.
At her memorial in May, her son told a story about his mother
Taking him to the UC library to see a protest that was quelled
By police with teargas.
He recalled them sitting on the grass, as if at a picnic,
Observing from a distance.
There, because in his mother's words,
These were momentous events, events that he had the opportunity to bear witness to.
Upon hearing this story, the words that came immediately to mind
Were quintessentially Nadine.

Our relationship was also one of contrasts.
Very close, but not intimate;
Supportive and caring, but not really friends.
Having the same vision and seeking the same outcomes,
But taking different pathways to that goal.
Perhaps because I was not afraid of her,
She also allowed me to see her unique sense of humor.

In my first semester at Berkeley,
After a flippant remark that I made about
Her picture on the notice board showing her "good side,"
She recommended that I see Eddie Murphy's movie, Coming to America,
Because I reminded her of him in that movie, a compliment that I still treasure.
Once, when I was complaining about not having enough funding,
She suggested, in her dry tones, that if things were really bad,
I should consider the world's oldest profession.
And when, on her birthday, I left a carrot cake in her office,
She called me in and thanked me.
When I protested my lack of involvement,
She turned away from her computer, looked me in the eye,
(Former students will realize the import of these actions)
And said, "No one else would dare to do this,"
And then turned back to the computer, interaction concluded.
And, upon my graduation, I had to submit the name of the champagne
That I wished to donate to the reception
To see if it was good enough to cross her threshold.

And so, to my school psychology colleagues,
Both those of you who knew her well, and those to whom she is only a name,
Every now and then, I urge you to lift a glass of a dry red or white of good vintage
In memory of Nadine's contributions:

President of the California Association of School Psychologists
When the organization still had "psychometrists" in its title,
The conceiver and first Chair of the Board of Educational Affairs,
NASP Legend of School Psychology
Champion of consultee-centered consultation in school settings,
Division 16 Senior Scientist even before the award was first given,
Non-feminist whose biography is included in "American Men and Women of Science,"
Leading figure in the development of APA's learner centered principles,
And the school psychology specialty guidelines,
Among many, many, many other professional accomplishments
In her more than four decades of service to school psychology,
But also mother, chef, tap dancer, wine connoisseur, and gourmet:
I give you Nadine Murphy Lambert.
Emphasizing prevention and intervention in our work

Gary Stoner
University of Massachusetts - Amherst

This message is excerpted from my Presidential Address titled Contemporary School Psychology from a Prevention and Intervention Orientation, given at the American Psychological Association Convention in New Orleans this past August.

In an essay I wrote for the 2002 Future of School Psychology Conference, while making the case for a prevention emphasis in our profession, I suggested the following:

...in the 21st century, school psychology will need ... a major commitment to prevention as a primary ... orientation and practice.

...(because) intervention oriented practices, like assessment practices oriented to address referrals, are reactive practices that tend to respond to problems at a point in time when the problems are intractable. As a result, no matter how well we develop and use empirically validated interventions, and intervention linked assessment practices, we still will be rendered either insufficient or ineffective or both, because reactive practices always will be faced with too many problems of too great a magnitude...

In about 1500, Erasmus said the same thing much more succinctly...“prevention is better than cure”.

To thrive in the 21st Century school psychology will need to emphasize prevention and intervention practices. This is because in our schools we see increasing numbers of children entering school with or at-risk for achievement, behavior, and social-emotional adjustment problems, while at the same time, we see limited numbers/shortages of professional school psychologists. These conditions present an opportunity for thinking about the need for group level (community, school building, grade within school, classroom) prevention and intervention programming. However, such conditions also present a challenge, as our profession historically has emphasized individual-oriented interventions, and individual-oriented assessment (mainly with students already experiencing problems).

To complement such individually focused practices, we need to continue to develop and make greater use of prevention and intervention practices such as:

- Intervention- and prevention-linked assessments, such as functional behavior assessments (as compared with assessment primarily for classification)
- Programs that target all students and teachers, such as Positive Behavior Support (as compared with referred students/referring teachers)
- Proactive professional service delivery activities such as school-wide screening for reading problems (as compared with reactive practices)
- Early intervention with problems, across ages/grades (as compared with what has been characterized as a “wait to fail” approach)
- Intervention/prevention strategies using an expanded range of delivery agents, such as computers and peers (as compared with over-relying on teachers as sole intervention agents).

But, how will these forms of practice become more prevalent?

To begin, through professional preparation and continuing education, every school psychologist needs to be prepared to deliver a set of primary- and secondary-level prevention strategies in the academic, social/behavioral, and emotional/adjustment domains. Such strategies might include the Incredible Years programs for promoting social and emotional development in young children, developed by Carolyn Webster Stratton and colleagues at the University of Washington. A program with similar foci for older children and adolescents is the Oregon Resiliency Project (Strong Kids, and Strong Teens) developed by Ken Merrell and colleagues at the University of Oregon.

We will also need to emphasize prevention- and intervention-linked assessment practices in our work. For example, systematic school wide screening for achievement and behavior problems needs to become a universal practice. Further, through such practices, and concomitant research, we need to develop a better understanding of screening and related prevention practices from the standpoints of consumers, policy makers, and professionals. For example, what might be barriers, from a school district policy standpoint, to district wide screenings for mental health problems?

“...if we are to avoid overwhelming the teachers in our schools, we need to pay attention to increasing the range of intervention agents (e.g., computers, peers, parents, and self-managed interventions) in an effective manner.”
As for the intervention emphasis, we first need to focus on how to increase the use of evidence based interventions in our schools. In addition, if we are to avoid overwhelming the teachers in our schools, we need to pay attention to increasing the range of intervention agents (e.g., computers, peers, parents, and self-managed interventions) in an effective manner. For example, how might the computerized early reading instruction program—Headsprout (see www.headsprout.com)—be effectively used to complement teacher delivered early reading instruction? Prevention and intervention emphases such as these will necessitate adjusting our professional training curricula to include more prevention and intervention oriented coursework and practicum experiences, and might also include increased attempts to conceptualize school psychology as support for teachers and parents in their teaching and child-rearing efforts.

Currently, we have excellent models available and in use regarding the strategies I have mentioned. For example, in the literature on primary and secondary prevention we have the positive behavior support work of Rob Horner and George Sugai, the U.S. Department of Education’s Reading First program, the school-based mental health work of Bonnie Nastasi, and the Check and Connect program developed by Sandy Christenson to name only a few. Through the leadership of Tom Kratochwill, Karen Stoiber and colleagues, we have a literature replete with careful attention to and documentation of evidence-based interventions. And, in our schools we are seeing more screening, early intervention, and data-based decision making activities.

However, many challenges remain. For example, in training, how will we make room in the curriculum for more prevention and intervention coursework and experiences, more prevention and intervention-oriented assessment, program evaluation, and time-series research designs? And how will we increase our emphasis on parent and teacher support in our in-service and pre-service training efforts?

Service delivery challenges include developing a better understanding of consumer (e.g., parents, teachers, administrators) acceptance/use of screening for academic, social, and adjustment problems. A related issue needing careful attention is that of how to better understand the concept of prevention and its accompanying practices as a culturally accepted/acceptable practice. That is, in the context of schools and schooling, we have not yet developed a full understanding of this negative reinforcement paradigm (i.e., what factors influence expending considerable effort now, to avoid potential future problems).

Finally, we have research to conduct relating to an increased emphasis on prevention and intervention. For example, we need to better understand how effective model programs can be implemented and sustained, using the indigenous resources of a school and/or community. This challenge will require careful attention to social validity issues, as well as the practical issues accompanying any effort at translating research into practice. In closing, the health of our profession depends on our collective willingness and abilities to intensify our prevention and intervention efforts and emphases. I am optimistic that the strong foundations I have noted here provide the platform we need to do just that.

A few resources on prevention and intervention in school psychology:

- American Psychologist (Special Issue; Prevention that works for children and youth), June/July 2003, Vol.58, No. 6/7.
- Prevention Science, Number 1 / March 2004, Special Issue: Blending Prevention Research and Practice in Schools.
- School Psychology Futures Conference Modules, Spring 2006: www.indiana.edu/~futures/home.html
It has been a rewarding experience to serve the Division as TSP Editor and Associate Editor for the past 6 years. I have worked closely with many wonderful Division 16 members and learned a great deal about the important work of Division 16 and APA. I feel honored that my final issue as TSP Editor is the 2006 Fall Issue, Celebrating the Life of Dr. Nadine M. Lambert.

I would like to take this time to acknowledge those individuals who have been instrumental during my editorship. First, I thank the past and current Division 16 Executive Board for affording me the opportunity to serve in this role. Second, I would like to recognize Dr. Michelle S. Athanasiou for her hard work as Associate Editor. Michelle has been a pleasure to work with and is a wonderful colleague. I wish her the very best in her new position as Editor for the next three years. Third, I am grateful to Heidi Jess, Graphic Designer of Image Quest for her exceptional work and dedication to TSP. Heidi has served as the Graphic Designer for Division 16 for over 14 years.

Fourth, I thank Drs. Tammy Hughes and David McIntosh for their leadership as Vice Presidents of Publication, Communications, and Convention Affairs. Their roles and accomplishments for Division 16 are enormous. Special thanks are rendered to Steven Little, Elaine Clark, Cecil Reynolds, Gary Stoner, Deborah Thriringer, Frank Worrell, and Ron Palomares for their support and helpful suggestions with TSP. I also would like to thank Cecil, Deborah, and Ron for the other professional opportunities they have provided me. Fifth, I thank the editorial advisory board (i.e., Drs. Pamela Abraham, Angeleque Akin-Little, Vinny Alfonso, Ron Dumont, Rosemary Flanagan, Patrick Grehan, James Hale, Tara Files-Hall, James Maza, Janet Mentore Lee, Amanda Nickerson, Stacy Overstreet, Carol Robinson-Zanartu, and Esther Stavrou) and the editorial assistants (i.e., Tanya Atamanoff, Victoria Chun, Courtney DeThomas, Erik Newman, and Laura Richardson) for their dedication to TSP. I would like to recognize Tom Fagan for his thoughtful historical announcements that honor and highlight the significant contributions of our former colleagues. Tom's contributions to TSP and Division 16 are immeasurable. Finally, I thank Dr. Angeleque Akin-Little for her work (over nine years) with People and Places and Jack Cummings for his diligence with maintaining the Division 16 Website and promptly posting TSP Issues for the membership.
Internship training is classically conceptualized as a critical professional training and socialization activity occurring at the end of a student's coursework. Although virtually all school psychologists and school psychology faculty agree on the importance of the internship as a capstone experience, there are a growing number of trainees and school districts requesting emergency certification in order to employ school psychology students who have not completed training protocols. Specifically, due to the shortage of school psychology practitioners, a growing number of students and schools request emergency or shortage permit certification for students who have not completed coursework and/or the culminating internship. In fact, while there has been no formal data collection on the extent of this practice, anecdotal reports provided by a national representation of training programs suggests this may be rising in number. In fact, these discussions suggest the practice “plays out” in various ways in each state. However, generally this allows a student enrolled in a school psychology training program to receive (emergency/temporary) certification and seek employment as a school psychologist without completing all phases and stages of professional training. Although advocates of this practice point to early entry after coursework as positive advantage for advanced graduate students, there is clear risk in allowing professional practice before a substantial applied training and supervisory component (i.e., internship training) has occurred. Explicitly, information and skills held by students can be and is likely incomplete, fragmented, and possibly misunderstood out of context. Either scenario poses risk for children.

With school psychologists simultaneously facing both growing shortages in the field as well as an increasing demand for school psychological services to meet diverse challenges in the school system, the importance of internship training cannot be underestimated. In fact, if the internship is viewed as analogous to the residency in medical practice where supervision is critical not only for skill development but for ongoing monitoring and refining of professional skills, than issuing emergency and/or shortage area certifications is less than ideal. In fact, this practice seriously contradicts the premise that vulnerable populations (e.g., minors, those with disabilities, etc...) should only be served by those with verifiable competence. Unless practitioners, teachers, and administrators understand the issues, the dangers of such initiatives will not be fully appreciated. This paper is intended to raise cautionary flags while offering school practitioners, clinical supervisors, and administrators a thoughtful examination of key issues.

Background

Without qualification, the public schools are facing a challenging array of problems. As example, issues including poverty, violence, substance abuse, sexual abuse, teenage pregnancy, physical neglect, suicide, and depression represent a sampling of the issues facing school districts. Fortunately, school psychologists have a strong appreciation for many of these issues, and training qualifies the school psychologist to provide direction to school systems facing complex problems. Still, with such a breadth of challenges, coursework, practicum and internship training must be appropriately rigorous if students are to develop professional skills that prepare them for myriad practice issues. Unfortunately, under the best of circumstances this is not always true. Under the conditions of on-the-job-training (a.k.a. emergency certification), there is little reason to believe that best practices can be applied when those skills have not verifiably been demonstrated by students!

As background, it should be noted that there are no solid, quantifiable data on the number of school psychology training sites in the United States. In contrast, the APPIC Directory lists 589 approved internships in professional psychology. However, quantity alone is not actually the concern. To date,
internships approved by the American Psychological Association require the equivalent of one year of full-time training (completed on a full-time basis over one year or half-time over two years), and these internships are not completed in places where the applicant is employed, as this would constitute a dual relationship and possibly degrade training quality. In school psychology however, as shortages escalate, interns are increasingly able to acquire emergency and/or durational shortage types of certifications enabling individuals to work as school psychologists before completing the internship. In practice, emergency certificates grant autonomy and responsibility which may pose risk.

Training Questions for the Future
1) Should professional associations’ training standards address issues of emergency certification?
2) Should state associations develop position statements regarding emergency certification?

Complications and Considerations
As school psychologists complete nationally mandated year-long or two-year half-time internships totaling 1200 to 1500 hours, we should ask about the risks of emergency certification. Acknowledging both the philosophical and practical issues, emergency certification needs to be seriously examined. Readers should ask, does the professional field or the public feel school psychologists can comfortably provide services with abbreviated training? How do certification concessions limit and/or hamper the rigor of training? Who is responsible for student competencies if students are simultaneously employed as school psychologists while also considered interns? How do training programs provide remediation on skill development that may have idiosyncratic acceptance in local districts but are inconsistent with national training standards? We must ask: Are students employed under shortage permits or emergency certification (and allowed to use such experiences as internships) compromising their education or disallowing themselves the opportunity to deal with comprehensive assessment, counseling, and diversity and social justice issues by entering into these arrangements? Are individuals with emergency or durational permits able to work effectively as actual productive card-holding school psychologists? Is the advantage of early entry into the work force able to balance quality professional clinical supervision?

While some may suggest that without such concessions they could not enter the profession, medical schools would certainly not allow concessions which would degrade professional training standards. Who would feel comfortable trusting a physician with reduced training hours in order to accommodate a growing shortage? While students might have to take a leave of absence from work, or acquire loans, such commitments are routine in medicine. Is an emergency certificate appropriate? We think not. Further, emergency certification as it is happening at this time threatens the integrity of training. In fact, with increasing numbers of clinical psychology programs reaching toward 2,000 hour practicum training requirements before internship training, it may be that school psychology programs need to thoughtfully consider the comparisons. After all, it is critical to ensure/assure the public that school psychology professionals working within the schools have completed rigorous course work, as well as practicum and internship training that is in alignment with training standards in related professions.

Conclusions
The internship experience remains a critical component of education and training for school psychologists. Unfortunately, as schools cope with a growing complexity of problems, inclusive of issues such as adolescent suicide and school violence, and as administrators look to school psychologists to assist in such aspects as threat assessments, suicide assessments, as well as traditional assessment, counseling, and consultation initiatives, it may be time to revisit, on a national scope, internship training standards as relates to emergency certificates.

Is emergency certification useful? Is emergency certification appropriate? What should be required for supervision if emergency certification is allowed? Do the benefits outweigh the costs? Truly, the questions are challenging. At the same time, as schools, children, and society copes with increasingly complex mental health issues, we think it is time to address emergency certification. We think it’s risky. We think the work of school psychologists demands appropriate depth and breadth in internship training. We think children’s mental health needs demand quality internships. Where do you stand?
THE COMMENTARY SECTION

Below is a critique to “Single-Session Treatment: A Counseling Paradigm for School Psychology” by W. Paul Jones, Renee M. Kadlubek, & William J. Marks, Volume 60, Number 3 (Summer 2006).

A Response to “Single-Session Treatment: A Counseling Paradigm for School Psychology”

Ron Farkas, PA Psychological Association School Psychology Committee

The authors propose a single session counseling model be used by school psychologists who are challenged by work overload yet wish to serve the counseling needs of students. They refer to the RTI model for disability determination, which can be applied for a mental health perspective to differentiate between students whose needs can be served by the school and those “whose mental health needs are so extensive that it is clear from the beginning that they require more services than the school could provide.”

The authors do not directly address the requirement under IDEIA that LEAs ensure that students with disabilities who require psychological counseling as a related service (that is, in order to benefit from their free and appropriate public education) receive that related service as part of their IEP. While the LEA may seek to use outside resources to deliver the services called for in the student’s IEP, the practice of “referring out” for psychological counseling has historically reflected the failure of LEAs to fulfill their responsibility under IDEA and now IDEIA.

Under the ‘Child Find’ requirement of IDEIA, if a student is deemed to have extensive mental health needs through a systematic screening process it would be appropriate and necessary to ascertain whether the student met the eligibility requirement for specially designed instruction or services - including psychological counseling. If the student is in fact found eligible, it becomes the LEA’s responsibility, similar to if the student was found to be in need of speech therapy or PT/OT services. It would then be incumbent on the IEP team to develop appropriate goals and indicate the frequency and duration of the service. Subsequently, progress monitoring would be conducted to ensure that the goals of the service were being met. Thus, the nature of the student’s psychological counseling under such circumstances would be individualized and could not take on a ‘one size fits all’ approach.

Although it is often the case that school psychologists have a multitude of demands to fulfill, delivery of IEP services (i.e., psychological counseling) elevates to the same level of urgency and legality as evaluations and reevaluations. As such, there is no forgiveness for the concept of not having enough time to do it. School psychologists must be knowledgeable about legal requirements and advocate with their school districts on behalf of students to ensure that LEAs are fulfilling their responsibilities to students under the IDEIA. That may mean that LEAs might need to employ more school psychologists.
Several years ago, at the impetus of Division 16, the APA Board of Directors approved, as did Council, the appointment and funding of a task force to evaluate the effects of Zero Tolerance policies in schools on children, youth, and families. Several school psychologists were appointed to the task force, including Jane Conoley and Russ Skiba, and the task force was chaired by Division 16 Past-President, Cecil Reynolds. The APA Council of Representatives at its August 2006 meeting adopted the report of the APA Zero Tolerance Task Force, making it an official report and policy of the APA. The task force reviewed 10 years of research on zero tolerance policies in schools and found that they did not have the desired effect of reducing violence and disruption and in some instances can actually increase disruptive behavior and drop-out rates. The report recommends that zero tolerance policies not be abandoned, but that teachers and school administrators be given more flexibility in the implementation of disciplinary actions. The report is quite lengthy and detailed and makes a variety of recommendations for improving discipline practices in the schools. The report is currently featured on the APA web site (www.apa.org) and can be downloaded there.

This comprehensive report is a significant accomplishment. Congratulations to the Zero Tolerance Task Force and the chairperson, Cecil Reynolds.

New APA Fellows

Congratulations to the following new APA fellows:

John Hintze
Shane Jimerson
Thomas Kubiszyn
Frank Worrell
Zheng Zhou
CALL FOR NOMINATIONS:
Lightner Witmer Award

I. Each year the Division of School Psychology presents the Lightner Witmer Award to young professional and academic school psychologists who have demonstrated scholarship which merits special recognition. Continuing scholarship, rather than a thesis or dissertation alone, is the primary consideration in making the award. While a specific scholarly work may be salient in the evaluation of a nominee, it is not likely that a single work will be of such exceptional character that it would be the basis of the award. Similarly, numerous papers, articles, etc., will not by themselves be a sufficient basis for the award. Instead, the Lightner Witmer Award will be given for scholarly activity and contributions that have significantly nourished school psychology as a discipline and profession. This will include systematic and imaginative use of psychological theory and research in furthering the development of professional practice, or unusual scientific contributions and seminal studies of important research questions that bear on the quality of school psychological training and/or practice. In addition, there should be exceptional potential and promise to contribute knowledge and professional insights that are of uncommon and extraordinary quality. Nominees must be (a) within seven years of receiving their doctoral degree as of September 1 of the year the award is given; and (b) be a Fellow, Member, Associate, or Student Affiliate of Division 16.

II. Five sets of materials should be forwarded on each nominee including a vita, at least three supporting letters, reprints, other evidence of scholarship, and contact information for the nominee, nominator, and letter writers (as indicated on the Division 16 website) so that they may receive results. All nominations and related materials should be submitted by March 15 to the Chair of the Lightner Witmer Award Committee (Rich Gilman c/o gilman@uky.edu). Hard copies or CDs will be accepted.

CALL FOR NOMINATIONS:
Outstanding Dissertation Award

Each year the Division of School Psychology presents an Outstanding Dissertation Award to a school psychology student who has completed a dissertation which merits special recognition and which has the potential to contribute to the science and practice of school psychology. The Outstanding Dissertation Award is to be given for an outstanding dissertation on a topic that has the potential to contribute to school psychology as a discipline and profession. The outstanding dissertation is on a topic that has the potential to impact the science or practice of school psychology, such as research on underrepresented topics and/or populations in the school psychology literature or an original contribution to a traditional area. The research should clearly address and test hypotheses based on important theoretical and empirical questions; the methodology should be sound and sufficient to test the questions posed; and the writing quality addressing these issues as well as implications for practice and future research should be excellent.

Nominees must have successfully completed their dissertation defense by December 31 of the previous calendar year. Nominees must be (a) have been a student member of Division 16 at the time they completed the dissertation; and (b) be a Fellow, Member, Associate, or Student Affiliate of Division 16.

III. Materials to be forwarded on each nominee should include five copies of: the nominee’s vita, supporting letters (minimum of two from members of the dissertation committee), the dissertation, and contact information for the nominee, nominator and letter writers so they may receive results (as indicated on the Division 16 website). All nominations and related materials should be submitted by March 15 to the committee chair, Renee Tobin (rmtobin@ilstu.edu).

CALL FOR NOMINATIONS:
Senior Scientist in School Psychology Award

Each year the Division of School Psychology presents a Senior Scientist in School Psychology Award to a mature professional and academic school psychologist who has demonstrated a program of scholarship which merits special recognition. A sustained program of scholarship of exceptional quality throughout one’s career is the primary consideration in making the award. The award recipient’s program of work should reflect systematic and imaginative use of psychological theory and research in furthering the development of professional practice and consistent empirical inquiry that bears on the quality of school psychology training and practice. The program of scholarly work should be
Call for Nominations: Jack Bardon Distinguished Service Award

The Division 16 of the American Psychological Association presents an annual award in honor of Jack Bardon, whose professional contributions broadly spanned a conceptual framework for the training, role and definition of school psychology and growth of the profession in consultation and organizational issues (Eidle, Hyman & Meyers, 1997). He helped bring the profession to maturity during a major expansion period. The Jack Bardon Distinguished Service Award is given to mature professional and academic school psychologists who have continued this important work through voluntary professional service that goes above and beyond the requirements of the position the person holds and who has demonstrated an exceptional program of service across a career that merits special recognition. A sustained program of service to the profession of school psychology throughout one’s career is the primary consideration in making the award. The recipient of the Jack Bardon award is a distinguished figure within the profession with a history of sustained contributions and accomplishments. They should meet both criteria I and II.

I. Major leadership in the development, delivery or administration of innovative psychological services or development and implementation of policy leading to psychologically and socially sound preservice and/or CPD training and practice in school psychology; and sound evaluation of such training and service delivery models and policies.

II. Sustained professional organization contributions including holding offices and committee memberships in state and national professional organizations such as Division 16 and significant products from those contributions that further the profession of school psychology. Examples include creation of and revisions to policy and practice manuals based on innovative guidance; guiding major policy or legislative initiatives; mentoring of new professionals into organizational contributions; administering dissemination of professional materials through such publication editing or convention programming; and representing psychology to the public and government through service on boards and commissions. The Jack Bardon Distinguished Service Award is to be given for sustained service to the profession across a number of years and not for service in one office or major task force.

Nominees must be either 20 years past the granting of their doctoral degree or at least 50 years old by December 31 in the year nominated. Five sets of material should be forwarded on each nominee, including a vita, supporting letters (minimum of three), five major papers of publications, and contact information for the nominee, nominator and letter writers so they may receive results (as indicated on the Division 16 website). All nominations and related materials should be submitted by March 15 to the committee chair, Jack Cummings c/o cummings@indiana.edu). Hard copies or CDs are accepted.
2006 Division 16 Award Winners

Judy Oehler-Stinnett, Oklahoma State University
Division 16 Vice President – Education, Training and Scientific Affairs

It is my pleasure to announce the winners of the 2006 Division 16 Awards. Thank you to the committee chairs, Barbara Mowder, Barbara Schaefer, Patricia Lowe, and John Carlson for their hard work. Thank you also to everyone who took the time to nominate the many deserving nominees and congratulations to them for their contributions. Here are this year’s winners:

**Outstanding Dissertation Award:**

The Outstanding Dissertation Award is given for an outstanding dissertation on a topic that has the potential to contribute to school psychology as a discipline and profession. Judgments are based on the theoretical base, methodology and quality of the work.

This year’s winner is Dr. Brian C. Poncy, whose dissertation, entitled “An Investigation of the Dependability and Standard Error of Measurement of Words Read Correctly Per Minute Using Curriculum-Based Measurement,” involved the use of generalizability theory to conduct two studies: a generalizability (G) study and a decision (D) study. In the G study, Dr. Poncy isolated and quantified sources of error in curriculum-based measurement (CBM) reading probes, and in the D study, he determined the optimal number of CBM reading probes needed to make a variety of educational decisions with confidence regarding students. Through Dr. Poncy’s work, the assessment process with CBMs will become more efficient and will help school personnel to reduce error in CBM reading probes. Dr. Poncy completed his work in School Psychology at the University of Tennessee-Knoxville with his academic advisor, Dr. Christopher Skinner.

An honorable mention was awarded to Dr. Alex Beaujean, whose dissertation, entitled “Using Item Response Theory to Assess the Lynn-Flynn Effect,” involved the application of state-of-the-art statistical analyses to examine increase in mean intelligence scores across time. In this study, Dr. Beaujean examined whether the rise in intelligence scores across time, the Lynn-Flynn Effect (LFE), can be explained by an actual increase in intelligence or by a psychometric artifact. To test these hypotheses, he compared two data analytic methods, Item Response Theory (IRT) and classical test theory (CTT), with both simulated and “real” test data. By conducting this study, he determined that IRT has potential to elucidate the LFE and warrants further research. Dr. Beaujean’s work is the first to apply this method to the LFE, an issue that has important implications for school psychologists. Dr. Beaujean completed his work in School Psychology and Educational Psychology at the University of Missouri-Columbia with his academic co-advisors, Dr. Craig Frisby and Dr. Rick Short.

**Lightner Witmer Early Career Award:**

The Lightner Witmer Award recognizes significant early career scholarly works, within the broad professional interest domain of school psychologists, to foster sound theoretical and research activity. It is named for Dr. Lightner Witmer whose early work with school children is considered by many to be the origin of school psychology.

The 2006 Lightner Witmer Award was given to Dr. Amanda VanDerHeyden, whose research program, including numerous professional publications, focuses on issues of early intervention, data-based decision making, response to intervention, and curriculum-based assessment. Her use of highly sophisticated research methods to address contemporary, “real world” issues has contributed significantly to the field of school psychology. Numerous policy and practice issues have arisen from these efforts and her work is considered by many to be extremely important to the future of education and special education decision making. Specifically, her scholarship offers meaningful decision rules for response-to-intervention service delivery models including issues relating to identification equity, system efficiency, team adherence to data in decision-making, effect on cost to the district, and impact on child outcomes across time. Amanda, who completed her Ph.D. at Louisiana State University and spent a number of years working within the field, is now a faculty member at the University of California Santa Barbara. She clearly exemplifies the energy, commitment, and quality for which the Lightner Witmer Award stands.

CONTINUED ON PAGE 170
Senior Scientist Award:

The Senior Scientist Award is given to a mature member of the school psychology community in recognition of a career-long significant program of scholarship representing outstanding contributions to the scientific knowledge base of school psychology. This award represents the Division's highest level of recognition of excellence in science.

Dr. Edward S. Shapiro was this year’s recipient. Dr. Shapiro’s contributions to the science of school psychology are numerous and diverse. While most widely recognized for his distinguished contributions to research on the assessment and treatment of academic skills difficulties, he also has played a major role in building one of the premier doctoral training programs in school psychology. A consistent theme throughout Dr. Shapiro’s work has been his ability to listen carefully to practitioners and conduct research that offers them evidence-based answers. During his early research years, Dr. Shapiro examined the development of self-management skills in individuals with developmental disabilities, including children in classrooms as well as adults in workshop settings. Much of his work embraces the model of behavioral assessment, which he successfully brought to the issue of academic skill assessment and intervention. More recently, he has responded to practitioners’ questions regarding curriculum-based measurement (CBM) in relation to high stakes state assessments occurring across the country. In response, he is conducting a series of studies considering the predictability of the CBM model to reading and math achievement in Pennsylvania. The initial study was recently published in the Journal of Psychoeducational Assessment. Beyond his contributions in the area of the science of school psychology, Dr. Shapiro also has addressed issues related to the training of doctoral level school psychologists. With colleagues at Lehigh University, Dr. Shapiro developed doctoral level school psychology training to meet the educational, medical, and psychological needs of children by training students across disciplines. Dr. Shapiro and his colleagues call this area Pediatric School Psychology. His work has benefited psychological science, school psychology practice, and, ultimately children and represents an outstanding, sustained, positive influence on the field and science of school psychology.

Jack Bardon Distinguished Service Award:

The Jack Bardon Distinguished Service Award recognizes major leadership in the administration of psychological services in the schools, development and implementation of policy leading to psychologically and socially sound training and practice in school psychology, sustained research contributing to more effective practice in school psychology, the inauguration or development of training programs for new school psychologists, and/or for the systematic nurturance of inservice training for practicing school psychologists.

The 2006 Jack Bardon Award was given to two outstanding professionals in our field, Dr. LeAdelle Phelps and Dr. Patti Harrison (no photo available).

Dr. Phelps has a superb record of service to school psychology. She is the first school psychology representative to the American Psychological Association’s Committee on Accreditation to serve as Associate Chair and Chair-Elect, and she also is a past Chair of the Council for the Directors of School Psychology Programs. Her contributions informing policy have also been recognized through her service as Chair of Division 16’s Task Force on School Psychology Training Standards, Liaison with the APA Board of Educational Affairs, and member of the APA Ad Hoc Health Council. Her editorialship of *Psychology in the Schools* has guided the journal to double its published issues and helped to elevate it into a top-25 ranked journal in psychology and education. Her scholarly contributions to the applied research literature as an expert on youths’ chronic health problems and associated school-related development and functioning are commendable. Dr. Phelps’ selfless service and dedication to the field, her mentoring and training of competent school psychologists, and her professionalism and integrity are hereby recognized as substantial assets to the field of school psychology.
Dr. Harrison has an exemplary record of service to school psychology. Her extensive scholarly work has focused on adaptive behavior, test development, cognitive processing, and gifted education. Her leadership as Editor of the premier publication in the field of school psychology, *School Psychology Review*, as well as her editorial board membership on *School Psychology Quarterly* and the *Journal of School Psychology* has helped promote rigor and high standards in the field’s scholarly publications. Dr. Harrison’s longstanding service in professional organizations is seen via her roles as Program Manager with the National Association of School Psychologists, an officer with the Society for the Study of School Psychology, and a leader of the 2002 Future’s Conference in School Psychology, among others. Her contributions toward shaping policies affecting school psychology practice are evident in her contributions to shaping the 2004 revision of IDEA and her work on the APA and AERA Joint Committee on Testing Practices. Dr. Harrison’s commitment to the field of school psychology, her leadership and mentoring skills, and her tireless contributions have provided an enduring model of professional service and responsibility.

Congratulations again to all winners and nominees. The deadline for the 2007 awards is in February. Please see the Division website and the announcement in this issue for more information. All interested parties are encouraged to nominate themselves or other deserving persons.

---

**Introducing the Parenting Relationship Questionnaire**

Developed by the authors of the BASC-2, the Parenting Relationship Questionnaire (PRQ) is designed to capture a parent’s perspective on the parent-child relationship.

The PRQ assesses traditional parent-child dimensions such as attachment and involvement. It also provides information on parenting style, parenting confidence, stress, and satisfaction with the child’s school.

With two forms—preschool (ages 2–5) and child and adolescent (ages 6–18)—the PRQ can be completed in 10 to 15 minutes by the mother, father or other primary caregiver, and offers a quick and reliable means of gathering valuable information.
(right) Thomas J. Fagan (L) and Thomas K. Fagan (R) meet on Julia St. during the recent APA convention in New Orleans. Thomas J., a member of Divisions 12 and 18, had just received a distinguished service award from APA. Some Division 16 members had been mistakenly congratulating Thomas K. following the announcement made a few months ago. Even APA erred by sending Thomas J.’s award reception instructions to Thomas K. a few weeks before the convention. In the past, the two have had their APA convention registrations and program acceptances switched. As fate would have it, both Thomas Fagans were staying in the Embassy Suites in New Orleans.

Linda Reddy receives the Outstanding Service award from Tammy Hughes, Vice President of Education, Training & Scientific Affairs.

Student Scholarship Award Winners sponsored by AGS. Natalie M. Siegel, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, Megan L. Mayberry, University of Illinois-Champaign, Amy M. Molina, University of Northern Colorado, Greeley. Thank you AGS!
Outstanding Service Award

Tammy Hughes presents award to Lea Theodore

Linda Caterino

Jack Cummings, R. Brett Nelson, & Robyn Hess

Stacey Overstreet and her Tulane students meet with Richard Woodcock during Division 16 Social Hour.

Tim Keith, Gary Canivez, & Linda Reddy

Kristen Varjas, Linda Reddy, Bonnie Nastasi, & Linda Caterino

Rosemary Flanagan, Lea Theodore, & Richard DioGuardi

Gary Stoner after his Division 16 Presidential Talk
Update from Vice President of Publication, Communications, and Convention Affairs (VP-PCCA)

Tammy Hughes, Duquesne University, Division 16 VP-PCCA

Colleagues, this year we have accomplished many of our goals around publications. A defining moment for the Division occurred this summer when *School Psychology Quarterly* officially became an APA journal. I feel that this opportunity confirms the status of school psychology scholarship to external constituents. Along with the change in publishers we have selected Randy Kamphaus as the new editor-elect starting January 2007. Thanks to the editorial vision of current editor Rik D'Amato, the expertise in contract negotiation provided by Cecil Reynolds, and these new developments, I am confident SPQ will continue on its upward trajectory. The *School Psychologist* also successfully completed a search for the editor-elect position. Amanda Clinton-Higuita will take over as associate editor-elect as Michelle Athanasiou takes over the editor position from Linda Reddy whose tireless work has substantially contributed to the success of TSP. Finally, the Division’s book series Applying Psychology to the Schools published by APA has new life as David McIntosh and LeAdelle Phelps have taken over as co-editors and are streamlining and formalizing the editorial process. This next year I plan to focus on the Conversation series while maintaining high standards in the Division Convention programming (Rosemary Planagan), Hospitality Suite (Cathy Fiorello) and the Web page (Jack Cummings). I look forward to a productive year.
New achievement test series from Pearson, the world’s largest education company

The nationally normed BASI™ (Basic Achievement Skills Inventory) series helps give you **precise, in-depth** diagnostic information about your students’ academic strengths and weaknesses. The BASI series is ideal for regular classrooms and for initial and triennial special education evaluations under the new IDEA guidelines.

**The BASI series offers:**

- Current, standards-based content covering math, reading and language skills
- Easy administration with many options—on-screen or paper and pencil with any or all subtests
- Self- or group-administration, which saves valuable time
- Parallel forms for accurate progress tracking and measuring RTI (response to intervention)
- Instant on-screen results and data export
- Detailed reports to guide remediation and facilitate IEP writing
- Free Parent’s Reports
- A means to monitor academic performance of an entire class or individual student

Call Pearson Assessments or visit our website for more information.

800.627.7271
www.pearsonassessments.com/tests/basi.htm
TEMPLE UNIVERSITY

The Department of Psychological Studies in Education seeks to fill two tenure track positions in its School Psychology program. The program is multi-theoretical in orientation and trains scientist-practitioners in an APA-accredited, NASP-approved doctoral program as well as a NASP-approved Masters plus Certification program. Preference will be given to applicants who are graduates of APA-accredited programs in school psychology, are certified school psychologists, and who are licensed or eligible for licensure in Pennsylvania. The responsibilities associated with the position include: teaching graduate courses, supervising doctoral dissertations, providing clinical supervision, conducting research, and writing grants. Preference will be given to applicants who have an interest in school psychology issues as they relate to urban education (e.g., policy issues in urban schools, multicultural assessment, interventions with disadvantaged youth, violence prevention, etc.). Rank will depend on experience; however, the program hopes to make at least one appointment at the senior level.

Applicants interested in the above positions should send a letter of application, selected publications, and a current vita containing the names, addresses, and phone numbers of at least three references who have been asked to forward letters of recommendation. Materials should be sent to:

School Psychology Search Committee, Catherine A. Fiorello, Chair, College of Education, 1301 Cecil B. Moore Avenue, Ritter Annex 269, Temple University, Philadelphia, PA 19122.

Inquiries may be sent to catherine.fiorello@temple.edu.

New SOS Suicide Prevention Middle School Program Offered Free Through RMHC Grant

A grant from Ronald McDonald House Charities (RMHC) will fund the dissemination of Screening for Mental Health’s (SMH) SOS Middle School Program, a suicide prevention and depression awareness program for adolescents based on the nationally recognized SOS Signs of Suicide® high school program. The middle school program is for grades six through eight. The funding will allow SMH to offer the program free of charge to 1,000 schools in the ‘06-’07 year. The middle school program helps youth recognize the signs of suicide, depression, and self-injury and respond to them effectively, using the ACT model (Acknowledge, Care and Tell). The main teaching tool is a video that incorporates peer intervention as part of its implementation strategy. Other components include student educational materials and stickers to reinforce the program’s messages, a strong parental component including an educational newsletter, and training materials for faculty and staff.

Registration for the SOS High School Program is also underway. New kit materials this year include customizable wallet cards and posters, resources organized into a new binder format with lesson plans, and additional educational and training materials for staff and parents. For more information about the middle school or high school SOS programs or to register, call 781-239-0071 or visit www.MentalHealthScreening.org.
New Initiative Will Fund School-Based Mental Health Services for Children and Youth

Princeton, N.J., June 15, 2006 – The Robert Wood Johnson Foundation (RWJF) launched a new program to support partnerships between schools and mental health service providers to reduce emotional and behavioral problems among children in low-income, refugee- and immigrant-dense communities. Caring Across Communities: Addressing Mental Health Needs of Diverse Children and Youth, is a three-year, $4.5 million national program that advances RWJF’s efforts to meet the needs of vulnerable families who may not be served by traditional health and social services. The program will be led by Julia Graham Lear, Ph.D., director of the Center for Health & Health Care in Schools (CHHCS) at George Washington University’s School of Public Health & Health Services.

Caring Across Communities places special emphasis on helping schools work with community organizations to reduce the significant cultural and language barriers to quality mental health services that face children of immigrant and refugee families. Immigrant and refugee populations are growing in size in communities across the nation, and their health and social service needs are expanding as well. In 2002, children of immigrants under age 18 totaled 13.5 million in the U.S. In addition, more than half of these children are raised in families with income below 200 percent of the federal poverty level, and they experience daunting economic, education and health challenges.

Caring Across Communities will award approximately $100,000 per year for up to 3 years to an estimated 15 geographically and ethnically diverse project teams. Participating organizations might include community mental health centers, multicultural service agencies, faith-based organizations, or other immigrant-or refugee-serving organizations with mental health expertise. An elementary, middle or high school can be either a sole site for services, or a significant provider in a network of care. Grantees must use approaches that are culturally and linguistically relevant to children and their families. The Caring Across Communities Call for Proposals is available online at www.rwjf.org/cfp/caringacrosscommunities. Potential applicants should contact the program at (202) 466-3396 or visit www.healthinschools.org for more information.

For more information, contact: Andrea Daitz, RWJF, (609) 627-5937, adaitz@rwjf.org
People and Places

- The University of British Columbia welcomes Dr. Kent McIntosh as an Assistant Professor. Kent is a 2005 graduate of the program in School Psychology at the University of Oregon.

- Duquesne University is pleased to announce the addition of two new Assistant Professors, Drs. Elizabeth McCallum and Ara Schmitt.

- Auburn University is pleased to announce that Dr. Gregory Ern has joined the faculty. Dr. Ern completed his Ph.D. under the direction of Dr. George Batsche at the University of South Florida, and was previously employed as a school psychologist in the Indian River (Vero Beach), Florida school district.

- Dr. David McIntosh has accepted a new appointment as the Meeks Distinguished Professor of Special Education. This is an endowed professorship. He will still be involved as a core member of the Ball State University School Psychology Program.

- Dr. Alexander Beaujean, a recent graduate of the University of Missouri-Columbia, has joined the faculty of Baylor University as an Assistant Professor of Educational Psychology.

- Lehigh University is pleased to announce that Dr. Robin (Phaneuf) Hojnoski, formerly of The University of Memphis, will be joining the faculty.

- The University of Georgia is pleased to announce the addition of two new faculty members, Dr. Amy Reschly (University of Minnesota) and Dr. Kelly Cole Robinson (University of Georgia). Dr. Reschly joins the program as an Assistant Professor and Dr. Robinson will serve as Director of the School Psychology Clinic.

Please send all submissions to Michelle.Athanasiou@unco.edu

Updated for today’s needs

The Vineland-II gives you unprecedented flexibility along with detailed information for your diagnostic decisions. Use this test to assess individuals with mental retardation, autism spectrum disorders, developmental delays, brain injuries, and other impairments.

Teacher Rating Form—Now Available! Formally known as the Classroom Edition, use this efficient form to learn about a student’s behavior in the classroom or in conjunction with one of the other versions of the Vineland-II to collect information about an individual’s behavior in a variety of settings.

Vineland-II

PearsonAssessments.com 800.627.7271
AGS assessments are now part of Pearson Assessments.
Copyright © 2006 Pearson Education, Inc. or its affiliates. All Rights Reserved. AAD 1118 09/06
The leader in achievement testing is set to launch a new Brief Battery from the Woodcock-Johnson® family of assessment products. Take it to your school’s leadership for purchase approval.

Find out more at www.woodcock-johnson.com or call 800.323.9540.
Gary Stoner, Division 16 President presents the 2006 Award winners (Left to right); Dr. Brian C. Poncy receives the 2006 Outstanding Dissertation Award, Dr. Amanda VanDerHeyden receives the 2006 Lightner Witmer Early Career Award, Dr. Edward S. Shapiro receives the 2006 Senior Scientist Award, Dr. LeAdelle Phelps receives the 2006 Jack Bardon Distinguished Service Award, and Dr. Patti Harrison also receives the 2006 Jack Bardon Distinguished Service Award (photo not available). More APA Convention photos inside this issue.