From the President

Fabricio E. Balcazar
University of Illinois at Chicago

A Pebble in the Pond?

This past weekend, the Community and Prevention Research Program at UIC hosted the 2013 Midwest ECO conference. There were over 150 people in attendance—one of the largest gatherings of community psychologists other than the Biennial conference. The students did a great job at planning and organizing the conference, hosting 75 presentations, roundtable discussions, workshops and poster sessions. It is very encouraging to see the enthusiasm of the discussions and the sense of camaraderie among the attendees, specially the students. One of the highlights of the event was a keynote panel discussion about “striking a balance between upstream and downstream interventions” inspired by the analogy of the fisherman on the river who ends up pulling people who are drowning out of the river. The conversation led me to ask the following question: What is our business as community psychologists? We are not in the business of pulling people out from the river—we leave that job primarily to the clinical psychologists, social workers, counselors and other professionals helping people cope and address their crises. However, with regards to the river in front of us, I see us as dam and bridge builders and river changers. In other words, we are about transforming the environment or the conditions that impact people either up or downstream. I think this is a challenging yet very critical role—we can become agents of change. An important task ahead of us is to identify and share strategies and interventions that work to prevent individuals from getting into the water in the first place. We have many tools and evidence-based interventions that work. Many of those interventions are available in the Community Tool Box (see http://ctb.ku.edu/) free of charge, which is a great resource that plays a critical role in helping practitioners and community members identify issues, plan and implement interventions, and evaluate them. The toolbox is making those interventions available to interested people from around the world. However, many students, professionals and practitioners do not know about the toolbox nor do they know about other available interventions developed by community psychologists in collaboration with local communities. One of our challenges is to figure out better ways to promote our prevention and intervention technologies in the social media or any other viable venue on the web. How can we maintain and expand the content of the knowledge-base of our successful interventions? How can we capture interventions that community psychologists are developing around the world but are not getting published or are not being made available to larger audiences? Perhaps we can follow the model from Wikipedia where interested volunteers contribute pieces to the knowledge-base and there is a common place where the information is deposited. I would welcome your suggestions for ways to address these issues in the future.

Likewise, I also want to reflect on another discussion we had at one of the Midwest ECO sessions, which focused on the devastating impact of the recent budget cuts—sequestration—over a myriad of social programs and services that depend on federal subsidies to deliver services to people in need. This morning a congressman from Illinois argued on National Public Radio that a child from the south side of Chicago (who appeared to be Black), should have the same chance to succeed as a White child from the North suburbs through hard work and determination. He added that this includes minimizing the role of government, therefore justifying the budget cuts of social programs that appear in his view to hinder people’s determination to work hard in order to succeed. We all know that a main flaw of this argument is that the two kids do not share the same schools, the same neighborhood or the same standards of living or conditions—one lives in a poor neighborhood while the other leaves in a wealthy neighborhood. They do not have the same opportunities and never will unless we radically change the fundamental inequalities in society. Ignoring the role of the environment in this argument is clearly victim blaming. We are all familiar with this position, yet it is perplexing to hear conservatives talk about it as the best solution to the nation problems—reduce welfare dependency, while we continue to subsidize multinational corporations with billions of dollars. So what can we do about this? We need to challenge these arguments whenever
From the Editors

Gregor V. Sarkisian and Sylvie Taylor, Antioch University Los Angeles

Happy New Year!

As we enter 2014 we are proud to introduce a new feature to TCP, *Remembering Swampscott.* TCP will dedicate space for this feature in each issue leading up to the 50th Anniversary of the Swampscott Conference and the 2015 Biennial in Lowell, Massachusetts. The SCRA Past Presidents, under the stewardship of Mo Elias, will contribute reflections on the Swampscott Conference and its impact on the development of community psychology and SCRA. We launch the series with a piece by James G. Kelly who provides us with a wonderful ecological overview of the social issues of the time and the development of a new consciousness in psychology. We eagerly look forward to future contributions about this pivotal conference.

Sylvie and Gregor
SPECIAL REPORT
Examining the Guiding Competencies in Community Psychology Practice from Students’ Perspectives

Kyrah K. Brown, Wichita State University; Gina Cardazone, University of Hawai‘i; Olya Glantsman, DePaul University; Sharon Johnson-Hakim, Atlantic Health Systems; and Michael Lemke, Wichita State University

Introduction
Over the years, masters and doctoral level graduate programs providing community psychology education have been surveyed to inform the field about the current state of graduate education (Connell et al., 2013). This survey was traditionally administered by the Council on Education Programs (CEP) and its predecessors (e.g., Council of Community Psychology Program Directors). In 2012, the Council on Education Programs (CEP) collaborated with the Community Psychology Practice Council (CPPC) to survey community psychology graduate programs. The Practice Council became involved with the administration of the survey to encourage a focus on competencies for community psychology practice. The goals of the 2012 survey included exploring the current state of graduate education in community psychology such as types of education opportunities within graduate programs, faculty composition, student and alumni information, and determining each program’s provision of education in community psychology practice competencies. For the first time in its history, the survey was grounded in the 18 Competencies for Community Psychology (CP) Practice (Dalton & Wolfe, 2012). The 18 competencies for community psychology practice are rooted in the core values and principles of the field, such as social justice, respect for diversity, and empowerment (Fryer, 2008; Kloos, Hill, Thomas, Wandersman, Elias, & Dalton, 2012; Rappaport, 1977). These competencies are also based on the skills needed to collaborate with organizations and communities to evoke social change (see Table 1 for list and description of competencies).

Table 1. The 18 Competencies for Community Psychology Practice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency</th>
<th>Definition: “The ability to…”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Foundation Principles</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecological Perspectives</td>
<td>Articulate and apply multiple ecological perspectives and levels of analysis in community practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowerment</td>
<td>Articulate and apply a collective empowerment perspective, to support communities that have been marginalized in their efforts to gain access to resources and to participate in community decision-making.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociocultural and Cross-cultural Competence</td>
<td>Value, integrate, and bridge multiple worldviews, cultures, and identities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Inclusion and Partnership</td>
<td>Promote genuine representation and respect for all community members, and act to legitimize divergent perspectives on community and social issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethical Reflective Practice</td>
<td>Identify ethical issues in one’s own practice and act to address them responsibly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Program Development</strong></td>
<td>Partner with community stakeholders to plan, develop, implement and sustain programs in community settings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevention and Health Promotion</td>
<td>Articulate and implement a prevention perspective, and to implement prevention and health promotion community programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community and Organizational Capacity-Building</strong></td>
<td>Engage, energize, and mobilize community members and groups regarding an issue of shared importance; and to identify personal strengths and social and structural resources that they can develop further to enhance empowerment, community engagement, and leadership.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small and Large Group Processes</td>
<td>Intervene in small and large group processes, in order to facilitate the capacity of community groups to work together productively.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Development</td>
<td>Identify and integrate use of human and material resources, including community assets and social capital.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation and Organizational Development</td>
<td>Facilitate growth of an organization’s capacity to attain its goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community and Social Change</strong></td>
<td>Help groups with common interests and goals to do together what they cannot do apart.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Development</td>
<td>Help a community develop a vision and take actions toward becoming a healthy community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Organizing and Community Advocacy</td>
<td>Work collaboratively with community members to gain the power to improve conditions affecting their community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Policy Analysis, Development and Advocacy</td>
<td>Build and sustain effective communication and working relationships with policy makers, elected officials, and community leaders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Education, Information Dissemination, and Building Public Awareness</td>
<td>Communicate information to various segments of the public, to strengthen competencies and awareness, or for advocacy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Research</strong></td>
<td>Work with community partners to plan and conduct research that meet high standards of scientific evidence that are contextually appropriate, and to communicate the findings of that research in ways that promote community capacity to pursue community goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participatory Community Research</td>
<td>Partner with community/setting leaders and members to promote program improvement and program accountability to stakeholders and funders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Competency domains and definitions described by Dalton and Wolfe (2012).

A group of graduate students, all members of the SCRA Practice Council, were inspired by the inclusion of practice competencies in the survey to graduate programs. Consequently, this group set out to modify the original survey and administer it to current graduate students. This survey was intended to attend to the voices of graduate students, whose perspectives may differ from those of program directors and faculty who completed the original survey. For example, while the program directors might judge
more effectively to conduct strengths-based praxis towards raising public awareness of the plight of vulnerable people and addressing the social justice issues they face in oppressive dominant societies.
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their program’s success by measuring whether or not specific competencies are introduced in class, the students may evaluate it from a perspective of confidence with which they can use these competencies in the field. The inclusion of graduate students in the graduate program evaluation process is not only empowering; it is a necessary step for gauging the state of community psychology education in a comprehensive fashion. Furthermore, including graduate students in the process of competency-focused curriculum development (and refinement) is especially important for two reasons. First, it recognizes that graduate students do understand what skills they want to develop during their graduate career. Second, graduate students represent the future leaders in community psychology and will be charged with preserving and advancing the field.

This collective effort to (a) examine the extent to which community psychology competencies are addressed in community psychology graduate programs and (b) to launch a follow-up directed at students about their perceptions of their graduate training, at the international level, is the first of its kind for the field.

Methods
After approval from the SCRA Executive Committee, a list of student members was obtained. A total number of 419 individuals were contacted via email. A screening question was included at the beginning of the survey to screen out any individuals included in the initial email list who were no longer current students.

Survey Instrument
The student survey, adapted from the CEP and CPPC survey distributed to graduate programs in community psychology in 2012, consisted of 43 items. The survey was hosted using Qualtrics Survey Software, which enabled tracking of targeted follow-up emails to individuals who had not yet responded to the survey. Demographic items were designed to gauge the respondent’s matriculation status, as well as the location and type of degree of program the respondent was enrolled in.

Two questions were asked for each of the 18 competencies: The degree to which the respondent would prefer to receive training in that competency, and the degree to which the respondent actually expected to receive training in that competency. A four-point scale was used to rate responses, which (please see Table 2 for a description). A full description of the 18 competencies before they answered the questions related to them.

### Table 2. Description of Education Levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Education</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exposure</td>
<td>In core community courses, all students learn about the value of this competency and how it can be applied in community psychology practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>In selected courses, including supervised practice/fieldwork, students can choose to gain supervised practice in performing tasks and actions related to the competency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expertise</td>
<td>Upper level students can choose competencies in which to develop further experience and attain a higher level of expertise. This might involve several field experiences or several terms or years. Postgraduate experiences and continuing education allow further development of expertise in specific competencies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Results

### Program Characteristics

Of the 419 surveys sent via email, 131 current community psychology graduate students completed the survey (RR= 31.5%). Respondents represented the following program types: doctoral program (81%), Master’s program (17%) and other (2%). The majority of respondents (77%) were from graduate programs in the United States and U.S. territories, and 23% represented graduate programs in Portugal, Australia, Italy, Japan and Canada. The average number of years in program was 3 years (SD=1.83), and ranged from six months to 10 years.

### Perceived Actual and Preferred Education among Master’s Students

Table 3 provides a summary of the perceptions of Master’s students regarding their graduate education in terms of preferred and actual competency education mean scores. The overall mean difference between preferred and actual competency education scores was .50, which indicates that participants perceived their actual education level to be slightly lower than the level of education they preferred to receive.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency</th>
<th>Preferred Education</th>
<th>Actual Education</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ecological Perspectives</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowerment</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociocultural and Cross-Cultural Competence</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Inclusion and Partnership</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethical, Reflective Practice</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Development, Implementation, and Management</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevention and Health Promotion</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Leadership and Mentoring</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small and Large Group Processes</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Development</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation and Organizational Development</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration and Coalition Development</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Development</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Organizing and Community Advocacy</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Policy Analysis, Development, and Advocacy</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Education, Information Dissemination, and Building Public Awareness</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participatory Community Research</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Evaluation</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.23</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.73</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.50</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The greatest discrepancy in participants’ reported actual and preferred education in the foundational competencies was observed in empowerment (Mean Difference=.61) and community inclusion and partnership (MDiff= .61). Among community program development competencies, the greatest discrepancy in participants’ reported actual and preferred education was observed in program development, implementation and management (MDiff= .61).

A more sizeable discrepancy was observed for one of the community and organizational capacity building competencies: consultation and organizational development (MDiff= .78). In addition, the greatest discrepancy in education regarding community and social change competencies was observed in community education, information dissemination and building public awareness (MDiff= .72), followed by public policy analysis, development and advocacy (MDiff= .61) and community development (MDiff= .61). Finally, with regard to the community research competencies, the greatest discrepancy was observed in participatory community research (MDiff= .67).

Overall, Master’s students desired education within the experience level across all 18 competencies (M= 3.23). Empowerment (M=3.5), participatory community research (M=3.5), program development (M= 3.44) and program evaluation (M= 3.44) were among the most preferred competencies. The competencies least preferred among participants were community leadership and mentoring (M= 2.94) and public policy analysis, development and advocacy (M=2.94).

Actual education was perceived to be at the exposure level (M= 2.71). Master’s students reported that they received the greatest amount of education in ethical, reflective practice (M= 3.06), ecological perspectives (M=3.11) and program evaluation (M= 3.11). Moreover, consultation and organizational development (M=2.44), resource development (M=2.5) and community education, information dissemination and building public awareness (M=2.5) were competencies that students reported receiving the least amount of actual education.

### Perceived Actual and Preferred Education among Doctoral Students

Table 4 summarizes the perceptions of Doctoral students of their graduate education in terms of preferred and actual competency
education mean scores. Overall, the mean discrepancy between preferred and actual competency education scores was 0.84, indicating that participants believed that their actual education level was nearly a full level below what they would prefer to receive.

Table 4. Perceptions of Preferred and Actual Education (Doctoral Students)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency</th>
<th>Preferred Education</th>
<th>Actual Education</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ecological Perspectives</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowerment</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociocultural and Cross-Cultural Competence</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Inclusion and Partnership</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethical, Reflective Practice</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Development, Implementation, and Management</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevention and Health Promotion</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Leadership and Mentoring</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small and Large Group Processes</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Development</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation and Organizational Development</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration and Coalition Development</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Development</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Organizing and Community Advocacy</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Policy Analysis, Development, and Advocacy</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Education, Information Dissemination, and Building Public Awareness</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participatory Community Research</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Evaluation</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among the foundational principles, the greatest discrepancy were found for community inclusion and partnership (MDiff = 1.04). Other large discrepancies were found for the empowerment and sociocultural and cross-cultural competence competencies (MDiff = .83 for both). Large discrepancies were found for both community program development competencies among Doctoral students responding to the survey: Program development, implementation, and management (MDiff= 1.10) and prevention and health promotion (MDiff= .85).

Sizable discrepancies were also found among the community and organizational building competencies of community leadership and mentoring (MDiff = 0.97), resource development (MDiff = 0.97), and consultation and organizational development (MDiff = 0.84). Similarly, all four community and social change competencies had discrepancies between preferred and actual education that were large: Collaboration and coalition development (MDiff = 0.86), community development (MDiff = 0.94), community organizing and community advocacy (MDiff = 1.00), public policy analysis, development, and advocacy (MDiff = 1.00) and community education, information dissemination and building public awareness (MDiff = 0.95).

Doctoral students desired education within the experience level across all 18 competencies (M = 3.25). Their most preferred competencies were the two community research competencies of participatory community research (M = 3.63) and program evaluation (M = 3.57), with the community program development competency of program development, implementation, and management being highly desired as well (M = 3.58). Least preferred competencies were small and large group processes (M = 2.92) and resource development (M = 2.97).

Finally, doctoral students perceived their actual education as falling within the exposure level across all 18 competencies (M = 2.41). Participants felt that they received the best education in the two community research competencies of program evaluation (M = 2.99) and participatory community research (M = 2.96). Resource development (M = 2.00) and community leadership and mentoring (M = 2.12) were lowest-rated in terms of actual education received among the 18 competencies.

Student Perceptions of Graduate Education: Years in Program and Perceived Actual Education

The relationship between the number of years in the program and students’ perceived actual level of education for all students was assessed. One of the most surprising findings from this analysis was that 15 of the competencies demonstrated an inverse relationship between years in the program and actual education. A statistically significant inverse relationship was observed in only six competencies: prevention and health promotion (r= -.24, p<.05), community leadership and mentoring (r= -.29 p<.05), small and large group processes (r= -.23, p<.05), resource development (r= -.33, p<.05), consultation and organizational development (r= -.27, p<.05), and community development (r= -.22, p<.05). It is unclear why these negative correlations exist. One possibility may be that increased time spent in a program leads to more realistic projections. Since participants were asked to rate the degree to which they “actually expect to receive education” in the given competencies, those in their first years may have higher expectations, while those who have received most or all of their formal education may have a more accurate assessments of what is and is not offered in their programs.

It is also possible that this negative correlation between years spent in the program and education expectations is due to differences in the focus of terminal Master’s programs and PhD programs. Overall, students in both programs had very similar ratings of the
The goals of a Master’s program may be confounded by the fact that many programs offer a Master’s degree en route to a doctorate, it may also reflect actual differences in goals of these two degrees. The goals of a Master’s program may be more focused on achieving competencies which will be directly useful in practice, while the goal of a PhD program may include much greater focus on theory and general research skills.

Conclusions and Action Steps

As an organization, SCRA has historically surveyed graduate programs to determine the state of graduate education in our field. In 2012, the graduate program survey was modified to assess the level of education that programs offer their students in the 18 competencies for community psychology practice using the exposure-to-expertise framework. This year, we made another major modification in an effort to advance this data gathering process. This follow-up survey was aimed at hearing graduate students’ voices regarding education in the 18 competencies within these programs.

Our findings from the student survey indicate that graduate students have strong preferences for education in certain competencies. In addition, it is clear that graduate students have also indicated gaps in their perceived actual education and preferred education in specific competencies. Generally, graduate students are interested in gaining more education in the practice competencies than what they currently are receiving. It is important to note, however, that these perceived ‘gaps’ vary by program type, which suggests that Masters students and Doctoral students might have slightly different attitudes and expectations about their graduate education. Further, when we assessed the relationship between years in the program and actual level of education received, it became clear that students’ perceptions of their level of education changes as they advance in the program. It appears that graduate students with more years in their program tended to report having received less education in areas such as prevention and health promotion, community leadership and mentoring, small and large group processes, resource development, consultation and organizational development and community development. These competencies, however, also appear to be areas that one would gain experience and expertise post-graduate school. But, it appears that students prefer education at the experience level.

In light of these results, we recommend the following action steps in order to better meet student desire and need for education in the 18 practice competencies, and hope these suggestions will be jointly supported by the CEP and the Practice Council, as well as SCRA as a whole.

Continue to include graduate student voices in dialogue concerning the state of education in community psychology. Based on the number of responses from graduate students, as well as the quality of the information received, we recommend institutionalizing the graduate student survey along with the program survey. As an organization that believes in both empowerment and inclusion, it only makes sense to encourage graduate students to have a platform to discuss their concerns and thoughts about the state of graduate education. The recommendation to institutionalize graduate student input is also especially important for individual graduate programs that are working towards modifying or establishing their identity as guided by the competencies.

Make graduate education opportunities transparent. No one program can provide education in all of the 18 competencies. It is understandable that programs necessarily ‘specialize’ based on faculty composition and available resources. Thus, we recommend that graduate programs with the help of students (a) identify which competencies are central to the program and (b) make this information readily available to prospective students (e.g., website, program brochure). That way, students can gravitate towards programs that match their desired career interests. For example, this might involve programs listing the practice competencies that they emphasize on both their university website and the SCRA website. In order for this to happen successfully, graduate programs must be willing to examine their current courses in light of the competencies and reflect on their strengths and weaknesses in an honest way. A great example of this process is the “Curriculum Mapping” facilitated by Sylvie Taylor and Gregor Sarkisian at Antioch University Los Angeles.

Take advantage of outside education opportunities for students. It is understandable that many graduate programs may not be able to provide education in ‘high-demand’ competencies due to limited resources and/or supports within the university. We recommend that programs build support for students who want to develop particular competencies outside of the formal structure of their department. For example, this could be accomplished through an exchange program, online learning, applied mentorships, or summer seminars. In order for this to be feasible and affordable, students need to receive credit back at their home institutions and receive financial support for these endeavors. A small, but significant step in this direction could include inviting practitioners who specialize in certain competences to present to students as guest lecturers within current course structures. David Julian and others in the Practice Council are currently working on a survey and directory of practitioners which will help to facilitate this process.

Establish continuing education opportunities for Masters and Ph.D. graduates. No one, at the beginning of their career, can possibly predict all of the skills and competencies that they need to be successful. Therefore, it is important to offer competency-focused continuing education opportunities that help early and mid-career community psychologists stay abreast of new developments in the field as well as gain more education in their preferred competencies. Such opportunities can be SCRA-sponsored seminars or workshops that are available in various locations. For example, this has been a central topic of discussion with the Professional Development Committee and Summer Institute planning, headed by Susan Wolfe.
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For several years, I have taught a writing-intensive seminar about stigma and mental illness to graduating psychology majors at the State University of New York (SUNY), New Paltz -- many of whom aspire to become mental health service professionals. In the first half of the semester, students gain a foundation in sociological theories of stigma, different ways of understanding mental illness, the history of treatment, media depictions, as well as real-world consequences of stigma (e.g., social distance; limited access to good quality health care, housing, and employment) as outlined in research, the popular press, and first-person accounts. This foundation is gained through writing assignments, experiential exercises, documentary films, student presentations, and a continuing dialogue. Throughout the semester, students take turns co-leading discussions on the week’s readings, a class structure that models an egalitarian partnership approach to service delivery. The course concludes with students learning about -- and in some cases designing their own -- innovative interventions designed to prevent and reduce stigma at both individual and structural levels.

A cornerstone of the classroom experience is a visit from guest speaker Steve Miccio, Chief Executive Officer of Projects to Empower and Organize the Psychiatrically Labeled (PEOPLE, Inc) with offices in Dutchess County (Poughkeepsie) and Ulster County (Kingston) and serving these counties as well as Orange, Putnam, St. Lawrence and Hamilton. At its essence, as a “peer-run” organization -- one in which only individuals with lived experience are qualified to provide services -- PEOPLE, Inc. defies assumptions about the capabilities of individuals who have struggled or continue to struggle with “extreme mind states.” As a recovery-oriented organization, PEOPLE, Inc. provides services including but not limited to housing assistance, community integration, in-home peer companionship, mobile outreach, peer support groups, Wellness Recovery Action Plan (WRAP) classes, recreational activities, social events (e.g., Nights Out in Ellenville) and employment. PEOPLE, Inc. is recognized both nationally and internationally for its models of emergency room support (e.g., in Benedictine Hospital in Kingston) and hospital diversion (via Rose House in Putnam County) for people with psychiatric disabilities. Respite homes based on PEOPLE, Inc.’s model have been established as far away as the Netherlands, Poland, and Iceland.

Miccio typically joins us about two-thirds of the way through the semester. The visit is carefully timed to take place after students have grappled with the problem of stigma but before we have thoroughly considered solutions and their relative challenges. In preparation for his visit, students read a New York State Office of Mental Health (NYS OMH) funded White Paper by New York State Office of Mental Health (NYS OMH) funded White Paper. 
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Educating Undergraduate Psychology Students about Stigma and Mental Illness: From the Classroom to the Field

*Written by Greta Winograd, Ph.D., Assistant Professor of Psychology, State University of New York, New Paltz*

For several years, I have taught a writing-intensive seminar about stigma and mental illness to graduating psychology majors at the State University of New York (SUNY), New Paltz -- many of whom aspire to become mental health service professionals. In the first half of the semester, students gain a foundation in sociological theories of stigma, different ways of understanding mental illness, the history of treatment, media depictions, as well as real-world consequences of stigma (e.g., social distance; limited access to good quality health care, housing, and employment) as outlined in research, the popular press, and first-person accounts. This foundation is gained through writing assignments, experiential exercises, documentary films, student presentations, and a continuing dialogue. Throughout the semester, students take turns co-leading discussions on the week’s readings, a class structure that models an egalitarian partnership approach to service delivery. The course concludes with students learning about -- and in some cases designing their own -- innovative interventions designed to prevent and reduce stigma at both individual and structural levels.

A cornerstone of the classroom experience is a visit from guest speaker Steve Miccio, Chief Executive Officer of Projects to Empower and Organize the Psychiatrically Labeled (PEOPLE, Inc) with offices in Dutchess County (Poughkeepsie) and Ulster County (Kingston) and serving these counties as well as Orange, Putnam, St. Lawrence and Hamilton. At its essence, as a “peer-run” organization -- one in which only individuals with lived experience are qualified to provide services -- PEOPLE, Inc. defies assumptions about the capabilities of individuals who have struggled or continue to struggle with “extreme mind states.” As a recovery-oriented organization, PEOPLE, Inc. provides services including but not limited to housing assistance, community integration, in-home peer companionship, mobile outreach, peer support groups, Wellness Recovery Action Plan (WRAP) classes, recreational activities, social events (e.g., Nights Out in Ellenville) and employment. PEOPLE, Inc. is recognized both nationally and internationally for its models of emergency room support (e.g., in Benedictine Hospital in Kingston) and hospital diversion (via Rose House in Putnam County) for people with psychiatric disabilities. Respite homes based on PEOPLE, Inc.’s model have been established as far away as the Netherlands, Poland, and Iceland.

Miccio typically joins us about two-thirds of the way through the semester. The visit is carefully timed to take place after students have grappled with the problem of stigma but before we have thoroughly considered solutions and their relative challenges. In preparation for his visit, students read a New York State Office of Mental Health (NYS OMH) funded White Paper by New York State Office of Mental Health (NYS OMH) funded White Paper.
persistent mental illness will all too often cycle between symptom relief, relapse, and hospitalization without a recovery and wellness paradigm offering integrated and continuous services -- including relevant psychosocial support, access to housing, benefits, education/employment, and medical care. Because of the close alignment between these goals and the services provided by PEOPLE, Inc., Miccio has been enlisted as a partner in the restructuring of New York State’s mental health system on a multi-county level (e.g., the “Imagine Dutchess” project) to address entrenched deficits in current systems of care, as required by states in the Olmstead Supreme Court Ruling of 2009 and President Obama’s Accountable Care Act.

This is the third year of the SUNY New Paltz psychology department’s official partnership with PEOPLE, Inc. Students participating in this unique internship have access to training in the wide range of services provided by PEOPLE, Inc. as well as opportunities to participate in official conversations about mental health care reform and the manner in which such reform is enacted in the Hudson Valley region. Students in both the class and internship are consistently impressed and inspired when they learned that programs and approaches developed by an organization in our own community are looked to as innovative models of service provision both within and far beyond the borders of New York State.

In June of 2012, Jennifer-Muir Braunstein (BA Psychology, 2012), a student in the stigma class in the fall of 2011 who participated in the internship in the spring of 2012 joined me at the international Together Against Stigma conference in Ottawa, Canada where we represented SUNY New Paltz and PEOPLE, Inc. as we presented a poster co-authored with Steve Miccio about the two-semester sequence described above. Our hope was that this presentation might prompt others to create university-community partnerships that offer students exposure to self-determination models of support service provision. Organized by the Mental Health Commission of Canada and the World Psychiatric Association Scientific Section on Stigma and Mental Illness, the conference brought together over 500 researchers, mental health professionals, policy makers and service users from around the globe. Jennifer recently began working in an official capacity within a program at PEOPLE, Inc. that supports access to independent housing. In this role, Jennifer also helps individuals gain or maintain access to needed services, social support, and a sense of belonging as participating members of the community.
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Community Ideas
Edited by Gina Cardazone

Fighting Poverty with Cash
Written by Sharon Johnson-Hakim, Atlantic Health System

If you’re like me, you probably get hit-up on a near monthly basis by a number of worthy seeming non-profits looking for donations to keep their programs afloat. So, the question becomes, how to decide which (if any) organizations to give to? To consider, of course, are where your money can have the most impact and what kinds of programs and activities you personally want to support. Do you believe in the agency’s philosophy and mission statement? Do you agree with how they interact with those that they serve? Does the organization promote sustainable actions? Perhaps you keep your “Community Psychologist Hat” on when making these donation decisions; if that’s the case, what then would a Community Psychology congruent non-profit look like?
Perhaps the organization would look like a traditional non-profit and more like GiveDirectly (www.givedirectly.org).

Through what they call a “radical new way of giving,” GiveDirectly distributes donated monies directly to poor families in Kenya through mobile phone technology (M-Pesa) via cash transfers.

GiveDirectly was started when its founders, then graduate students studying economic development at Harvard and MIT, wanted to make a donation to an organization that was successfully advancing economic development across the globe. The problem? Even though they were scholars in the field, they couldn’t agree on or identify an organization that successfully met their standards or values. Hence, the birth of a new non-profit. As an organization, GiveDirectly operates with three values in mind: efficiency, transparency and respect.

Their approach allows them to cut down on program expenses, and put at least 90% of every dollar donated in the hands of the poor. Additionally, their definition of respect includes elements of empowerment, which echo our field’s own beliefs in self-determination and asset-based approaches to community development. GiveDirectly is often asked why they provide unconditional cash transfers, instead of putting conditions on how recipients use the money. Their stance is that empowering the poor to make their own decisions enables them to purchase the things they need most, which enhances the impact of the funds, and serves to echo their core value of respect. An example of this is that participants have often used funds to replace grass, thatched roofs with tin ones, which substantially improves the quality of their lives, and saves money in the long run. Though the logic of this purchase is immediately apparent, it is the kind of investment that may never occur to external funders who don’t possess the lived experiences that can inform this kind of decision.

One can see that as an organization GiveDirectly is challenging the role of the “expert” in helping individuals get out of poverty. GiveDirectly offers enrollment to those who qualify using objective criteria such as census data to identify poor communities and the objective, assessed quality of a family’s dwelling (does it have solid walls, floors or roofs?) to determine eligibility. Each family in the program receives $1,000 over either one or two years. This amount was selected because it was
fair, well-understood, and potentially transformative. The average recipient has been living on 65 cents per day, so this amount of money has a sizeable impact on their day to day life. The underlying message the organization operates on is that no one knows what a "poor person" needs to get out of poverty more than that person themselves; they are the experts in what they need. Cash transfers have been used to purchase tin roofs or additional land, start or expand businesses (e.g. purchasing livestock or a motorcycle), and pay for medical, educational, and household expenses.

Unsaid here, or in the organizations' promotional materials, is that in addition to considering each individual an expert on their own situation, the organization is trusting that they will do what is best with the money. There are no safeguards against spending on what we would consider "ills" such as tobacco or alcohol. As a donor to this organization, the only "assurances" that they give you is that 1) your money is going to someone who needs it, and 2) the organization will try its best to get as much of that dollar in the hand of a recipient as possible.

Cash transfers to the poor are not a new idea. According to the Department for International Development's (Part of UK Aid) 2011 report, evidence suggests that cash transfers have uniformly positive impacts on the life of recipients. Cash transfers benefit children and can have long-term sustainable impacts on the lives of recipients. Additionally, the poor do not abuse cash as predicted by derogatory stereotypes.

Recently, GiveDirectly has been advocating for the role of data in philanthropy. To evaluate its work in Kenya, GiveDirectly contracted with the evaluation group Innovations for Poverty Action to conduct a randomized controlled trial looking at the impact of the direct transfers in Kenya. The study found that transfers from GiveDirectly have positive, meaningful and sustainable impacts across recipients' assets, business income, expenditures, food security and mental health. The full paper is available on their website.

Following this initial evaluation, GiveDirectly is experimenting with how they distribute money, asking questions such as: Do lump sums in the beginning have a larger or smaller impact than funds distributed over a longer period? How can funds be distributed on a community rather than individual basis? And how do they better ensure that monies make it to their intended recipients? Continued self-evaluation and adjustments to their model will enable GiveDirectly to continue to improve their effectiveness and increase their impact in Kenya.

Call to Action
So what does this mean for us, as Community Psychologists? For me personally, it causes me to pause and reflect on the assumptions I make, either internally or aloud, about the communities and individuals I work with and how the organizations I represent approach working relationships with community members. When we discuss concepts such as "community buy-in" or collaboration, what's our frame of reference? More often than not, it's the "expert" or "outsider" point of view. If nothing else, GiveDirectly sends our field, and our allies in the philanthropy and community development world, a loud and clear message that says: question the assumptions underlying your work, challenge your organization to never stop innovating, and work to ensure that you are both A) doing no harm, and B) having a meaningful impact as defined by the communities you are working with and for.

The Community Practitioner
Edited by Susan Wolfe

Community Psychology Careers in Education
Educational institutions offer community psychologists a range of career opportunities beyond teaching and doing scholarly research. Most have research and evaluation or institutional research offices that collect and analyze data focused on improving the educational and other services they provide. The three contributors to this column describe the work they have done in various educational settings. They all demonstrate the value-added that community psychologists bring to the table.

Susan Ryerson Espino and Mimi Doll describe their work with the Chicago Public Schools, highlighting the experiences and skills utilized in the K-12 educational setting. Jamie DeLeeuw next shares information about her work as a Coordinator of Institutional Research, Evaluation and Assessment for Monroe County Community College. Finally, Cathy Crosby-Currie and Christine Zimmerman share their perspectives on working in institutional research at St. Lawrence University.

Community Psychology Experiences in a Large Pre K-12 Public School District
Written by Susan Ryerson Espino, Ryerson Espino Evaluation & Development Consulting and Mimi Doll, Candeo Consulting, Inc.

Overview
We are two Chicago-based, practicing community psychologists trained at DePaul and UIC (Mimi and Susan respectively). We met while working as internal evaluators within a centralized evaluation unit at Chicago Public Schools (CPS). We continue to collaborate through our now external consulting practices. Overall, we were introduced to diverse roles, content areas and skills to support program development, evaluation and research within a large school system. We share these thoughts to give you a sense of one fast-paced practice context.

Diverse content areas
We arrived at CPS with existing research and evaluation interests; we grew in exposure to new content areas. For instance, Susan was able to build on past work involving refugees, English Language Learners, and students with disabilities. Mimi arrived at the district with significant interests and experiences with health promotion and risk prevention with adolescents, as well as community and structural level interventions. We were challenged to provide program evaluation support in new areas and support reforms serving populations we were engaged with in the past. Taken together, our work within CPS has exposed us to early childhood math, literacy development, formative assessments, teacher professional development and credentialing, formative, standardized and norms-based assessments, data use, mentoring, arts education, Native American Education, world and heritage language, technology, gifted education, social studies curriculum and study abroad programs.

Diverse roles
We wore many hats. We led program evaluations, managed external evaluations, and supported strategic organizational and evaluation planning. We received and provided feedback among evaluation and research colleagues but were largely independent as we conducted formative and summative evaluations from start to finish. We were challenged to create diverse tools,
often on short notice, including: surveys, observation and interview protocols, rubrics, in addition to data monitoring and management resources. We were encouraged to assume the role of project historians; we helped staff in an evolving district understand their programs in historical context and utilize data and evaluation to continually enhance their programs. We worked with curricular and administrative offices to form a qualified external evaluation vendor pool, solicit proposals from vendors, refine scopes of work, and oversee the implementation of external evaluations. We consulted with staff from curricular offices to help develop, refine and communicate strategic plans supporting program development including evaluation and research agendas. We partnered with colleagues to support grant and evaluation plan writing. Susan also served as a Research Review Board (RRB) Member and helped review the educational value, research methodology, and legal compliance of external research proposals. Occasionally we were able to provide training opportunities and mentoring for graduate students interested in applied work. Overall, what an exciting and challenging juggling act!

**Skills**

While our past facilitated our entrance, little prepared us for the time and project press within this politically-charged setting. For instance, we had some academic training in evaluation coupled with more hands-on experience conducting mixed methods evaluations, most frequently as members of teams. We both had interdisciplinary training and interests. This positioned us nicely to collaborate with multidisciplinary team members but also stretch ourselves to take on a lot of responsibility, independently. We had experience to ground ourselves in new literatures when time afforded this luxury. We gained appreciation for the need to bridge and translate best practices and knowledge between the worlds of practice and research. We were well versed in writing reports and delivering presentations; yet challenged each other to reimagine dissemination materials for diverse stakeholders, materials that prioritized practical implications.

We had prior experiences conducting external research within schools. We experienced the confusion that resulted when the district did not communicate research policies well to stakeholders. Our time internal to CPS helped us more fully appreciate the protection of school time and the need to maximize the benefit of external research for internal reflection and change. We were able to help disseminate policies and procedures to internal and external audiences, to demystify the process, encourage engaged scholarship and practice, and bridge communication.

Through our respective graduate programs we received some, but not enough, training in consultation and organizational theory, however we have developed these skills “on the job” at CPS or other places. Mimi in particular had experience facilitating groups and supporting strategic planning, both proved invaluable when she joined the internal CPS evaluation unit; she shared these skills freely. We have had the privilege to help partners think deeply about organizational capacity.

We have grown in our evaluation practice, strengthening linkages between related streams of work within a large organization, fostering efficiencies, prioritizing data use practices to reflect on participants, services, and outcomes.

These experiences certainly broadened our experiences, perspective and appreciation of urban educational contexts including the challenges and resources impacting the development and implementation of school-based programs. Our time within our internal unit provided us opportunities to collaborate with other practicing social scientists. Perhaps most importantly, we arrived at CPS with deep training and appreciation for ecological systems theories, empowerment theories, holistic child development, and the importance of collaboration and citizen participation. We were challenged to collaborate with new stakeholders and sometimes unwilling “partners.” We challenged our colleagues with our vision of citizen participation and social justice. This foundation nurtured us and helped us stay focused on the overarching mission of our work, fostering a culture of learning such that school contexts are strengthened for children and families.
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University classrooms are ripe environments for safely introducing controversial topics. In college, students are pursuing knowledge and expanding their horizons. Even so, that does not mean that raising uncomfortable topics in the classroom is an easy task. Social justice issues around inequality, oppression, and privilege often incite controversy.

A roundtable was organized at SCRA’s 14th Biennial Conference to discuss the challenges associated with teaching issues of social justice. Many challenges were identified and centered on several themes: designing the course; adapting to the diversity of your students; creating a trusting environment; responding to unexpected comments; and managing our own expectations as instructors.

**Course Design**

Designing courses that focus on issues of inequality, oppression, and privilege can be challenging. One of the first aspects to consider in organizing the course syllabus is the order of topics to be covered. Often, it helps to cover more difficult topics near the end of the semester (e.g., privilege) rather than the beginning. As the instructor, you will have a better feel for your students and they too will be more comfortable over the course of the semester in discussing these topics. Second, our combined experience has also shown that when teaching diverse and controversial topics, the inclusion of multiple teaching modalities is essential. Besides the standard lecture format (some choose not to lecture at all), instructor can use small group activities/exercises, large group discussions, debates, guest speakers, films/videos, and reflective journaling as major proportions of the time in their classrooms. A large part of this learning usually includes a high-level of student
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participation in the classroom and with writing activities, both of which are included as graded components in the course syllabus. Third, designing the course to include an experiential feature is also very valuable. Assigning and encouraging students to attend diversity events on campus or in the community can be worthwhile learning experiences that expose students to different perspectives and worldviews. Reflection papers from students attending these different events indicate the experiences which can range from new knowledge learned to being very impactful to their lives overall. Students sometimes express being extremely motivated and passionate about a new area and even taking on an activist role. In general, a well-designed course can help with the implementation of course goals and objectives but teaching controversial topics also requires flexibility.

**Adapting to Student Diversity**

Every classroom presents a unique set of challenges. Students arrive with different understandings of the topic based on diverse backgrounds and experiences, and this course may be the first introduction to topics such as social inequality, unearned privileges, and various forms of discrimination for some students. It is important to tailor your language and approach toward your students’ perspectives. This can be especially difficult in larger classroom settings or in classes where a dominant view has been asserted early in the semester.

A well-designed course is important, but must include the ability to adapt to your students. If a course is structured too rigidly, you lose the ability to explore certain topics more in depth when needed. Many students have experiences that are relevant to social justice issues and may speak out on those experiences. Discussions can therefore become heated and, as instructors, we may need to change the plan for the class. It is important to engage the students in a series of discussions and targeted questions that can be used to teach critical thinking skills in these moments. The material may also need to be adapted by spending more or less time on planned topics, or even introducing new material mid-semester. Making the material relevant to their experiences and highlighting their privilege, acknowledged or unacknowledged, is critical to discussions of social justice issues. Adapting materials and questions to fit within a student’s experience helps to expand their perspectives on critical issues.

**Creating Class Climate**

A safe classroom climate is critical when teaching sensitive topics, and must be considered even before the class meets for the first time. We recommend pre-planning strategies that set the tone for the semester. First, including guidelines for discussion on the class syllabus is crucial. It is also important to revisit those guidelines throughout the semester. Consider that students may be taking the course because it fulfills a school requirement, and plan strategies to build buy-in early on. The students are more likely to reject the issues discussed in class if they feel like they are forced to take the course rather having chosen to take it themselves. Without buy-in from the students, the classroom climate may suffer. That is why it is useful to address the topics, structure, and importance of the class at the beginning of the semester.

**Responding to Unexpected Comments**

Occasionally a student will make a comment that is offensive, discriminatory, or generally challenging to the subject matter. The challenge to the instructor is how to respond to the comment in a way that is respectful and encourages critical thinking. It is important to handle unexpected comments quickly and in a way that does not hinder the remaining discussion by other students.

The first solution for unexpected comments is to establish discussion guidelines in the syllabus, and refer back to them when discussions became heated. Setting the boundaries for respectful communication at the beginning of the course provides students with a type of contractual understanding of the expectations. While outright verbal fights rarely occur in the classroom, it can be a concern for some instructors. Throughout the semester, the instructor is responsible for monitoring the class climate and calling a time out before the conversation moves to this intensity. It is important to challenge our own discomfort when uncomfortable moments happen and as a result the most learning actually occurs. Students can be empowered to think critically about a topic based on the comments made and offer counter arguments, in a respectful manner, which increases the opportunities for all involved to build on their critical thinking skills.

Instructors must also be diligent in grading written work, as we may encounter papers written by students who voice discriminatory beliefs in their writing. It is important to take time grading these papers and set them aside in order to gain clarity and professionalism, when needed. Using a rubric helps to organize the grading in such a way that reduces subjective grading in these situations. One of the best ways to address these types of inappropriate comments in writing, however, is to include a requirement that sources be cited and valid. This requirement encourages students to research their topic in a way that can educate them and challenge these degrading and discriminatory beliefs.

**Managing Your Own Expectations**

When teaching issues of inequality, oppression, and privilege, it can be disappointing when it seems that students are not living up to the instructor’s expectations. Instructors who are aware of strategies to manage their expectations may be better positioned to sleep soundly at night without worries that students are falling short. There are three strategies that could be helpful in managing expectations. First, it is critical to ensure that instructors are aware of their own expectations and have designed their courses to best promote the expected changes. We find that creating a logic model for the learning outcomes is a useful strategy to employ in the planning process. As the instructor, you should identify your ideas of successful and unsuccessful learning outcomes and consider how the readings, activities, and class discussions move you toward those successful outcomes. Second, communicating expectations to students can set students up for success. Instructors’ expectations of personal growth and change are not normally discussed in academic settings. You can normalize their reactions by sharing your own “ah-ha moments” and gaffes. At the same time, it is important to remember that your students have varied levels of motivation to change, and that they come to the class with different experiences. This acceptance of varied viewpoints can help create a climate that facilitates change. Third, making students’ positions transparent throughout the term provides feedback to both you and the students regarding their progress towards your expected outcomes. You and your students can monitor how their ideas change by using standard assessment tools relevant to the topics being discussed such as myth belief scales or identity assessment scales. Students can also be encouraged to place their experiences next to alternate views to help situate
themelves and understand their reactions to the course material. Thus, planning and focusing on the process of change in addition to the expected outcomes can be a useful tool in managing expectations.

While many challenges arise when teaching sensitive issues, a carefully-designed course can help prevent problems in the classroom. When designing a course around social justice, it is important to take time to plan the course, create a safe and trusting environment, remain flexible to adapt to your students’ needs, and respond quickly and respectfully to unexpected comments. Keeping these basic principles in mind helps make a course about inequality, oppression, and privilege where students can go beyond basic knowledge and gain practical learning experiences. As instructors, we must remember to manage our own expectations of how the class will go and how each student will learn. When designed correctly, courses around issues of social justice can encourage students to expand their horizons and become agents for social change.

**Early Career Interest Group**

*Written by Michèle Schlehofer, Salisbury University and Ashlee Lien, SUNY College at Old Westbury*

Greetings! We hope that those of you who attended the 2013 biennial in Miami had a wonderful conference experience and a safe trip home. The 2013 biennial was pivotal for us in many respects, first and foremost because the Executive Committee approved the formation of the Early Career Interest Group (ECIG)! The idea for the interest group was born when a group of early career SCRA members met at the 2011 biennial in Chicago and realized a need for mentoring and professional development within SCRA that was specific to those of us at the early stages of our career. This led to the development of an Early Career Task Force, which has been working for the past two years to develop a group devoted to professional development, networking, training, and recognition of early career SCRA members. We are quite excited to become a formal interest group, and have great plans for the future. Our first chair is Susan Long (Lake Forest University), with Chiara Sabina (Pennsylvania State University at Harrisburg) serving in a support capacity.

Also at the 2013 biennial, we held our first-ever Early Career Professional Development Pre-Conference Workshop on Wednesday, June 26th. This half-day event featured five presentations on professional development topics relevant to early career professionals. Susan Wolfe (Susan Wolfe and Associates) started our workshop with her presentation on “Community Consulting in Practice,” followed by a talk by Isa Fernandez (Nova Southeastern University) on “Federal Grants 101.” Lenny Jason (DePaul University) shared his expertise in “Influencing Public Policy,” followed by Eric Mankowski (Portland State University), who provided insight into “Forming and Sustaining Inter-Cultural Partnerships for Community Research and Action.” Finally, David Julian (Ohio State University) rounded out our morning with a session on “Practicing Community Psychology in Local Health and Social Service Settings.” Overall, approximately 40 early career professionals were in attendance, and informal feedback on our pre-conference workshop was positive. We will be placing materials from the workshop on our page on the SCRA website.

Also at the 2013 biennial, we held our first-ever Early Career Professional Development Pre-Conference Workshop on Wednesday, June 26th. This half-day event featured five presentations on professional development topics relevant to early career professionals. Susan Wolfe (Susan Wolfe and Associates) started our workshop with her presentation on “Community Consulting in Practice,” followed by a talk by Isa Fernandez (Nova Southeastern University) on “Federal Grants 101.” Lenny Jason (DePaul University) shared his expertise in “Influencing Public Policy,” followed by Eric Mankowski (Portland State University), who provided insight into “Forming and Sustaining Inter-Cultural Partnerships for Community Research and Action.” Finally, David Julian (Ohio State University) rounded out our morning with a session on “Practicing Community Psychology in Local Health and Social Service Settings.” Overall, approximately 40 early career professionals were in attendance, and informal feedback on our pre-conference workshop was positive. We will be placing materials from the workshop on our page on the SCRA website.

**Mission Statement of the ECIG**

The ECIG supports SCRA members who have been working as a community psychology researcher; practitioner; activist; or teacher or professor; or in a related field, for no more than seven years. The important aims of this group are: (1) promote the concerns, interests, and issues unique to early career individuals within SCRA; (2) promote opportunities for early career scholars to make contributions to or hold leadership positions within the SCRA community; and (3) promote formalized opportunities for recognition of professional accomplishments by early career SCRA members. ECIG will accomplish these goals by providing professional development networking, training, information-sharing, social support, and mentoring in order to advance the careers of early career professionals and promote collaboration. Membership is open to all with an interest in the development and support of Early Career Community Psychologists (ECCPs), including graduate students, ECCPs, and those with more established careers.

**Moving Forward**

Last year, the Task Force gained significant momentum, which we hope to continue as an interest group. We established an early career listserv, and encourage you to join. The list is open to anyone interested in early career development, regardless of whether or not you are still early career. To join the list, send an e-mail to LISTSERV@LISTSERV@LISTSERV.APA.ORG. Leave the subject area blank, and in your message area type: SUBSCRIBE SCRA-ECP Your first name Your last name (e.g. Fred Smith).

During the last year, we have also offered one-time mentoring opportunities via our Mentored Conversation series. Here, mentors with expertise in a variety of topics provided small-group mentoring to early career professionals via the SCRA conference line. Topics included work/life balance; building a program of research as a faculty member; and forming community partnerships.

As the ECIG, we would like to extend upon our prior efforts and offer increased opportunities for early career professionals within SCRA to connect with each other. We are also looking to hear from you on where to focus our efforts. What would you like to see offered? What would be most useful to you? To this end, we will be conducting an online survey of early career professionals. Please keep an eye out in *The Community Psychologist* and over the SCRA listserv for our survey.

If you are interested in learning more about the ECIG, have ideas for what you’d like to see us accomplish, or would
like to become involved in the ECIG at any level, please contact Susan Long at long@mx.lakeforest.edu or Chiara Sabina at cus16@psu.edu. We look forward to hearing from you!

---

**International Committee**

*Edited by Kahaema Byer*

The International Section for this Winter edition of TCP is introduced by a summary of the recent European Congress of Community Psychology by President of the association, Serdar M. Değirmenciğolu of Turkey. In addition, the column presents highlights in Community Psychology in France, Argentina, and Egypt. If you are interested in submitting to the column for the coming issues, please email Kahaema Byer at k.byer@umiami.edu or byer.psychology@gmail.com.

---

**News from the European Congress**

*Written by Serdar M. Değirmenciğolu, President of the European Community Psychology Association*

The 9th European Congress of Community Psychology was held in Naples, Italy, on November 6-9 at Fondazione Mediterraneo. The conference was organized by Caterina Arcidiacono (University Federico II) with support from Italian Society of Community Psychology (SIPCO), Campania Region Psychologists’ Association and Fondazione Mediterraneo. The Local Organizing Committee consisted of doctoral students, post-doctoral fellows and young psychologists. Filomena Tuccillo, Susanna Rota and the entire team was very welcoming, helpful, and offered participants warm Neapolitan hospitality. A large team of volunteers from Portugal, Spain, Italy, Turkey, Brazil, Canada and the US helped the organizers.

I asked a few people what they liked most about the congress and here is what they said.

*The conference tool was good for keeping track and seemed to link well with the Internet (and a very attractive logo was created). It was rewarding to re-connect with many colleagues from different countries, and the good amount of time over lunch and evening meals meant that meaningful conversations could be had. It was also a great city as a site - inexpensive and interesting for the limited time that we had to explore. It was a coup to have Robert Roe (President of the European Federation of Psychologists’ Associations) there - he could be a valuable influence for the development of the field in Europe, and seems to have some sense of its potentials.*

(Jacqueline Akhurst, England)

*The presence of many young researchers and graduate students. They were very willing and happy to attend the conference and engage with many "senior" community psychologists. The effort by the Organizing Committee to give everybody the possibility to present his/her work, even work in progress. And the warm climate of Neapolitan organisation and hospitality: The organizers tried and succeeded in responding the very different and multiple needs of the participants.*

(Bruna Zani, Italy)

*Opportunities to engage critically with others from community psychology. Opportunities to promote trans-disciplinary thinking. Renewing colleague-ial relationships with progressive allies and the forging of new ones. The remote participation by Skype of contributors (colleagues from the American University of Cairo and Birzeit University in Palestine) unable to attend in person. The move to establish a task force regarding the catastrophic implications of neo-liberal fiscal austerity.*

(David Fryer, Australia)

*What I liked most about this conference was that there were five people from Norway present, and that this gave us an opportunity to meet for the first time. One of these participants works in the National Health Administration, and to establish contact with her was useful. The other thing I liked was visiting the former Camorra community, and listen to their experiences with coping with the long term effects of living under the oppression and stress from these times.*

(Nicholas Carr, Norway)

---

**Community Psychology in France**

*Written by Thomas Saïas and Kahaema Byer*

Community Psychology in France is in an exciting time! The field is in its early stages of growth in large part to the tireless efforts and commitment of Thomas Saïas, president and founder of the French Association of Community Psychology. When Dr. Saïas initiated the grand project of reviewing the state of Community Psychology in France, he found that there was only one program that offered coursework in Community Psychology but there were no academic programs across the entire European Union member state, despite the legacy of critical theorists of French background. Recent efforts to identify universities that offer community psychology coursework today yielded just about a dozen programs. Of 150 Masters programs, no more than 5 offer community psychology courses, most of which are taught by social psychologists.

Furthermore, in French Universities, the predominant theoretical orientation is clinical, and more specifically, psychodynamic. In a country of approximately 40,000 psychologists, an average 4,000 more graduate each year, 80% of whom are clinical psychologists. The process of training competent, relevant, and competitive professionals is therefore complicated.

The predominant culture of treatment within mental health in France is therefore individualized and curative. As an example, the problem of depression and suicide amongst elderly persons is viewed by psychologists and social workers (also predominantly psychoanalytic) as needing to cure symptoms such as depression while community psychologists hope to promote social participation and involve local partnerships in doing so. All of this further complicates the process of developing Community Psychology as a field within the French state.

Language also has provided both opportunity and challenge for the development of Community Psychology in France. While Dr. Saïas is a member of the European Community Psychology Association, he notes that only 5 French speaking persons were present at the recent congress in Napoli, neither were there any representatives from Belgium or Switzerland. In general representation by French speaking psychologists is low in community psychology, even at regional and local levels. One reason for this is the limited language spaces and lack of opportunities for French-speaking persons. There is some consideration of overcoming this challenge by shifting from a French association to a French-speaking association in order to widen the impact on French speaking psychologists and to engage a broader community, such as those in European context, Quebec, Africa, and elsewhere. This approach would also allow for the development of a network of French speaking persons.
community psychology can be of service to the institutions with similar goals, and ultimately the French population. While France has a large number of non-governmental organizations and great implicit demand for the type of work that Community Psychologists do, many organizations are not equipped with the skills needed. Community Psychologists therefore hope to help support development of local projects in a strategic and more professional way by providing resources such as efficacy based evaluation including evaluation of mental health.

The French Association of Community Psychology hopes to draw from longer standing models and resources around the world, such as those in the US as it seeks to build Community Psychology in France. There is currently no formal partnership with the US and the association is interested in developing connections with a team at SCRA interested in building relations with the French community. Interested parties should email Thomas Saïas at t.saias@psychologie-communautaire.fr

---

**International Community Research Project and Action: Examining White Privilege and Discrimination, and the Use of Novel Intervention Strategies to Create Community Awareness About Discriminatory Behaviors in Argentina**

**Written by Luciano Berardi, Fabricio Balcazar, Fabio Lacolla, Vierelina Fernández, Daisy Gonzalez, and Ricardo Camacho**

**Program Description**

The Summer Research and Service Experience (SRSE) program aims to provide a unique learning experience to students from underrepresented backgrounds in academia (students with disabilities, first-generation, low-income and ethnic minority groups). The program goal is to offer students a research experience in an international setting. The course is a 12 week experience that includes intensive literature reviews, IRB submission, collection and analysis of data, and

concludes with students’ conference presentation. The SRSE program is funded partially by the Arnold L. Mitchem Fellowship, the Center for Access and Attainment at DePaul University and the Summer Research Opportunity Program (SROP) at the University of Illinois at Chicago (UIC). The 2013 SRSE to Argentina was designed in collaboration with Universidad de Buenos Aires (UBA), to study issues of white privilege and discrimination in Argentina. Travel included visits to the cities of Buenos Aires, General Roca, Neuquén and San Carlos de Bariloche. The SRSE program incorporates an international travel and service component to each student’s research experience. This unique service learning experience is based on a framework which suggests that the support of academic mentors and participation in group activities and workshops are key program elements for successful undergraduate research experiences (Klinkead & Blockus, 2012). The following article outlines the 2013 SRSE program, its collaborators, rationale, activities and timeline.

A total of seven students (four Arnold L. Mitchem Fellows and three McNair Scholars) participated in the 2013 SRSE to Argentina program. The program curriculum utilized a three-part approach. During phase one (from April 5th to May 30th) the students’ work focused on formulating literature reviews, developing individual research questions and receiving training in research methods, as well as collaboration on the creation of the SRSE study IRB proposal. Phase two (from June 8th to June 23rd), included traveling through Argentina to participate in lectures at the Universidad de Buenos Aires (UBA), Escuela de Psicología Social Para la Salud Mental, Escuela de Psicología Social de Patagonia and the Escuela de Psicología Social de Neuquén. During the visits to each of these institutions, and of the aforementioned institutions, and of collected over two hundred surveys. Finally, students participated in activities and events related to their individual
research projects. For example, students and faculty participated in a morning television talk show describing their visit to Argentina and the research in which they were engaged. Students and faculty also participated and co-coordinated a public Sociodrama (Moreno, 1943) attended by more than two hundred participants. In addition, students hosted a talk at a university-based radio show about the research study, attended an international conference and conducted site visits to local places and organizations of interest (i.e. the College of Medicine at UBA, the National Library and other community-based organizations and events). Finally, for phase three (from June 8th to June 23rd), students returned to UIC and worked on preparing reports of their research projects. While under the supervision of faculty mentors students performed a number of research in an effort to develop their research skills and contribute to the competitiveness of their graduate school applications. All of this research work was also presented at the McNair national conference and will soon be presented at the Midwest ECO conference.

**Students Research Projects**

**Perceiving discrimination in Argentina: From a National to a Regional Understanding, Vierelina Fernández**

In Argentina, there are racial demographic variances by region that may relate to differences in perceptions of privilege. Hence, the current work attempts to answer the question: in what ways do Argentines from Buenos Aires and Patagonia perceive privilege and discrimination on the basis of social class and skin tone? This study focused on two distinct focus groups conducted in Buenos Aires and on three focus groups conducted in General Roca, Argentina over a two-week period. There were a total of twenty-two participants in the Buenos Aires focus groups and thirty-one participants in the Patagonia focus groups. Approximately ninety-five percent of all the participants were female. In Buenos Aires, the participants were all university students whereas the participants from Patagonia were all second career students. The findings highlight the importance of race in Argentina. The findings highlight the importance of race and class status as a venue for discrimination, while people from Patagonia are directly concerned with race (in particular, with native populations from Argentina, Bolivia, Ecuador and Peru who live or work in the countryside). The implications for racial and social class harmony in Argentina are discussed.

**Examining McIntosh’s Observations on White Privilege in Argentina, Ricardo Camacho**

Argentina’s historical and cultural context has conveyed a phenomenon of White Privilege with regard to how individuals are viewed based on their physical and social traits. Research suggests that White Privilege is defined as the concrete benefits of access to resources and social rewards and the power to shape the norms and values of society that whites receive, unconsciously or consciously, by virtue of their skin color in a racist society (Adams, Bell & Griffin, 1997). The current study utilized McIntosh’s (1988) 50-observations to collect individuals’ perceptions of White Privilege in the context of Argentinean society and to identify how they perceive privilege. The study attempted to determine how demographic factors and the recognition of skin color impact the way in which Argentineans perceive their racial identity. The hypothesis suggests that skin color affects racial identity recognition. One hundred ninety-nine participants responded to a web-based survey by means of the Snowball Sampling Approach. An exploratory factor analysis indicated a two-factor solution explained the variance. The results suggest that respondents had difficulty understanding some of the questions posed by the McIntosh’s conceptualization of privilege. This is not surprising since these issues tend to be heavily influenced by context and culture.

**Dealing with Issues of Discrimination through Sociodrama, Daisy Gonzalez**

Psychodramas and sociodramas have been used as techniques in group therapy since 1957 in Argentina. This is an ethnographic study of a sociodrama that took place in General Roca, Rio Negro, Argentina on June 15, 2013 at the Cultural Center of the Town. The theme of this sociodrama was discrimination. The event was organized and coordinated by the Primera Escuela Patagonica de Psicodrama, and conducted by Dr. Fabio Lacolla. The event was video recorded for evaluation purposes. There were 170 participants from various ages, sexualities, genders, races and cultural identities. The findings of this participant observation qualitative study and the analysis of the video recordings suggest that sociodrama is an effective tool to facilitate discussions on discrimination amongst a large and diverse group of people in a community. It was through the role playing and acting out process in which the coordinator led the group that the participants engaged with their bodies and minds in the discussion of discrimination. The feedback session provided insightful information regarding how many participants felt about privilege and discrimination in their own lives.

In the course of a summer, the SRSE program assists students from underrepresented backgrounds in academia to become better prepared for graduate education in the field of Community Psychology and other applied social sciences. Study abroad experiences overall have served disproportionately white and affluent students (Salisbury, Paulsen & Pascarella 201; Shih 2009), with 81% of study abroad participants from white and privileged backgrounds, when only 64.4% of college students are white (NCES, 2010). It is clear that more programs, like the SRSE, offering community psychology training to underrepresented groups are needed not only to close the social-inequality gaps in global education, but also to diversify the pool of future community psychology PhDs with international experiences. The value of this type of programming relies on the fact that nearly everyone who has had an international experience develops an appreciation for diversity and a clear view of their own national/cultural biases and assumptions (Aber, 2010). A truly global endeavor for community psychology will need to train more students not only from minority backgrounds and deepen students’ international perspective. International dialogue, exchange and collaboration are necessary steps to achieve international dissemination of the field of community psychology. SRSE program is an example of international collaboration to train a future generation of international community psychologists.

**Participating institutions:**

*The Center for Access and Attainment, DePaul University: (http://www.depaul.edu/emm/caa/index.asp)*

*The Center for Capacity Building on Minority with Disability Research, University of Illinois at Chicago: (https://sites.google.com/site/disabilityempowermentuic/)*

*Cátedra de Teoría y Técnica de Grupos II, Universidad de Buenos Aires: (http://www.ubagruposdos.blogspot.com/)*

*Primera Escuela de Psicología Social de la*
have an exciting opportunity to be at the forefront of advancing global trends in multicultural and systemic practice aimed at promoting psychological and physical health. AUC has American accreditation, our classes are taught in English, and both international and Egyptian students are welcomed. Because we are located in Cairo, there are many opportunities for future community psychologists. Our students may address ongoing social issues such as poverty, the educational system, or sexual harassment, as well as tackling relatively new issues such as navigating issues of power within a democratic system, creating a sense of community following the social changes of the January 25th revolution, or facilitating prevention efforts on important yet often overlooked issues such as obesity. They gain culturally sensitive skills that are in high demand such as how to conduct applied research, assess community needs and strengths, design and implement prevention and intervention programs, evaluate programs, consult for nonprofit organizations, and strengthen community capacities.

Psychology is a growing field in Egypt, although still not entirely accepted as a science. Education about the field of psychology continues to be needed at all levels of society, including university settings. Community Psychology is relatively unknown, although community psychology practice competencies are very relevant to the Egyptian context, and plenty of local people engage in community psychology practice under different names. One of the challenges of developing the field of community psychology in Egypt is that many people only think of counseling or clinical work when they think of psychology. Therefore, a lot of education needs to be done to create awareness of what community psychology has to offer. By developing community websites, offering workshops, inviting guest speakers, and building a network of internship and practicum opportunities, we are gradually building an understanding and appreciation for the community psychology approach. We are finding that local organizations are eager to know more about using community psychology approaches in their work, especially for needs assessment, program development, and outcomes evaluation. Their employees are often lacking training in how to plan effective programs and measure outcomes, so community and organizational capacity building is in great demand.

Our program offers students exposure to all of the community psychology principles in coursework, and then gives them the opportunity to develop expertise in some of the principles through their internship and thesis work. After learning the community psychology principles, students report that they are able to better understand social issues and create sustainable solutions to the problems that exist. They say that the principles provide them with a perspective that allows them to work effectively across a variety of settings: taking new approaches to problems, interacting with populations in culturally appropriate ways, and being thoughtful about ethical issues that may arise. However, while all of the competencies of community psychology are useful in the Egyptian context, they are used to varying degrees. For example, we utilize a participatory approach as much as possible, but due to the constantly changing political environment, participatory community research is not always feasible. Policy work too is very much needed here, but the channels for influencing policy are unclear. Above all, students and faculty are learning to respond flexibly in our work as community psychologists. Community and social change is constantly happening around us in Egypt and while it is not always clear the best way to approach a given issue, the knowledge and skills the students possess are helping them to better understand the changes that are occurring and to craft solutions for the challenges they face.
Living Community Psychology
Written by Gloria Levin
Glorialevin@verizon.net

“Living Community Psychology” highlights a community psychologist through an in-depth interview that is intended to depict both personal and professional aspects of the featured individual. The intent is to personalize Community Psychology (CP) as it is lived by its diverse practitioners. For this installment, we profile a children’s hospital-based researcher who incorporates community psychology principles and approaches in her work, while according first priority to raising healthy, caring children.

Featuring:
Melissa Strompoli
ABD Coordinator of Impact Assessment and Evaluation
The Children’s Trust of South Carolina, Columbia, SC, mstrompolis@gmail.com

“To understand who I am, you need to know that I lived in Wisconsin until I was 18. That means I love cheese, beer, and the Green Bay Packers,” says Melissa Strompolis. She attributes her attraction to the values of community psychology from her sensitivity in high school to the gap between the “haves and have nots.” Before that, she didn’t realize her family was poor, other than the superficial realization that she could not afford her peers’ name brand clothes. She later gained a broader social perspective, questioning socioeconomic disparities. Melissa’s parents divorced when she was 6 years old. Her father at first lived in the same city as the family which included an older and younger sister and an older brother. Child support was based on a percentage of her father’s salary so that it was subject to the insecurities of working class employment.

A few years later, her mother remarried, to a man who was middle class, representing a step up for the family. However, he had poor financial management habits. When that marriage ended, her mother bought out his share of the house so the family could continue living there. Melissa’s biological father continued paying child support, although he had since moved out of town and had remarried with new children.

The family followed the mother’s religion, regularly attending the local Lutheran church. (Her mother is from German parentage; her father, a Catholic, is of Greek descent.) Her parents valued a parochial school education, so all four of the children attended a private Lutheran school. Unlike her younger sister, always more religious, Melissa began questioning religious precepts. “Eventually, religion had no claim on me.”

The Strompolis’ lived in a small, 3-bedroom house in an affluent town with a population of 25,000. “Being surrounded by $1 million homes was a constant reminder of our modest finances. Although we had the basics, our economic status was far below that of our peers.” This became more obvious when she entered the public high school, populated by the wealthier kids, with their computers and expensive cars. Melissa feared being judged, especially with regard to her clothes. She learned a significant lesson when her brother caught her with his American Eagle t-shirt (worth $20) which she intended to wear on the first day of high school. When he demanded its return, she cried “that we should sell it...” Kevin wisely advised her that the type of people who look down on you for your clothes are not the type you want as friends. “That advice was the biggest gift Kevin could have given me.”

The oldest sister, Jenn, was a major influence on her younger siblings, telling them that they were as good as anyone. Jenn was the first to graduate college and was determined to set a high standard for her younger siblings. The parents exerted no academic pressure and would have been satisfied with whatever their children pursued. Both were high school graduates. Melissa’s father attended trade school and recently retired after 39 years as a maintenance mechanic for a manufacturer. Her mother, now retired, held administrative assistant jobs throughout her career.

While Melissa enjoyed school and earned good grades, she was into sports (especially basketball and volleyball) and her social life. However, beginning in high school, she had a laser focus on two goals: studying psychology and attending college in a warm state. Her high school’s resource center identified Eckerd College in St. Petersburg, Florida as a good match. Eckerd has a beautiful waterfront campus, and she was intrigued by the diverse student body, including international students. The college’s strong psychology program was an additional plus. She was able to cobble together financial support with a Pell grant, scholarships and student loans.

Eckerd, a private liberal arts and sciences college, even today has fewer students than her (2,000-student) high school. Nevertheless, it offered a lot. “I thoroughly enjoyed my college experience, so much so that my younger sister followed me to Florida, having won a volleyball scholarship at a nearby college.” Melissa took diverse courses in psychology and interned at a group residential home for troubled girls, although, unlike many students, she was never interested in being a therapist.

She proceeded through college without identifying a specific field of psychology for her career. Eckerd’s capstone courses encouraged community volunteering, but she did not know about community psychology at the time. She graduated college in 2005 but, without a specific career direction, she matriculated for a general master’s program in psychology at the University of West Florida (UWF) in Pensacola.

While at UWF, she worked for the Navy at a nearby military base on biomedical clinical trials and human factors research. Through mutual friends, she met her now-husband, Brandon, an Air Force enlistee from Hawaii whose father also had been military. Brandon was not interested in traditional academics but, being very smart, was trained to maintain Air Force fighter jets. She had no intention of dating anyone in the military, but they enjoyed mutual interests such as attending music festivals around Florida. Their courtship lasted 5½ years, including 2 years of being engaged.

As she approached graduation from her master’s program, Melissa knew she wanted to earn a psychology PhD but did not know in what specialty. In her final semester, she took a course in community psychology and was “hooked” by the field’s values. One day in April, rather late for graduate school applications, her professor showed her an email on SCRA’s listserv from Jim Cook who was seeking students for the one-year old community health psychology doctoral program at the University of North Carolina at...
Charlotte (UNCC). She clicked with Jim in her interview, and the program, being involved in community change work, was a perfect fit for her. She started UNCC’s program in September 2008 in the second cohort of (two) students entering the PhD program. The faculty then consisted of Jim Cook and Ryan Kilmer.

Melissa worked on a number of research projects and taught community psychology at UNCC. She worked on a large grant to evaluate health services, a 20-hour commitment that soon grew to 30 hours weekly. She became interested in policy and advocacy, in the belief that small changes in policy can lead to real changes across many people. She sought advice from a UNCC graduate, Laura Clark, who held a responsible position at an advocacy organization. And she took advantage of the policy-related resources at UNCC, including a statistics guru with whom she spent countless hours learning structural modeling.

In July, 2012, having completed her coursework and other academic milestones in Charlotte, she moved to Columbia, SC where Brandon was then stationed. They had been married 1½ years but, up to that time, had never lived in the same location. She began working as a Research Associate at the University of South Carolina’s Center for Child and Family Studies, within the College of Social Work.

Melissa also is working diligently to prepare her advocacy-oriented dissertation, which will explore how to effectively communicate with advocates. Having a fulltime job, writing a dissertation and making time for family and regular exercise requires discipline. Being a Type A personality, she is very well organized and focused. She acknowledges that Brandon’s busy work schedule and frequent deployments, presents her with fewer distractions or demands on her time. Her target is to be awarded her PhD degree by August 2014. “However, I have learned to let others’ expectations go and just do the best I can.”

At the time of publication, Melissa had just accepted a new position, as Coordinator of Impact Assessment and Evaluation, with The Children’s Trust of South Carolina (http://www.scchildren.org), due to start January 6, 2014. This nonprofit organization’s stated mission is to “strengthen and support public and private prevention efforts that keep South Carolina’s children safe.” Operating statewide, the organization was formed in 2007 by merging four organizations whose missions sometimes were overlapping and duplicative. Melissa will be measuring and documenting the organization’s ten-year goal of halving the incidence of reported cases of child abuse, neglect and unintentional injuries in South Carolina. This will involve Melissa in the public policy realm, an area in which she has been proactive within SCRA. Among her responsibilities will be to create and implement a framework to measure the Trust’s progress in achieving its public policy aims relating to children’s safety and well being.

Melissa’s active involvement in public policy began when her professors encouraged her to join SCRA’s policy committee. Her trajectory, from passivity to leadership, can be especially instructive for all graduate students. Initially, she was a lurker on the policy committee’s regular teleconference calls. But this changed after the Chicago biennial conference where she was warmly welcomed by Judah Viola, who introduced her to other policy committee members. She encouraged her to become more active, beginning with writing a piece for The Community Psychologist (TCP). Soon after, she volunteered for support roles within the committee, including taking meeting notes and reviewing small grant proposals. She joined a workgroup as the only student on a subcommittee but she says: “I was treated equally, never as a student.”

Her involvement in the policy committee (and thus SCRA) grew exponentially after the mass shootings in Sandy Hook, NJ. “I grew up hunting with my father, but I’ve always been wary of guns,” she says. Melissa reviewed statistics from other countries and concluded “the U.S. does not have to be this way.” She drafted a policy statement, based on her research, and shared it with Ken Maton and Brad Olson, who enthusiastically agreed to join her in finalizing and promoting the statement, later published in TCP. Later, Tom Wolff assisted her in devising a strategy to mobilize SCRA members to advocate for gun control legislation by contacting their Congressional representatives. “I believe that calls to action are more meaningful if they are signed by more than one person.”

You may remember Melissa’s name from all of those emails she and her colleagues sent to the listservs to mobilize SCRA on gun violence. Although she acknowledges having spent a great amount of time on the campaign, she gained important experience coordinating the action alert and keeping track of the responses, by State. Having been the first concerted advocacy effort in SCRA, the policy committee strategized methods for increasing the future response rate to calls to action.

Melissa then volunteered to assist Ken Maton with analyzing data received from a policy/advocacy survey that had been circulated to SCRA, the results of which have been published in TCP and posted on the website. The survey should be a useful tool for creating a strategic plan for the policy committee to follow in the near future. She participated in the pre-biennial conference policy workshop and is excited at the prospect of SCRA building on its initial efforts at effecting policy. She would like to see more policy/position statements promulgated within SCRA and looks forward to the publication of reports prepared by the recipients of SCRA’s policy grant. Ahead is the prospect of creating a policy agenda that addresses the issues that SCRA members feel are most important. “We also need to teach policy classes, especially at the graduate level, and provide policy-related webinars.”

Melissa has been motivated by advice not to be afraid to take the first step in making a commitment to something about which you care. This involves overcoming her fear that she would not do a good job worthy of SCRA. She plans to follow the real world advice from a biennial conference mentor Jim Emshoff, to seek a job that will provide you at least two of the following: That the job pays well and/or is fun and/or betters the world. Less useful advice, heard at the Chicago biennial conference, was to become expert in one field. “Because I am married to a military spouse, subject to geographic transfers, I don’t have that option. My employment options are limited by that reality so I have to stay as broad as possible.” She considers community psychology as having many practical applications and, thus, possibilities for jobs wherever Brandon is transferred. To increase her options, she earned a certificate in nonprofit management at UNCC, and her work with SCRA’s Policy Committee has exposed her to policy-related skills that could be attractive to a potential employer.

Her family remains very close, with constant texting and regular Skype dates. Her mother visits her annually, and she makes two visits a year to Wisconsin, reconnecting with her mother, Jenn who works in Madison in nonprofit management and Kevin, operations director of a trucking company. Living closer to her, in Florida, so allowing more frequent face time, is younger sister Holli who is a high school dean and varsity volleyball coach.

Melissa’s future, of course, is
inseparably linked with that of Brandon. He has done well in the military, holding the rank of Technical Sergeant, and has a supervisory position. However, his heavy work schedule is in constant flux, and he has had frequent deployments, both short term and overseas. She is always anxious for his safety although, fortunately, fighter jet maintenance is performed in a safe environment, such that his overseas deployments do not place him in active combat zones. She estimates they have lived apart half of the span of their relationship, causing him to miss important family milestones. On the other hand, she acknowledges that their relationship has been strengthened by his absences, when she can concentrate on her studies and spend social time with friends.

Melissa’s academic life is antithetical to the military culture; the expected role for female spouses of military husbands is to be strictly supportive. “His colleagues give him a hard time about me, such as my using my family name rather than his last name.” Referring to her feminism, they say – “oh, she’s one of those.” Most of their social friends are civilians, and Melissa has never lived on a military base although she does obtain her health care on base as well as shop on the military base for tax free and discounted prices.

Brandt intends to retire in nine years, at age 38, with 20 years of service, at which time Melissa’s career will dictate their choice of locations. With retirement income at half his salary, he will be able to slow down, a big change from his current 60-hour work week, including every other weekend. But, meanwhile, “balancing our careers is tricky,” she acknowledges.

---

New Graduate Programs Group
Edited by Tiffany Jimenez and Brian D. Christens

In the Fall 2013 issue of TCP, we described the formation of a New Graduate Programs Group that is working to support the development and implementation of new graduate programs that are aligned with the goals of the Society for Community Research & Action (SCRA). This group is currently coordinated through designated co-chairs on the Practice Council (rep: Emma Olgye-Oliver), the Council on Education Programs (rep: Brian Christens), and the SCRA Executive Committee (rep: Tiffany Jimenez). In this issue and the next two, we are featuring descriptions of new graduate programs. Below, Emma Olgye-Oliver describes the incorporation of the SCRA Practice Competencies in the new M.S. in Community Psychology at Marymount California University, and Alisa Pykett, Victoria Faust, Brian Christens, and Shepherd Zeldin describe the Ph.D. program in Human Ecology with emphasis in Civil Society & Community Research at the University of Wisconsin–Madison, launched in January 2012.

Marymount California University: M.S. in Community Psychology
Written by Emma Olgye-Oliver

I thank members of the Society for Community Research and Action for developing explicit core competencies within the field of Community Psychology. These competencies shaped the M.S. in Community Psychology at Marymount California University. Every course taps into at least one core competency and many courses allow students to develop two or three core competencies. I’ve heard of a two-for but a three-for? What next! With continuous reflection of these core competencies in relation to their coursework I am confident that our students will be prepared to explore the full gamut of careers as research-practitioners by the end of their two year stay with us.

The first week of our first semester I asked our students to identify five current job postings that sparked their interest. They selected jobs such as director of development and non-profit executive director to name a few. These students knew little about the theoretical underpinnings of the field but they were hooked by pre-registration conversations about community psychology scholars reframing social issues to address the root cause of societal concerns and develop long-term solutions. At the end of the semester I will ask our students to identify five additional current job postings but this time I will present the assignment alongside a list of the core competencies within community psychology. It is my hope that our students will identify jobs that represent their development in this first semester (having taken courses in Prevention Science, Organizational Development and Consultation, and Leadership). Further I anticipate that they will return in the spring with a sense of excitement and appreciation to absorb the wonder of research methods and statistics. Our interdisciplinary program provides students with an opportunity to experience numerous perspectives related to leadership, ethics, and program evaluation. Further, MCU has adopted a team teaching approach using an Economist and a Community Psychologist to teach research methods and statistics, which will include geospatial techniques and will allow our students to envision research and statistics as a fundamental skill set to become a producer and/or consumer of research to aid community well-being and development.

I anticipate engaging our students in the work of the SCRA in numerous ways. I envision our students helping to organize a pacific ECO conference. I enjoyed many southeastern ECO conferences as a graduate student at Georgia State University and I’ve shared the ECO Vimeo clips of Gabe Kuperminc, Jim Cook, and Craig Brookins with my students and they are eager to meet with scholars in our field. The informal nature of ECO conferences and the low cost will allow our students to share their community-based research experiences, learn from neighboring research-practitioners and be part of a supportive community on the west coast. Finally, I have greatly benefited from participating in the Practice Council and the Peer Consultation meetings hosted by SCRA. These are two opportunities for our students to learn from scholars in the field and most importantly give back to the SCRA and ensure seamless succession regarding the many roles within our SCRA committees.
University of Wisconsin–Madison: Ph.D. in Human Ecology with Emphasis in Civil Society & Community Research and M.S. in Human Ecology
Written by Alisa A. Pykett, Victoria N. Faust, Brian D. Christens, and Shepherd Zeldin

The Civil Society and Community Research (CSCR) program is situated within the School of Human Ecology at the University of Wisconsin–Madison. The University of Wisconsin–Madison is a dynamic research environment with leading graduate programs across the social sciences. It is also the state’s land grant institution, and our faculty and students often conduct work in collaboration with the University of Wisconsin–Extension, offering additional opportunities for community-based research, evaluation and outreach.

The CSCR program blends perspectives from different disciplines – including community and developmental psychology and education – in the study of civic and community engagement, social issues and community well-being. The program is designed to train public scholars, qualified for positions in research and teaching universities, cooperative extension, community-based organizations, foundations and other nonprofit and non-governmental organizations.

The CSCR program offers opportunities to conduct research in community settings, often in collaboration with community organizations or coalitions, and to become participant-scholars in change processes. Current students are involved in action research, evaluation projects and practice related to promoting positive youth development, civic engagement, health equity, primary prevention, youth-adult partnership, community organizing, and systems change. The CSCR program supports students to build expertise in mixed-methods research and evaluation. The Action Research Core, a student-driven action research collaborative housed in the Center for Nonprofits, provides one platform for this work. Students interested in future teaching and training positions also have the opportunity to teach in the department’s undergraduate program in Community and Nonprofit Leadership.

The core curriculum for CSCR students includes courses on building civil society, mixed-methods for community-based action research, civic engagement across the lifespan, community, power and collective action, research design and utilization, and evaluation. The diverse range of core faculty research and practice interests reflects the interdisciplinary nature of the program:

- Lori Bakken – adult education, evaluation, educational program development and evaluation, research education, evaluation capacity building
- Brian Christens – community organizing, empowerment, community participation, youth organizing, systems change, action research
- Constance Flanagan – adolescents’ and young adults’ civic and sociopolitical development, social class divide in civic opportunities, social responsibility and social trust, eco-justice and children’s concepts of the ‘commons’, teens’ theories about inequality
- Cynthia Jasper – philanthropy, mentoring, community service, community-university partnerships
- Shannon Sparks – health disparities and health equity, social determinants of health, health care decision making, community-based participatory research, ethnographic and qualitative methods
- Wendy Way – financial security, financial literacy education, work-based education, continuing adult education
- Shepherd Zeldin – youth adult partnerships for community change, adoption of innovation in community organizations, youth engagement in Portugal, Malaysia, and Canada, evaluation of community and school-based initiatives.

The CSCR program engages with the Society for Community Research & Action (SCRA) by encouraging participation at biennial, regional and international conferences, seeking out leadership roles for both faculty and students within SCRA and building new relationships with other researchers and practitioners involved in SCRA. We will also continue to learn from and support new programs through our leadership in the New Graduate Programs Group.

Public Policy
Edited by Doug Perkins and Ken Maton

As the new co-chairs of the Public Policy Committee, we are pleased to introduce ourselves to you. We hope to build upon the outstanding leadership provided by immediate of past chair, Judah Viola, and personally thank Judah here publicly for his work reinvigorating the committee. We briefly discuss here several of our priorities for the year; additional information is available on our website. One of our priorities is to solicit ideas for new policy position statements relevant to community psychology; please let us know if you have suggestions and/or are potentially interested in putting one together. There is a small amount of funding available to facilitate collaboration with colleagues on preparation of policy position statements; each policy statement will lead to action steps and also be published in AJCP and on our website. We are equally interested in member-generated rapid response requests, which involve issue advocacy steps for our division to support, in a timely fashion. We continue to oversee our small policy grants program, and expect to announce this year’s awardees in our next TCP Column. An SCRA task force focused on policy issues related to mass incarceration is being constituted, and is expected to generate a position statement as part of its work. A new Policy Committee opportunity for graduate students is to do a community psychology practicum with us; this semester we have two students doing so. J’Vonnah Maryman and Taylor Scott, who are working on a number of initiatives. One initiative Taylor is involved with, the Prevention Project, is the focus of the current column. Thanks Taylor for your work on this! We welcome inquiries from graduate students about involvement in a practicum with us this spring or next fall. Finally, we are always on the lookout for new policy initiatives to pursue and new committee members—just send us an email. We look forward to a productive year.

Doug Perkins
douglas.d.perkins@vanderbilt.edu
and Ken Maton
maton@umbc.edu.
The SCRA Policy Committee’s most recent endeavor involves collaborating with the Prevention Project, a group of passionate advocates promoting a “Prevention Model,” which can enable policymakers to improve societal well-being while reducing government expenditures. Researchers and practitioners in the group would like to influence policy makers to devote more resources to prevention, where evidence indicates it is cost saving compared to remedial approaches for problems such as illness, crime, substance abuse, and high school drop-out. The group has emphasized accountability via fidelity to evidence-based practices and reduction of the federal deficit as ways to gain bipartisan support for investing in a healthy future.

Prior to the group’s inception, in 2010, Neil Wollman, Senior Fellow at Bentley University’s Alliance for Ethics and Social Responsibility, wrote a white paper summarizing the benefits of prevention in many policy areas. That paper was distributed to state, local, and national policymakers, as well as to fellow advocates, and a related op-ed was published in the Indianapolis Star newspaper. Afterwards, Neil began to recruit individuals and organizations that shared a passion for prevention, in order to promote governmental adoption of the “Prevention Model.” As an integral part of this effort, in early 2013 Neil reached out to the SCRA membership to join the initiative. Collaboration with the Public Policy Committee was underway, and gained traction when Taylor Scott, a graduate student at UNCC, began a practicum with the Policy Committee. The main goal of the practicum was to enhance the collaboration and create synergy between the groups.

Through the process of sharing the white paper and connecting with people sharing interest in prevention policy, Neil also began talking with Representative Bobby Scott (D-VA), who has a history of promoting youth violence prevention in his home state, and suggested holding a congressional briefing. The Congressman was interested in promoting further congressional involvement, and so he suggested regular briefings on Capitol Hill to build interest with colleagues and inform Congress members and their staff about different mechanisms for integrating prevention into public policy.

Most recently, Rep. Scott’s office helped to accommodate space for a briefing on September 10th in the Rayburn House Office, and helped, alongside Prevention Project and SCRA members, to recruit colleagues in the House to send their staff to the briefing. The briefing provided an overview of prevention as a model for addressing social and budgetary issues. A panel was invited to describe benefits on various topics, including healthcare, education, mental health, substance abuse, criminal justice, national security, and disaster prevention. The panelists’ talks were video recorded in order to share highlights with Congressional offices, researchers, practitioners, and other government staff not in attendance, and also to make available online in order to promote public awareness. Following each speaker, audience members were invited to ask questions or provide comments, which promoted thoughtful discussion. For instance, one audience member noted that he was appreciative of the bipartisan effort, especially because he felt that different parties would be compelled by different topics.

The briefing appeared to be very successful. It was well attended, even though the timing of the briefing coincidentally coincided with an impromptu talk President Obama scheduled that day about Syria. Representative Bobby Scott attended much of the briefing and spoke to the audience about his history promoting prevention in Virginia state policy during his time as a state representative. Audience members included individuals from government executive agencies (e.g., Department of Health and Human Services), nonprofit research or advocacy organizations (e.g., Bipartisan Policy Center), university faculty, consultation firm staff, foundations, and importantly—staffers representing at least ten different congressional offices (80% Democratic; 20% Republican).

During the briefing, a revised version of the white paper describing the “Prevention Model” was provided to attendees, in addition to other materials, so that they could take with them source materials with detailed information to help make the case for prevention in multiple policy domains. This version of the white paper was updated with new references, attention to criticisms of prevention research, and expanded information about the importance of fidelity when implementing evidence-based approaches in order to mirror results of prior research. The paper primarily describes potential benefits of prevention at the federal level; however, it notes that the model applies to state and local government efforts as well, and there are areas in which benefits to one or the other level of governance are specified (e.g., state governance is particularly relevant to criminal justice).

The next steps of the Prevention Project will largely involve coalition-building among members of Congress, intermediary organizations, interest groups, and other advocates in order to develop relevant legislation. There have been discussions about developing a formal Congressional caucus to promote prevention in policy, but there may also be opportunities to collaborate with existing groups. For example, the newly developed Future Caucus is a group of young representatives with a mission “to foster a bipartisan community of Members of Congress dedicated to pragmatic, innovative leadership on future-oriented issues and engaging with future leaders across the country on critical policy issues” (Millennial Action Project, 2013). This is a mission that seems to lend itself nicely to prevention efforts.

Public outreach reflects another ongoing effort of the Prevention Project, and as such, the group is developing a social media platform to share information with the public, promote engagement in dialogue about the issues, and mobilize grassroots advocacy to demonstrate public support for preventive policies. Public support is crucial in promoting prevention because there is no immediate gain for elected officials to fund preventive efforts — it takes time to demonstrate success, oftentimes results will not be manifest before the next election. The Prevention Project is currently working with volunteers to streamline video footage from the briefing into a cohesive film that can be distributed to Congressional offices, advocates, and the broader public (via website and social media) who were not able to attend. Videos like these will be useful for ongoing outreach and recruiting additional involvement.

Members of SCRA who would like to be involved with the Prevention Project should contact Neil Wollman, to join the group’s email distribution, which provides updates about the group’s activity, and often provides information about specific opportunities for further involvement. Ongoing tasks that would...
benefit from SCRA members’ support include the social media campaign, website development, additional video manipulation (e.g., creating short clips about specific topics), and ongoing outreach to fellow advocates and policymakers. Calls to action will be posted on the SCRA listerv that will request members to call their representatives to encourage them to learn more about prevention strategies and to ask them to attend future briefings. Interested members should consider holding a letter writing campaign among colleagues that asks policymakers for their support and involvement. There are also opportunities for involvement in grant writing and fundraising, which would help to support a staff person to maintain ongoing outreach efforts and to fund individuals traveling to briefings.

The next briefing will likely be scheduled for mid- to late January, after Congress returns to session. Future briefings will cover more specific topics than the first, including a focus on how to select preventive interventions based on available evidence, how to successfully implement and scale up interventions, and strategies for building capacity to reduce risk factors that contribute to a broad array of negative outcomes (e.g., adverse childhood events contribute to psychological distress, delinquency, and poor educational outcomes). Individuals who would like to be involved in the planning, orchestrating, videotaping, or speaking for future briefings should contact Neil Wollman (NWollman@bentley.edu). More information about the Prevention Project can be found on the website (preventionproject.us), Facebook, and Twitter, where you can follow the new social media campaign and message us to provide feedback about our activities. You may also access the most recent white paper at http://www.bentley.edu/offices/sites/www.bentley.edu/files/webform/A%20Multi-Issue%20Prevention%20Model_10-13.pdf

Want to Get Involved?

If you are part of (or know of) a new program that fits with the mission of the NGPG and may be looking for supports from SCRA as it develops, please contact Tiffeny Jimenez at tiffenyjimenez@nl.edu. We are also still in the process of developing the structure of the NGPG and are interested in additional involvement. If you are a practitioner, faculty member, program director, or professional or student affiliate and have interest in working with this group, please contact us to do so.

Reference


Regional Update

Edited by Regina Langhout, Regional Network Coordinator, University of California at Santa Cruz; langhout@ucsc.edu

The new school year brings with it some changes in regional leadership. Thank you to three outgoing Graduate Student Regional Coordinators for your SCRA service: Chris Langeler and Virginia Johnson (Southeast region), and Samantha Hardesty (Northeast region). Welcome to our new Graduate Student Regional Coordinators: Aran Watson (West region), and Natalie Kivell, Alexander Ojeda, Candalyn Rade, and Nashalys Rodriguez (Southeast region), and Undergraduate Regional Coordinator: Britney Weber (Southwest/Rocky Mountain). Also, welcome to our new Regional Coordinators: Sarah Desmarais and Courte Voorhees (Southeast region), and Lauren Lichty (West region). Finally, I want to commend the Rocky Mountain/Southwest Region for their recent work to connect with one another. It is exciting and inspiring to see their networks grow.

Midwest Region, U.S.
Regional Coordinators
August J. Hoffman, August.Hoffman@metrostate.edu, Metropolitan State University
Luciano Berardi, lberardi@depaul.edu, DePaul University
Nathan Todd, ntodd@depaul.edu, DePaul University
Student Regional Coordinators
Abigail Brown, abrown57@depaul.edu; DePaul University
Jacyln Houston, jhoust12@depaul.edu, DePaul University

News from the Midwest
Written by August Hoffman

The Midwest Ecological-Community Psychology Conference (ECO) is sponsored by the Community and Prevention Research Program, Department of Psychology at the University of Illinois at Chicago (UIC). It will take place on Saturday, November 16, 2013 in Chicago, at the UIC campus. There will be a social gathering on the evening of Friday, November 15, 2013 at 6 pm. The conference’s theme is Equity, Power, and Progress: Understanding and Changing Systems to Promote Social Change. It puts emphasis on how to understand better concepts such as “systems,” “equity,” and “social justice.” The guiding question it seeks to address is how community psychology is -- or could be -- aligned with the goals of systems change and the promotion of social justice. We also plan to exchange and develop knowledge about achieving this goal. More information about the theme and registration may be found at the conference’s web page: http://MidwestECO2013.wordpress.com/; for additional information, email Midwest.eco.13@gmail.com.

This October 4-6, 2013, August Hoffman (Metropolitan State University) and Barbara Curchack (Inver Hills Community College) sponsored a tree planting ceremony in Newtown, CT. The event was a collaborative effort to work with survivors, community members, and students from Metropolitan State University and Inver Hills Community College to plant trees as a lasting memory to the victims of last year’s December 14th tragedy at Sandy Hook Elementary School. A total of 30 trees were planted in the Newtown Victory Garden and
an additional 30 trees were given to community participants. The fruit grown (apples, figs, cherries and peaches) will be donated to local food pantries in the Newtown, CT community.

Please mark May 2-4, 2014 in your calendars for the SCRA meeting at the Midwest Psychological Association conference, held in Chicago. Also, plan to join other SCRA members from the Midwest Region on Friday, May 3rd for an informal dinner near the conference. Details will follow. Additional information and a call for proposals will be forthcoming on the SCRA listserv.

Announcements or information for inclusion in future Midwest updates should be sent to Luciano Berardi (lberardi@depaul.edu).

West Region, U.S.
Regional Coordinators
Joan Tchovey-Jacobs: jjtjacobssmartstartecstes.com
University of LaVerne
Lauren Lichy: LLichty@uwb.edu
University of Washington at Bothell
Student Regional Coordinator
Erin Ellison: eellison@ucsc.edu
University of California, Santa Cruz
Aran Watson: detengamonos@gmail.com
Alliant International University

News from the Northwest
Written by Lauren Lichy

During the recent NW ECO conference, representatives from multiple community psychology and community psychology-related programs met to discuss the state of community psychology in the NW and opportunities for growth and collaboration. As a result of these conversations, efforts are underway to develop strategies for creating and promoting a SCRA track within the Western Psychological Association meeting. In addition, we intend to identify new spaces for building ties across programs as well as among existing CP scholars, practitioners, and individuals who self-identify as doing community psychology relevant work in the region.

Rocky Mountain/
Southwest Region, U.S.
Regional Coordinators
Jessica Goodkind: jgoodkin@unm.edu
University of New Mexico
Eylin Palamaro Munsell: epalamar@asu.edu
ASU Colleges at Lake Havasu City
Student Regional Coordinator
Brittney Weber: Brittney.Weber@asu.edu
Arizona State University

News from the Bay Area
Written by Erin Ellison

The network of Bay Area community psychologists and colleagues from other fields continue to meet once a semester for an informal colloquium. The group generally consists of community and clinical psychologists, public health researchers, community workers, and others with interests in community-based research and intervention. If you are interested in attending and/or presenting at one of our meetings, please contact Erin Ellison or Aran Watson (see emails below). The goal of our network is to provide a forum to informally discuss work in progress, network with other community practitioners, and provide an exchange of ideas related to community intervention work. The larger group meets twice a year, alternating between University of California Berkeley and University. Our meeting for this fall is on November 22nd at University of California, Berkeley. Presenters are Danielle Kohfeldt, Ivy McClelland and Amy Lam. If you would like to be on our mailing list, please email Erin Ellison (eellison@ucsc.edu) or Aran Watson (detengamonos@gmail.com).

Northeast Region, U.S.
Regional Coordinators
Michelle Ronayne, michelle.ronayne@gmail.com;
Nova Psychiatric Services (MA)
Suzanne Phillips, suzanne.phillips@gordon.edu;
Gordon College (MA)

News from the Northeast
Written by Suzanne Phillips

The Northeast Region has two quick updates this quarter:

The next annual meeting of the Eastern Psychological Association is in Boston, March 13-16, 2014, complete with a day of SCRA programming. This year, we have a “media” theme, although there are presentations and posters in a variety of areas. Check the EPA website for details, at http://www.easternpsychological.org.

We need help! We are looking for both faculty/professional-level and student-level coordinators to join our team. Coordinators serve three year terms and provide regional leadership and guidance to the processes of membership development, activities, and communication. At the Biennial in Miami, I asked student coordinators about what they like about serving in this way, and they cited the opportunity to do something important and the chance to shape programming; if this sort of leadership reminds you of any students you know, please send them our way. If you are interested in serving at either the faculty/professional or student level, please contact Michelle Ronayne at michelle.ronayne@gmail.com.
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News from the Northeast
Written by Suzanne Phillips

The Northeast Region has two quick updates this quarter:

The next annual meeting of the Eastern Psychological Association is in Boston, March 13-16, 2014, complete with a day of SCRA programming. This year, we have a “media” theme, although there are presentations and posters in a variety of areas. Check the EPA website for details, at http://www.easternpsychological.org.

We need help! We are looking for both faculty/professional-level and student-level coordinators to join our team. Coordinators serve three year terms and provide regional leadership and guidance to the processes of membership development, activities, and communication. At the Biennial in Miami, I asked student coordinators about what they like about serving in this way, and they cited the opportunity to do something important and the chance to shape programming; if this sort of leadership reminds you of any students you know, please send them our way. If you are interested in serving at either the faculty/professional or student level, please contact Michelle Ronayne at michelle.ronayne@gmail.com.
In this issue, Rachel Becker Hebst and Susan Wolfe detail their community work in Colorado and Texas. Also, Samantha Cooper and Brittney Weber, undergraduate students from ASU Colleges at Lake Havasu City, share their impressions of the NW ECO conference.

Written by Rachel Becker Herbst, Denver, CO

I recently began my work in Colorado as a psychology fellow with the Consultation Liaison in Mental Health and Behavior (CLIMB) team at the Child Health Clinic in Children’s Hospital Colorado. The Child Health Clinic is a major teaching clinic, where 42 general pediatric residents, 20 Family Medicine residents, 24 Physician Assistant students, and approximately 60 Medical Students are taught primary care pediatrics each year. The clinic provides care to 18,000 children each year, the majority of whom rely on Medicaid for insurance. The goal of CLIMB is to provide sustainable integrated mental and behavioral health care in pediatric primary care. Through direct services, training residents on the impact of contextual and psychosocial factors, program evaluation, and research regarding health promotion and disparities, CLIMB is implementing a program that could be replicated in other sites across the country. In an effort to translate this model to community-based pediatrics, we recently began to implement CLIMB in two local pediatric practices. Our community partners identified these practices as serving families with substantial mental and behavioral health needs. Finally, to ensure sustainability of integrated pediatric primary care, we are collecting clinical informatics research that demonstrates the effectiveness of CLIMB, the need for mental health parity, and the reimbursement of services provided by integrated behavioral health care providers.

Written by Susan Wolfe, Cedar Hill, Texas

I have been engaged as the local evaluator for four Healthy Start programs in Texas, which are funded by the Health Resources and Services Administration (HRSA). The goal of the Healthy Start initiative is to reduce infant mortality and racial and ethnic disparities in infant mortality. Each project has a service and systems component. Service components are case management, depression screening, health education, and community outreach. System components include sustainability planning, developing a local health system action plan, collaboration with their State Title V office, and having a community consortium. In this loosely defined role I provide different services to each project such as program evaluation, sustainability planning, preparing local health systems action plans, coalition building, and other capacity building activities. This fall HRSA will be issuing the RFP for the competitive applications and all four projects will be required to re-apply for funding. For the first time, existing projects will not receive preference points. HRSA has re-designed the initiative, which they refer to as “Healthy Start 3.0” and the program requirements are at this time unknown. I will be assisting with the preparation of the grant applications and the development of required sustainability plans.

Written by Samantha Cooper, Lake Havasu City, AZ

Attending the 8th Annual NW ECO conference in Portland was a remarkable experience. The entire atmosphere of the conference was welcoming and comfortable. Before arriving, just the thought of the conference was intimidating. Upon arrival, all of my previous misgivings were put to rest and I was shown the most gracious hospitality. The professors and graduate students were both impressive and congenial. In particular, the graduate students were extremely helpful during their “Applying to Graduate School 101” presentation. They informed the audience about the steps required for admission into graduate school and how to utilize our resources in the most efficient ways. As an undergraduate I found this session informative and inspiring. I can tell from just spending one day at this conference that community psychologists are helping to make our world a better place.

Written by Brittney Weber, Lake Havasu City, AZ

When the chance arose for me to attend the 8th Annual NW ECO Conference in Portland, I knew I had to jump on the opportunity. I am grateful that I did so, as it provided me with an occasion to learn about concepts that are pertinent to my daily life, as well as to the culture at large. My three favorite aspects of the conference itself were the people in attendance (both students and professors), the cultural diversity, and the applicability of the shared ideas within everyday experiences. The first presentation I attended concerned the topic of cultural competency and brought up the theme of reciprocity, which was echoed throughout the day. The second presentation concentrated upon sustainable prevention in youth serving organizations. This was particularly fitting for me, given that I am currently an intern at Lake Havasu City’s Intergency Council, which houses a Big Brothers Big Sisters program. The lunch hour offered time to talk further with some of the presenters and other conference attendees, and it also gave me the chance to discuss my senior capstone project for ASU in Lake Havasu. Those with whom I spoke were engaging, which reflected an atmosphere of mutual respect that colored the entire conference.

Southeast Region, U.S.
Regional Coordinators
Ciara Smalls Glover: csmalls@gsu.edu
Georgia State University
Sarah L. Desmarais: sdesmarais@ncsu.edu
North Carolina State University
Courte Voorhees: cvoorhees@miami.edu
University of Miami
Student Regional Coordinator
Rebecca Rodriguez: rrodriguez12@student.gsu.edu
Georgia State University
Natalie Kivell:
University of Miami
Alexander Ojeda:
University of South Carolina
Candalyn Rade:
North Carolina State University
Nashalys Rodriguez:
Georgia State University

News from the Southeast
Written by Ciara Smalls Glover

North Carolina State University hosted the 2013 Southeastern Ecological and Community Psychology (Eco) conference September 27 – 29, 2013 at the NC State Forestry campsite in Bahama, NC. The theme for the
conference was “Reconnecting with Our Roots: Un-conferenced in the Elements.” The focus was on reexamining the core values and principles of community psychology that we often take for granted, through a participatory un-conference format. Rather than having scheduled, single-speaker sessions, the 60 students, faculty and community members came together to discuss the core values of community psychology in participant-driven and collaborative un-conference sessions between multiple co-presenters. Attendees initiated discussion topics by writing an idea on the agenda grid. There were a total of 21 sessions, ranging from topics of being a radical community psychologist to ethnic minority mental health. In keeping with the un-conference format, the 2013 Southeastern Eco conference also had an outstanding 4-person panel in lieu of the traditional keynote speaker. Panelists included representatives from academia (Deena M. Murphy, Triangle Research Associates and North Carolina State University), industry (Jason Hibets, Red Hat), non-profit (Sharon Goodson, North Carolina Community Action Association) and government (Dwayne Patterson, Community Services Department, City of Raleigh) who each are actively engaged in the local implementation of community psychology values. Discussion of the roots of community psychology flowed from the sessions and panel as students and faculty shared s'mores by the campfire. The 2013 Southeastern Eco captured the spirit of community psychology through a reconnection to the elemental components and values of social change.

Australia/New Zealand and the Pacific
International Regional Liaison
Katie Thomas, katiet@ichr.uwa.edu.au;
University of Western Australia
Undergraduate Regional Liaison
Kendra Swain: kendra.swaine@gmail.com
Curtin University

The New Landscape of War:
Women as Primary Targets
Written by Katie Thomas

Women, War and Peace was screened at the recent Trans-Tasman “Women in Psychology” conference hosted in New Zealand. SCRA members Heather Gridley and Carmel O’Brien organized the event and the discussion that followed. The Forks Film series challenges the conventional view that war and peace are primarily a male domain and graphically illustrate the suffering of women and children as new foci in the post-Cold war era. The series demonstrates why women need to be equal partners in any peace brokerage and decisions. Concurrently, in New South Wales (NSW), Krellyn Crofts organized the screening of, “Pray the Devil Back to Hell,” the Forks Film documentary of the Liberian conflict. The film documents how Liberian community women, acting from the realization that there was no future for their children if they did not act, and that no one else was doing what needed to be done, effectively organized themselves and achieved peace for their nation. The film is an inspirational record of the power of community activism and bears witness to the tremendous courage of individual women who risked their lives daily for their families and country.

The NSW screening was advertised as a community event and gathered so much public interest that it had to be moved from the University to a local theatre. The forum discussion and question and answer session went for two hours after the event. The Panel was chaired by Dr. Natalia Szableskwa who is an International Law Specialist and included Andrea Cullinan, UN consultant for Internal Displacement and Women’s Empowerment; Sarah King, a Sierra Leonian and the Founder of the Sierra Leone Book Project; Kirsten Keith, Officer of the Sierra Leone Special Tribunal and Moray Ralph, Regional Manager of the Red Cross. Dr. Szableskwa said it was inspirational to witness community and student commitment to women human rights defenders and to global human rights. There was a book prize donated by Ms. King and many people stayed after the forum to continue the conversation with the officials. Community interest in international justice was so evident that the screening of “I Came to Testify,” the Forks Film documentary of the Bosnian women witnessing against the men who gang raped them in the conflict, is now being organized by Ms. Crofts. The Theatre was so impressed by the event that they have offered to reduce the hire fee by more than $500 in order to support the next screening. If there are other Pacific Regional members who would like to host a film screening, please contact Dr. Katie Thomas katiet@ichr.uwa.edu.au. In Australia, this activity is PD eligible for Community Psychologists to maintain obligations under the new Australian Health Practitioner Regulation Agency standards.

Another upcoming training opportunity is the Trans-Tasman Community Psychology Conference, which is planned for 27-29 November, 2014 in Fremantle, Western Australia. The theme is: “Back to the Future: Collective Reflexivities for Transformative Change .” The Trans-Tasman Community Psychology Conference is a biennial event that brings together community psychologists from New Zealand and Australia. The last Trans-Tasman Conference on “Poverty and Inequality,” hosted by the Institute of Community Psychology Aotearoa, New Zealand (NZ), was held at the Tapu Te Ranga Marae in New Zealand. This is a perfect opportunity for SCRA members who have always wanted a trip Down Under. If you are interested in this Professional Development event you can contact the organizers at contact@communitypsych.org or visit www.communitypsych.org for more information.

Latin America
Regional Liaison:
Tesania Velázquez Castro, tvelazq@pucp.pe;
Pontificia Universidad Católica del Perú, Perú
Nelson Portillo, nportillo@uca.edu.sv;
Universidad Centroamericana (UCA), San Salvador, El Salvador
Submitted by
Nelson Portillo
**Rural Issues**
*Edited by Susana Helm and Cécile Lardon*

**Highlights from SCRA Biennial 2013**

The Rural Interest Group organized a roundtable discussion on Teaching Rural Community Psychology, and we also provided a special interest lunch meeting. Mahalo (thank you) to the participants: Cheryl Ramos from University of Hawaii Hilo (co-discussant), Etta Lee (co-discussant) and Jen Wallin-Rushman from Abraham Baldwin Agricultural College in Georgia, Jennifer Rae from the University of Ottowa, Carrie Forden from Clarion University in Pennsylvania, David Perez-Jimenez from the University of Puerto Rico – Rio Piedras, and Lian Taljaard from South Africa. In addition to the Rural IG sponsored sessions, Etta’s search of the conference website revealed that there were at least 40 sessions with a focus on rurality.

During the roundtable, we shared our thoughts on unique characteristics of rural communities, such as individuality, isolation, and distrust/apprehension with outsiders. For example, while there may be a higher acceptance of individuality in rural communities because people know each other as neighbors, co-workers, teammates, extended family, and/or from religious activities; there simultaneously may exist a seemingly less open acceptance of people from outside the community. Other highlighted characteristics included out-migration of youth; chronic economic distress, as well as acute distress in the recent 5 years; religiosity; natural resources (land, water, forests, open space, subsistence livelihood), and related opportunities and tensions; and food and agriculture. These characteristics contribute to issues of concern related to land use and land management; as well as natural and built resource use, resource management, and access and barriers to resources. Such rural disparities, relative to urban and suburban areas, represent important content areas in teaching rural research, policy, and practice.

We also discussed how a “sense of place” is very strong in rural areas, which may differ from a psychological sense of community. While many community psychologists have studied sense of community in urban/suburban environments, there seems to have been less emphasis in understanding sense of community as experienced by rural residents. There was discussion of refocusing the community psychology lens for a broader depth of field that is more inclusive of rurality. While there are many ways of accomplishing this, we currently are moving forward by developing a resource manual for teaching rural community psychology, which we plan to make available online on the SCRA website. To begin, we will post lists of useful videos, books, and articles you may want to use in your classes. For example, the *Journal of Family Social Work* recently published two special issues that highlight rural families and human services. Overviews of the special issues are provided by the special issue editors (see Alford, Cook, Conway, 2013; and Cook, Alford, Conway, 2012).

**References**

**Brief Report**

For the Rural IG columns we highlight the work of community psychologist and colleagues in their rural environments. We welcome your submissions and inquiries! With any submission, we will provide timely feedback in the form of track changes and comment bubbles on your word document, so that a series of revisions is possible. We aim for submissions of about 1200 words, with up to 10 APA style references. Photographs (jpegs) and other graphics enhance articles, which are now published in the online version of *TCP* in color! Please send submissions to Susana (HelmS@dop.hawaii.edu) and Cécile (cslardon@alaska.edu). This is a great opportunity for students to share their preliminary thesis or dissertation work, or insights gained in rural community internships. For this issue we have another excellent student-authored example from graduate student researcher Krissy Gleason. We would like to encourage student submissions from beyond Hawai‘i for the next *TCP* issues.

**Human Trafficking in Hawai‘i: Special Challenges in Rural Areas**
*Written by Kristen Gleason, University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa, kdg8@hawaii.edu*

**Acknowledgements – Funding provided by University of Hawai‘i Department of Psychology Gartley Award**

Over the past decade human trafficking has been gaining public attention and spurring local, state, and federal government responses. As a community psychology graduate student at the University of Hawai‘i, I decided that a contextually-grounded exploration of human trafficking in Hawai‘i would be important for understanding how to better address the issue in a specific place and time. The State of Hawai‘i is an ideal place to explore issues of human trafficking as it has had several high profile trafficking cases in recent years (Lin, 2011; Mori, 2012) and previously had established an anti-human trafficking coalition with members located primarily in the metropolitan center of Honolulu.

**Brief Overview of Human Trafficking**

Acknowledging issues surrounding the definition of human trafficking is a critical first step in trafficking research. How we define a problem determines how we address it. In the case of human trafficking, because the media tends to publicize the most extreme and sensational cases, many people assume that these cases represent the dominant definition of the problem (Berman, 2005; Brennan, 2008). However, in reality there are alternative characterizations of human trafficking that include much more nuance and subtlety.

In recent years, human trafficking service providers have begun to divide trafficking into two categories: sex trafficking and labor trafficking. One of the most publicized and therefore recognizable types of trafficking victims are sex trafficking victims, often women who have been kidnapped and forced into prostitution. Contrary to this stereotype, the official legal definition of sex trafficking also includes those who have been coerced in more subtle ways. Additionally, anyone under the age of 18 who is participating in the sex industry is considered a trafficked person and need not prove coercion at all (*Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act of 2000*, 2000). This has resulted in a growing number of “domestic human trafficking victims,” who are usually young U.S. citizens who have...
become a part of the sex trade.

While there have been a few labor trafficking cases with victims who were U.S. citizens (Bales & Soodalter, 2009), the vast majority of labor trafficking victims are undocumented immigrants. Labor trafficking can occur in many industries including agriculture, hospitality, domestic service, and manufacturing, and does not need to include “kidnapping” or even movement across borders. Like sex trafficking, labor trafficking does not need to include physical force, and often traffickers use more subtle forms of coercion to induce compliance, such as withholding immigration documents.

The Present Study

The aim of the present study was to learn more about human trafficking in Hawai`i from service providers whose duties include providing legal or social service support to victims, helping victims of crime through the court process, or advocating for victims in other ways. A qualitative study was designed in which urban, suburban, and rural service providers (N=13) were interviewed in one-on-one face-to-face semi-structured interviews. Several potential participants were identified from among services providers who attend anti-trafficking coalition meetings located in the metropolitan area. These participants represent social service providers with experience in addressing human trafficking in a mainly urban/suburban setting. Snowball sampling was used to identify additional contacts that may have some experience with or knowledge of human trafficking in rural areas. Identifying rural service providers was particularly challenging as these areas do not have agencies that deal specifically with human trafficking. However, interviews with rural service providers were included because their experiences with trafficking might be different from urban/suburban providers and because very little is known about potential human trafficking cases in rural Hawai`i. This paper focuses on these unique rural aspects. Selected preliminary results are described below with exemplary quotes excerpted from the verbatim transcripts of interviews.

“We don’t have trafficking here”

Analyses of interviews with human trafficking service providers indicates that across both rural and urban contexts there is widespread misunderstanding about what human trafficking looks like. The majority of the participants discussed their experiences around the confusion they encounter among the public, parents, landowners, police officers, and even potential victims over what constitutes human trafficking. For example, a participant from a rural agency with experience with human trafficking openly discussed not being sure of the definition of trafficking:

“In my opinion, it’s sort of being uprooted or kidnapped in a way from where you normally were and sort of been taken out of that, yeah, that region and forced to be placed... somewhere else. And we weren’t sure. Yeah, because it’s not a phase- maybe on the news we hear about it- but it’s not much of (pause)...It’s not very prevalent here, in this community.”

Often this confusion centers around the difficulty of recognizing the more subtle aspects of potential vulnerability and coercion among victims of human trafficking, as well as other forms of sexual and labor exploitation.

“So, I think part of that is the nature of the rural community, and the balance of, when you have a impoverished community, when people say things like, ‘Ya know, Hawaiians don’t want this kinda job, so I gotta use these immigrants’... Some of the cultures who are willing to work really hard, and maybe not get paid for another week. And then, you know, their papers might get held, just- you know, in other words, I’m trying to suggest that maybe some of the people are thinking that they helping in the labor area.”

Confusion over what constitutes human trafficking may combine with issues of power interests, isolation, and lack of resources in rural communities to perpetuate the myth that “human trafficking doesn’t happen here.” Several rural participants expressed concerns that the people in power may not be motivated to address human trafficking in their community.

“So I think other [rural] counties, I think if we send our prosecutor over and he says, ‘we don’t have this problem [on this island]!’ then we don’t get any information coming back, right?”

“Prosecutors, police, police commissions, I mean, we those- that’s the opposition that we face in trying to bring the issue forward.”

Rural Communities Often Are Isolated and Have Fewer Resources

In addition to challenges in defining human trafficking so that victims may be properly recognized as such, rural areas in the State of Hawai`i also have large, isolated regions that pose three challenges. First, these areas provide potential cover for a range of illegal activities, including human trafficking and other forms of worker exploitation. According to participants, their remoteness and isolation result in very little interference or contact with authorities who might intervene:

“The thing too though, like, for us ‘cause we’re such a big island and where we have lots of very rural areas that people- like in [community A], for instance, people always go like ‘in [community A] people can just go hide out’ (laugh). So I think that’s why I think there’s trafficking here, because it’s so big that people can go unnoticed for a very long time before something happens.”

The second major challenge that rural remoteness poses for those wishing to address human trafficking is that trafficked persons are more cut off from outside resources. This creates an added layer of vulnerability as escaping an abusive situation is much more difficult in remote areas. This difficulty of escaping an exploitative situation and seeking help overlaps with the final challenge these rural communities face, namely access to fewer resources.

“So now we’re sort of limited with our work force to having, um, you know, people who need services come to us instead of us being able to go to them. Right? And on an island with very little transportation and, you know, so rural, that you have people who, you know, who can’t access the service they need.”

Several rural service providers expressed concerns over lack of resources and personnel. Accessing and providing services to people in rural communities was cited as a potential barrier to those who might seek help from escaping trafficking situations. An added concern when dealing with international victims was the difficulty in finding adequate interpreters. With trafficked persons it is very important to ensure that interpreters are not connected in any way with the traffickers. According to one service provider, the small pockets of tight-knit immigrant communities from which interpreters might be drawn in rural Hawai`i present a real challenge for finding qualified interpreters who do not have potential connections to traffickers.

Conclusion

The question many rural service providers asked themselves was whether they were not seeing trafficking cases because there were, in fact, no cases or
because none had yet been identified. While urban, suburban, and rural participants all discussed the challenges related to misunderstandings about the definition of human trafficking, rural participants seemed to have particular challenges that may be preventing them from identifying potential trafficking cases. It is likely that the more general failure to recognize subtle forms of abuse combines with 1) issues of power and local authority; 2) the difficulty of uncovering abuse in isolated areas; and 3) the limited resources that these rural communities often have in identifying and addressing abuses. Results from this study indicate that to begin to address human trafficking in these rural areas one needs to start with expanding the definition of the problem. Human trafficking exists within a range of labor abuses, worker discrimination, and sexual exploitation. Advocates need to begin to re-situate trafficking within this range of abuses and bring awareness to more subtle forms of abuse so that the conversation no longer centers on whether or not there is trafficking (abuse at the extreme end of the spectrum) and expands to discuss how to create a community that does not tolerate abuse and exploitation.
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School Intervention Interest Group
Edited by Melissa Maras and Joni Splett

Greetings from the School Intervention Interest Group! In this issue, we present an article discussing the impact of teacher support of and responsiveness to Social Emotional Learning programs on implementation quality and student outcomes. Colleagues from Xavier University present their efforts to examine and improve teacher responsiveness to the implementation of a school-wide Social Emotional Learning program in a diverse, low income public Montessori school. They examine teacher responsiveness as an aspect of implementation quality and a potential moderator of student outcomes. Implications for practice and evaluation are discussed.

Assessing Teacher Responsiveness to Social Emotional Learning Programs
Written by Jennifer E. Gibson, Sehra Polad, and Rachel Merchak, Xavier University

Social emotional learning (SEL) programs have become popular in schools. Rather than attempting to prevent one particular problem, such as bullying or poor academic achievement, SEL programs aim to address the difficulties and deficits that underlie many childhood problems (Greenberg et al., 2003). SEL programs focus on improving children’s ability to understand and manage emotions, empathize with others, establish and maintain positive relationships, inhibit impulses, and effectively problem solve (Elias et al., 1997). A significant body of research now demonstrates that SEL programs result in a range of positive social, emotional, behavioral, and academic outcomes (Durlak, Weissberg, Dymnicki, Taylor, & Schellinger, 2011).

There are many aspects of implementation. Durlak and DuPre (2008) describe eight: Fidelity, dosage, quality, participant responsiveness, program differentiation, monitoring of control conditions, program reach, and adaptation. While fidelity and dosage are increasingly measured, other aspects are rarely assessed (Durlak & DuPre, 2008). Among these is participant responsiveness, which can be defined as the degree to which participants “buy-in” to and support a program as demonstrated by their engagement in the program and satisfaction with the program, including satisfaction with the programs’ relevance, acceptability, and benefit (Carroll et al., 2007; Kutash, Cross, Madias, Duchnowski, & Green, 2012). Participants include not only the students who receive the program, but also the principals, teachers, and other adults involved in implementing and supporting the program (Carroll et al., 2007). Responsiveness is typically measured through self-reports and observations, but is very rarely assessed for teachers.

Teacher responsiveness is important because it may impact other aspects of implementation, and, ultimately, student outcomes. Research suggests that when teachers are the primary implementers of a program, their support for the program is associated with greater fidelity and quality of implementation, as well as greater student engagement in the program (Datnow & Castellano, 2000; Fagan & Mihalic, 2003). When programs are delivered by other personnel, high levels of teacher buy-in may convey the importance of the program to students and increase the likelihood that the teacher reinforces program components throughout the school day. In contrast, low teacher buy-in may undermine the efforts of the person delivering the program. In fact, Langley, Nadeem,
Kataoka, Stein, and Jaycox (2010) found that clinicians implementing school prevention programs ranked lack of teacher support as one of the top implementation barriers. Thus, teacher responsiveness is important, both when teachers and when other personnel are delivering an SEL program.

In our own work supporting and evaluating an SEL program, we are examining multiple aspects of implementation, including teacher responsiveness, and using this data to improve implementation and understand outcomes. In 2011, we formed a partnership with school mental health clinicians working in a public Montessori school serving primarily African American (80%) and low income (80%) students. The clinicians were primarily engaged in individual, family, and group therapy, but recognized that many students would benefit from improved social and emotional skills, and that implementing a universal SEL program would increase their reach. After some exploration, they selected the Promoting Alternative Thinking Strategies (PATHS) curriculum because of its strong evidence base and developmentally appropriate lessons. Grant support allowed the clinicians to dedicate approximately 10 hours a week to PATHS, so they took primary responsibility for implementing the program the first year, and will be gradually transferring implementation to teachers. This is intended to build teacher buy-in by easing them into the program. Clinicians piloted the program in preschool/kindergarten classrooms in fall 2012 and started school-wide implementation in spring 2013.

From the beginning, we asked the clinicians to track implementation via a record that can be completed in just a couple minutes at the end of each PATHS lesson. We adapted a record available as part of the PATHS curriculum (Domitrovich, Greenberg, Kusché, & Cortes, 2008) to allow implementers to rate fidelity, dosage, quality, adaptation, and student responsiveness using Likert scales. As the clinicians began implementing the program school-wide, they observed differences in teacher engagement. Some teachers sat in the circle during PATHS lessons and actively contributed to the discussion, while others remained outside of the circle and engaged in side conversations or used their phones. The clinicians became concerned that these latter behaviors conveyed to students that the lessons were not important, and thus decreased the likelihood that students would engage with and benefit from the program. As a result, we made efforts to increase teacher engagement, and also decided to track teacher responsiveness to determine what impact it may have on student outcomes.

Clinicians now rate teacher engagement during lessons using a five-point Likert scale with behavioral anchors. A teacher who sits in the circle and makes at least three positive contributions to the discussion receives a rating of 5 (very engaged), whereas a teacher who leaves the classroom during the lesson receives a rating of 1 (very disengaged). We will sum engagement ratings across the lessons to get a total engagement score for each teacher, and then examine whether student outcomes are associated with engagement scores. In addition, each teacher will complete a satisfaction survey, and satisfaction scores will be examined alongside student data to determine if this aspect of teacher responsiveness moderates student outcomes.

For schools in which teachers are the primary implementers of SEL programs, the same method can be used to assess teacher satisfaction and how it may impact student outcomes. However, if teachers are the one's delivering the intervention and completing the implementation record, the scale that we use to measure engagement would be inappropriate. Instead, an observational tool could be used to gauge how enthusiastic teachers are in their delivery of the program. Ideally, this tool would be completed by an outside consultant on a regular basis throughout the school year, and would also include items related to other aspects of implementation, such as quality and student responsiveness. Other researchers have been successful in assessing implementation in this manner (Conduct Problems Prevention Research Group, 1999).

In summary, it is important to examine multiple aspects of implementation of SEL programs. While teacher responsiveness is rarely assessed, we argue that it may impact other aspects of implementation and student outcomes. We hope our description of how we have measured implementation, including teacher responsiveness, will lead others to include teacher responsiveness among the many aspects of implementation they examine.
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**Self-Help & Mutual Support**

*Edited by Greg Townsley and Alicia Lucksted*

This edition of the SCRA Self-Help/Mutual Support Interest group column marks the introduction of new co-chairs, Alicia Lucksted and Greg Townley. Many thanks to Louis Brown for his dedication and service as chair of the interest group over the last four years. Alicia Lucksted is Assistant Professor in the Department of Psychology at Portland State University. His interests and experience in self-help and mutual support for future editions of this column. It is a great outlet for editorials and a variety of practice, research, education, and other projects. Please contact us with your ideas and for details on the meetings and other activities.

---

**Hearing Voices Groups:**

*Journeys through Madness Written by Casadi “Khaki” Marino, Portland State University School of Social Work PhD student*

In the worst days of my madness, I heard the voice of a demon laughing and disparaging me. The demon, who never introduced himself and who I never named, would tell me I was a horrible person who had brought harm to the world, that I did not deserve oxygen, and that I should be in pain. At times I would feel him hurting me physically. He would appear for undisclosed reasons and on his own time, often when I was trying to sleep. I might be going about my business and hear, “You should be dead! Die! Die! Die!” I would try to talk about my experiences, but people had no idea how to respond. Most people simply looked at me oddly. My mother just cried. I dropped out of school and spent more and more time wandering around or being alone. If I happened to see my reflection in a mirror or window, I wouldn’t necessarily recognize myself at first. I might think, “Who is that person? She looks really disturbed… Oh, that’s me.” If a police officer should encounter me, he was usually good enough to drive me home. I couldn’t function, I couldn’t sleep, I couldn’t do anything but feel lost and go insane.

As my periods of madness would come and go, I eventually found my way back to college. Although I was moody and would have odd experiences that I couldn’t really share, I wasn’t always being tormented and could usually focus and study. I was fortunate enough to have access through school to psychotherapy with a Jungian practitioner. She was comfortable with expressions of distress through image and metaphor and helped me explore the effects of a childhood of trauma, loss, and loneliness. My father had been a troubled and violent man with his own abuse and abandonment history. I was like him in terms of appearance and temperament. He seemed to have an intuitive understanding and was able to soothe me. He read me Winnie the Pooh and we would play with the dog and go to the beach. We had fun. Yet he terrorized the home and betrayed me. I remember thinking to myself, “Sometimes my father is my father, and sometimes my father is a monster. When I grow up, I never want to be a monster.” I wanted the best of my father and I wanted to be a good person. I put away the rest only to have it come roaring back many years later with an overwhelming force that took me away from myself. My father committed suicide sometime after I began having madness and his death took away even more ground and balance. I walked around feeling as if I had large, gaping holes inside and no sense of purpose or meaning. Therapy helped me to disentangle myself from what had happened and move experiences into the past. I was no longer such a haunted person. I eventually became a therapist myself and have worked in the mental health field for many years. I am currently pursuing a PhD in Social Work at Portland State University in order to study peer services, recovery, and disability and mad theory.

I only discovered the Hearing Voices Movement a few years ago when a group established in my home town of Portland, Oregon. I have since established my own group, Light of Madness, and co-facilitate weekly groups. I was immediately drawn to the approach as it assumes madness makes sense in relation to life experiences and holds to a wide variety of coping and recovery approaches. A number of ways of understanding madness is considered valid. Madness is considered a personal reality that may represent emotions, experiences, or problems of living. The Hearing Voices groups can provide an environment in which individuals can talk openly about their experiences and gain a sense that they are not alone. Participation allows for recognition and acceptance of experiences as an alternative to engaging in denial (Martin, 2000; Snelling, 2005). Individuals are guided to explore triggers, how voices developed and what they may represent, to develop new ways of responding to difficulty, and to regain a sense of control. The recovery approach can be structured as steps. The first steps are to identify the most problematic aspects of the voices and choose and practice coping strategies. Next, the individual explores the emotions associated with the voices and develops alternative means of managing the emotions. Finally, the last is explored in order to accept and work through conflicts and contributors to madness (Knols & Corstens, 2011). Recovery becomes a process of expressing one’s story, finding meaning, understanding vulnerability, and managing emotions and social demands. As one tells one’s story and makes meaning of experience, the individual as narrator of experience and agent of one’s life begins to reemerge.
Hearing Voices developed in the Netherlands in the late 1980s and groups exist through Europe, Australia, New Zealand, Canada, and the United States (HVN USA, 2013; Intervoice, 2013). The basic premise of the Hearing Voices Network is that hearing voices and similar phenomena are a variant of human experience that should not be denied and cannot be cured, but can be accepted and managed (Blackman, 2000). The personal significance of madness experiences can be explored and integrated into one’s life. Individuals can be assisted to build a language for what had not been expressed and to rework identity from a fragmented or devalued self to one that makes sense in context, can grow or develop through experiences, and have much to offer others (Longden, Corstens, Escher, & Romme, 2012; Woods, 2013).

Hearing Voices self-help groups have limited professional evaluation due in part to resistance stemming from the history of coercive mental health interventions (Casstevens, Coker, & Sanders, 2012). As more individuals with madness histories enter the academy, formal research on the processes and mechanisms of change through the Hearing Voices approach will further develop. Hearing Voices group participants have reported that the opportunity to discuss shared experiences have been most helpful due to providing de-stigmatizing or normalization effects. Individuals have reported feeling less isolated as a result of participation (Conway, 2004; Meddings, Walley, Collins, Tullet, McEwan & Owen, 2004). In a review of twenty-five studies on Hearing Voices groups, it was found that key ingredients of successful groups were providing a safe context to explore experiences, sharing strategies for coping with distressing experiences, and helping group members relate differently to their experiences so that they could believe that they had power and control over their voices (Ruddle, Mason, & Wykes, 2011). Researchers who conducted a case series study to explore predictors and mechanisms of change in Hearing Voices groups found that gaining coping strategies and learning that voices are not all powerful led to reduction in distress. Targeting coping strategies may not be sufficient to effect change as it seems that changes in beliefs are related to reduction in distress (Ruddle, Livingstone, Huddy, Johns, Stahl, & Wykes, 2012).

While support groups are recognized as critical to the Hearing Voices Movement, there has been no systematic gathering of information on how groups are organized and operated. Preliminary work on this matter has just begun. I am involved in a study under development on the goals and experiences of U.S. group facilitators. Led by Nev Jones, PhD candidate, of the Lived Experiences Research Network, the study will explore how groups are organized and facilitated and who seems to benefit from participation. Plans for future work include development of an instrument to measure the effects of participation in Hearing Voices groups (LERNetwork, 2013). Additionally, I am conducting a study with individuals who have attended Hearing Voices groups to explore how madness experiences relate to self-concept. Integration of madness experiences into one’s identity may be an essential component of recovery.
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Student Issues

Edited by Danielle Kohfeldt and Chuck Seper

Céad Míle Fáilte

Written by Shannon M. Williams, M.A., Community Psychology Program, DePaul University

The Irish Gaelic expression above means “you are welcome a thousand times over, wherever you come from, whoever you are” – a saying that well explains my experience of Ireland! Upon my arrival in Dublin, Ireland, I was graciously greeted by staff and faculty at All Hallows College (AHC), one of our sister Vincentian colleges, as the first Community Psychology doctoral student from DePaul University to take part in the Graduate Global Experience GGE. “Get to know the soul, hearts, and heads of the people” to be “less of a tourist and more of a new resident” were words that I took to heart from my advisor and that completely described the newly formed GGE that I was fortunate to take part in.

The Community Psychology Program at DePaul recently put into place the GGE, which gives students an opportunity to become diversely enriched by experiencing varying populations through cultural immersion tied into research and action. The optional GGE prospect is offered to students in their third year of the community psychology program.
program, for a chance to enhance their doctoral training in a 3-9 month (1-3 quarters) dialogue abroad arrangement, and potential funding to cover the trip and stay! Once students complete their Master’s degree, students are able to study, teach, or research overseas through available tuition waivers, covered airfare, included housing and meals, and even a stipend via a research assistantship and online teaching assistant hours – what more could we students ask for which such a once in a lifetime endeavor!

As I was experiencing my first visit to Europe, I still felt right as home between the frequent cups of tea, never-ending chocolate desserts, lack of Chicago winters, and wonderful stories of the history and culture of Ireland! I immediately settled right in with the people of Dublin and never felt like just a visitor. I enjoyed my cultural immersion via grand tours of the city of Dublin, Kildare, and Howth, through a weaving of Irish humor, history, and folklore. I experienced Irish family dinners and get-togethers, joined the campus choir, attended cultural and historical outings, and even became part of the soccer culture in Ireland. While assisting a women’s soccer program on campus for students, I happened to find my way to an opportunity to play at the highest level of women’s soccer in Ireland, in the National Women’s League! AHC was so supportive about this endeavor, which led to more chatter spread across the campus about my Irish happenings, not to mention the excitement that the male counterpart soccer team was one of their best in the country! And then to top it all off, I was somehow able to squeeze some unforgettable trips to Barcelona, Paris, and Rome during my 11-week stay – who knew it would be so easy to travel, get involved, and to get around Europe once you are there?

Given the opportunity to explore Ireland, I was fortunate enough to have the rare experience to witness 5,000-year old ruins and historic sites, including the impressive New Grange, Slane Castle, Chester Library, Clonmacnoise, St. Brigid’s well, National art galleries and museums, and Phoenix Park! Moreover, I experienced St. Patrick’s Day in Dublin, informed that “only Americans go to the parade in Ireland as the Irish enjoy watching it from inside in the warmth.” I instantly became “semi-famous” by being asked to take part in a video where I was interviewed during the TradFest, a traditional Irish music and dance festival celebrated in the streets and cathedrals! The Gathering, who promote Irish events nationally and internationally, interviewed me in a video that was posted on their webpage and on youtube, that even led to someone approaching me and a Fulbright Scholar colleague in the city having recognized us in the video – I can’t say that that happens too often in Chicago!

At AHC, I got a wonderful chance to know all encompassing campus life on a deeper level with the help of a magical dining hall that led to hearing stories that are passed down from generation to generation, sharing of talents, insights, jokes and laughs, and charismatic storytellers that led to my surreal experience that I’m positive would be part of an amusing reality tv show! With support systems created on my home and then new campus, I was able to accomplish a plethora of goals through having multiple people invested in the mutual goals set through collaborative efforts and relationships. I was no longer considered a graduate student, but viewed and treated as a staff member at AHC. I am very grateful for my rich cultural experience where I was engaged on multiple levels and furthermore have future connections for teaching, research, and post-doc opportunities.

But this was not a vacation – it was a time to build upon my professional development. Among the educational opportunities experienced, module, lab and workshop lectures on social justice and community psychology were included. Also, I engaged in student assessments on various topics and strategic planning. Additionally, I assisted in the development of a Community Psychology (CP) undergraduate program at AHC, providing knowledge of essential components necessary to implement such a program. One of my favorite highlights were hearing from students and faculty that community psychology is so near to their vision and the work that they have been doing all along – it was just a matter of placing a cohesive unit and a name behind the conversations! Ireland is very willing and capable of building a strong CP program at the college level, as they have embraced crucial principles of CP for many years through service, commitment, and action. I found faculty, staff, students, and the community clearly geared towards CP values. I am truly excited to see what their future holds and how they will excel in the CP world!

Through GGE, with strong ties to AHC, providing knowledge of essential components necessary to implement such a program. One of my favorite highlights were hearing from students and faculty that community psychology is so near to their vision and the work that they have been doing all along – it was just a matter of placing a cohesive unit and a name behind the conversations! Ireland is very willing and capable of building a strong CP program at the college level, as they have embraced crucial principles of CP for many years through service, commitment, and action. I found faculty, staff, students, and the community clearly geared towards CP values. I am truly excited to see what their future holds and how they will excel in the CP world!

Through GGE, with strong ties to other countries and programs around the world, students are able to embark on a truly remarkable experience in another part of the world, which I have had the powerful opportunity to experience this past winter in Ireland. This international exchange is beneficial to all involved as the GGE aligns all interests and needs from students and the involved communities/institutions. Students may also use this abroad occasion to fulfill several of the doctoral program requirements, including fieldwork projects and independent research. An initiative such as GGE is a rewarding stepping stone to connect knowledge to action in expanding research horizons with hands-on learning experiences through community collaboration and cultural engagement on a whole new level. This is truly what Community Psychology principles are all about.

Overall, I brought back with me the enhanced love for tea, Irish jigs, taking time to enjoy life and laughter, and reminiscing that are sure to bring me back to a place so easy to call home. I had the rare opportunity in life to say: “I am Shannon, standing on the Shannon bridge, over the Shannon River, in Ireland,” a highlight I thankfully wasn’t allowed to leave without doing so. And while there is still so much left to see and to accomplish, I look forward to my return and to reunite with some of the most amazing and down-to-earth people I have ever had the pleasure to be surrounded by – and while just under 3 months may have been short-lived, I certainly have a life-time of memories to always keep me close.

And as the Irish say with a famous Gaelic Blessing:

“May the road rise to meet you,
May the wind always be at your back,
The sun shine warm upon your face,
The rain fall soft upon your fields,
And until we meet again,
May God hold you in the hollow of His hand.”
can be learned, discussed, and supported. Under the banner of “community research and action,” a number of graduate students and faculty have come together to develop graduate-level community psychology course offerings, a vibrant graduate student workgroup, and, perhaps, much more.

Although I’m certain that each individual involved in the growing community of community psychologists here at UM has their own story to tell of how they have come to be involved and the roles they hope to play, mine began with a set of readings assigned in my clinical psychology theory course (Winter 2011). Within that week’s readings, clearly aimed to raise questions around many of the person-centered causal assumptions made in much of clinical psychology research, my classmates and I were introduced to Prilleltensky’s “Psychology and the status quo” and Sarason’s “An asocial psychology and a misdirected clinical psychology.” Through discussion, and some debate, our instructor, Dr. Edward Chang, opened the door to a half-century-long dialogue between clinical and community psychology.

As these arguments percolated in my head, I turned to my research advisor Dr. Joseph Gone for help in sorting through my ideas, hopes, and concerns about incorporating community psychology values and perspectives into my own research. After some discussion he handed me Dr. Edison Trickett’s “Community psychology: Individuals and interventions in community context,” and with this basic understanding of the field’s landscape I came back two weeks later to ask Joe to teach a graduate-level community psychology course. In response, he challenged me to find the requisite six doctoral students who would enroll.

At that point, there did not seem to be a central hub of community-based research, and certainly no well-established networks of individuals practicing community psychology. I resorted to spamming listers for Public Health, Social Work, Education, Psychology, and Sociology with a course abstract drafted by Joe and the Trickett article attached in hopes of dredging up potential classmates from across UM. A surprising number of people expressed interest, a more than sufficient number stated that they would undoubtedly take such a course if offered, and a handful of responses conveyed an enthusiasm that seemed to transcend standard grammatical use of capital letters and exclamation marks. I couldn’t help but share some of that enthusiasm when I sat down with Joe to blithely convey that the ball was now in his court to pull together a graduate seminar.

Through a course plainly titled Community Psychology (Fall 2013), Joe introduced us to the historical context of the field, key discussions and tensions that have emerged in dialogue with clinical psychology, and a number of faculty members from across UM who identified as community psychologists. In addition to developing a foundational knowledge of community psychology through the course’s content, guest lecturers Drs. Richard Price (psychology), Robert Jagers (education and psychology), and Marc Zimmerman (public health), joined us for a day each to share insights about the practice of community psychology and entertain us with personal narratives from careers of doing community psychology within varied academic and research contexts.

As the semester end neared, a number of classmates expressed interest in creating an environment in which they could continue to learn about community research and action, and receive peer guidance and feedback in applying principles of community psychology to their research projects. Out of this conversation, and with a vital administrative push by Babe Kawai-Bogue, we formed a graduate workgroup with Dr. Lorraine Gutierrez as our faculty advisor and modest funding from our Rackham graduate school at UM to host regular meetings and an occasional invited speaker.

Through a self-organizing process we have maintained a rich multidisciplinary composition and developed a set of priorities for our group that include serving as a reading group to stay abreast of the community psychology literature, a venue in which project proposals and analyses can be presented for peer feedback, a resource for bringing in presenters who can draw upon their work to share methodological and conceptual insights relevant to community psychology, and an organization through which we can organize opportunities for community work practicum experiences. And perhaps most importantly, we have become a supportive peer group with hopes of fostering contextualist, social change discourse within our respective departments and serving as a resource from which we can all draw social support. Toward these ends, our first two months as a workgroup have witnessed engaging article-based discussions, an informative presentation on geographical information systems mapping as a method for documenting relations between structural environments and health outcomes, several promising proposals for community work projects that could develop out of group members’ existing relationships with communities in and around Ann Arbor, and a handful of coffee and happy hours for good measure.

Equally inspiring has been a parallel discussion that has emerged among some psychology faculty at UM. This discussion has centered on creating additional community psychology course offerings for graduate students and contemplating movement toward making community psychology a certificate program within the psychology department. Although only a discussion at this point, these changes would serve as important steps toward more concretely instantiating community psychology values and perspectives within UM social sciences and reinserting our institution into larger conversations within the field. A certificate program with additional course offerings would help to acknowledge the efforts of graduate student group members working to incorporate community psychology values and approaches into their work, as well as lend some legitimacy to the community psychology expertise we are all working to develop. Needless to say, our graduate student group is supportive and hopeful!

Looking forward, we are excited to reorient momentum that has resulted from developing internal relational networks toward developing relationships with community psychology organizations, institutions, and practitioners beyond UM. Starting with the Midwest Ecological-Community Psychology Conference, many group members have expressed interest in becoming active partners in helping to organize and eventually serving as a host site. Of course, we also have our eyes set on the Society for Community Research and Action (SCRA) and look forward to building professional relationships at the national level as well. Additionally, we look forward to inviting community psychologists from other institutions to engage with us here in Ann Arbor, adding to the resources currently available at UM to draw upon.
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The Swampscott Conference: Pivotal Assertions for the Concepts of Community and Prevention
Written by James G. Kelly

This conference was initially conceived as an opportunity to include psychologists in the rapid unfolding of the National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH) funding mandate to create community mental health centers. What happened over the five days, May 4-May 8 1965, was to assert that psychologists not be restricted to the federal mandate but to generate new methods that enlarge psychologists’ roles as leaders in the design and implementation of community programs. This shift was inspiring to the participants who had an enlightened spirit: to chart new directions; to free psychologists from a history of clinical mental health services largely for individuals.

There was an evolving mood of pleasure, and excitement, as the participants were realizing this new self-defined mandate along with the insights of not being restricted by imposed mandates. In retrospect, this was indeed a new self-awareness that the very career experiences of the participants could be the source for new thinking rather than being guided only by imposed, however well intended, federal guidelines.

Thinking back I believe that there were at least three conditions and histories that enabled the conference to be a genuine freeing occasion.

1. Several Decades of Pioneering Work by Psychologists post World War II

The participants were aware of a small number of psychologists, social scientists, psychiatrists, and public health advocates who had already been creating new paradigms and prototypes for community and preventive based enterprises. These historical pioneers were in many cases still active and serving as resources to further pave the way. Their achievements were invoked at the conference: Gerald Caplan, Jerry W. Carter, Jr., Bill Fairweather, Louisa Howe, Paul Lemkau, Alexander Leighton, Ron Lippitt, Erich Lindemann, Kurt Lewin, Charlotte Owens, Lucy Ozarin, F. C. Redlich, John Seeley, A.H. Stanton, Ed Wellin, Helen Witmer. They were truly pioneers and independent thinkers. Awareness of these path finders also made us realize that the earlier contributors were not always psychologists but psychiatrists, sociologists, anthropologists and public health researchers.

2. The Social Movements at the Time

Some of the participants and speakers, like Art Pearl and Bob Reiff, were key actors, in the various social movements germinating at the time. We were aware of them and noted that the processes of community organizing exemplified by Saul Alinsky raised our consciousness about the needs and obligations to redress past oppressions and personal costs of racism, sexism,
economic limitations and an imbalance of services for those in need. Some of the participants themselves were active as organizing resources for community change. There were participants who had experience in community interventions even though not always trained for such work. There was a palpable and explicit notice of the role of the community psychologist as an activist scholar, as Forrest Tyler, then of NIMH, expressed as a “participant conceptualizer”. The activist role in university education was somewhat subdued because for many participants there was a desire to have community psychology as a valid option for doctoral training. At the same time there was an awareness that too much verbal celebration of activism could serve as a constraint in establishing doctoral education in many of the top universities. The concept of an activist scholar was a revolutionary idea.

3. The Framework for Organizing and Implementing the Conference

The Planning Committee was very sensitive to organize an explicit task oriented conference based upon small group discussions with assigned groups, supported by late afternoon plenary sessions then followed by three guest speakers in the evenings. The commitment of the participants to this process was high. The excitement for the process helped bond the participants to the new found purpose. Don Klein’s skill was apparent in staying the course. There were at least three participants at the conference, often clinical psychologists who were moving into organizational roles. Their work with the National Training Laboratories, Kurt Lewin’s legacy, gave the conference in the presence of Don Klein, Weldon Moffitt and Jack Glidewell’s talk real currency for the blending of clinical and organizational skills and methods.

There was leadership in establishing a creative conference atmosphere. The conference planners included participants who had a variety of roles, such as state mental health psychologists and directors of regional mental health programs. Personally I did not know many of these participants but I wanted to know them and found a kinship and support from these new acquaintances. The conference had its own unique atmosphere: the strangers discovered kinship. There was a palpable norm for listening. There was respect for each other with increasing awareness that we all were on the cusp of making recommendations that were true to us and that could really matter to our own communities.

I hope that SCRA can facilitate access to the written report of the Conference. The Report written by Chester C. Bennett, then Director of Clinical Psychology at Boston University is a perceptive and veridical review of the conference and what was accomplished. It expresses the details with appreciation and a realization of the significance of what had occurred over these five days in May. In addition, six of the participants, Jack Glidewell, Ira Iscoe, myself, Stan Schneider of NIMH, Don Klein and Gersh Rosenblum talk about their experience at the conference in the SCRA Interviews available through the SCRA website or by contacting Jim Dalton or Vince Francisco.

I enjoyed calling up my memories of the conference and making them public. I am honored to have been invited to the Conference and pleased that nearly 50 years later I can offer these recollections.

James G. Kelly

JGKJazz@gmail.com