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Strategic Complacency, Embracing Risk, and Sustaining SCRA

What would it take for community psychology to disappear? … to be subsumed by other disciplines? … or to cease to be relevant? We have just completed another successful biennial conference where we reflected on the accomplishments and limitations of fifty years of community psychology and looked toward the future. There are many reasons to be optimistic. SCRA has a well-respected journal and has launched a book series. Several SCRA members edit community-psychology focused journals and have created online resources that seek to “give away” community psychology (e.g., The Community Toolbox). Increasingly, we are having dialogue with partner community psychology organizations in different regions around the world about how we can challenge social conditions that limit well-being and engage with community partners to promote action and research that can advance social justice. It could be easy to be satisfied with these accomplishments and leave aside concerns about the future. However, there are matters for concern. For example, many training programs in the U.S. and Canada have dissolved in the last 20 years. APA accreditation is becoming increasingly focused on narrow views of clinical psychology and discourages integration of clinical and community psychology. Other disciplines have become more collaborative, more focused on prevention and health promotion, or interested in addressing social inequities. For example, Colleges of Education have become more interested in community research and action. As these disciplines welcome and incorporate community psychology perspectives, however, it seems quite probable that these other disciplines would move to subsume community psychology once our collaborations are no longer novel. It would be highly ironic if we did not consider how the settings where we have developed community research and action will change and might no longer need the contributions we had previously shared. Unless we adapt as individuals and as a professional society, it is highly probable that the settings where we have worked will change without us.

During my time working on the Executive Committee of SCRA, I have observed many examples of stewardship that maintained the organization, raised awareness of the field, and supported the development of our members. These examples came from elected representatives and from members serving on interest groups, councils, and committees. I greatly appreciate these contributions and have worked to encourage them. However, I wonder whether we too often assume that community psychology as a field, and the settings where we cultivate it, will continue as we have known them. Recent generations of community psychologists encountered an established field as students. As such, younger community psychologists (e.g., trained during the last 25 years) are largely not aware of the challenges and the work it took to establish community psychology settings forty and fifty years ago. Given the many successes of community psychology, it is too easy to be complacent regarding survival of settings and the place of the field in work sites and places of learning.

While serving as SCRA President, I have begun to think that we need to flip the dialogue about promoting the organization dialogue on its head … that is, not
to focus on risk management but to take strategic risks and manage our complacency. Lonnie Snowden (1979) observed the “peculiar success of community psychology” 35 years ago in that many of our innovations were picked up by larger disciplines (e.g., clinical psychology, education) without recognition of the field of community psychology. George A. Miller (1969) encouraged psychologists to “give away” psychology in his APA Presidential address. While this ethos of the 1960s remains in much of how community psychology is practiced, we have spent much less time discussing what we need to do to sustain the field in new contexts and changing socio-political environments. Paradoxically, as we have created more community psychology journals, conferences, and publications, have we become too insular? We spend more time talking with each other, debating with each other, and less time interacting with people trained in other disciplines. Community psychologists trained in the last 25 years have not had to make the same kinds of arguments or fight for recognition and resources in the same way that those who helped found the field had to do. Perhaps we have not honed the skills necessary to create new settings. Many of the foundational publications in the formation of U.S. community psychology were published in the American Psychologist, Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, or social psychology journals or other social science journals. Now our most important work is published in community psychology journals with a smaller audience. Who has been making the case to social psychologists or clinical psychologists that a community perspective has something to offer? At conferences, how many of us present “community psychology” to people who have never heard of it before? Have we developed institutions to sustain community psychology that have decreased our reach and relevance?

Community psychology is almost always a minority viewpoint within a field, whether it is psychology, public health, social work, education, medicine, or public policy. How can we survive? Where do we need to cultivate a foundation and where do we need to cultivate new opportunities? I don’t ask these questions to forecast doom and gloom, rather to encourage dialogue that can help keep us dynamic, responsive, and generative.

I expect that part of what we need to do is take more strategic risks to work outside of “community psychology” settings and raise awareness of our perspectives. These might include synergies with other psychology disciplines, with related social science disciplines, with non-traditional community stakeholders, or partnerships to tackle new issues. After 50 years, it is clear that we cannot wait for others to create settings for us. We need to be social entrepreneurs. We also need to expect that some of our settings will cease to “host” community psychology. Perhaps we need strategies for ongoing creation of new community psychology settings. Finding the right balance of efforts to sustain settings and to reach out will be challenging. How can we maintain a core for the field while seeking to build new pathways and partnerships?

During the next few months, SCRA will be conducting strategic planning for the development of the organization and promotion of the field. Victoria Chien Scott, our Administrative Director, will be leading these discussions. I encourage our members to think about where SCRA can take strategic risks and to identify instances of complacency that we need to address. Perhaps there are areas where we might be “strategically complacent” and preserve what we have developed. More often we can be innovative and take risks for new development. Recent examples of risk taking
include creating online resources to support members and raise awareness of the field. We are re-working our communication strategy and thinking about how we can use our publications for greater social networking. We are adding a part-time communications and outreach staff person to help with these efforts. These are relatively small risks. Where do we have other opportunities?

SCRA is changing. We need your risk-taking input to help us foster a vibrant, responsive community psychology that can be renewed and sustained.

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

Greetings!

It is with great pleasure that we welcome a new column to TCP. Geoffrey Nelson will be serving as the column editor and shepherding the newly formed Transformative Change in Community Mental Health Interest Group. Their first column appears below. We are looking forward to this important addition to SCRA.

We would also like to take this opportunity to thank Tom Wolff, Eric Mankowski, and Doug Perkins for sending us copies of missing back issues of TCP to add to our online archives. We now have all issues from 1975 to the present archived on the SCRA website.

Sylvie and Gregor

New Interest Group!

Transformative Change in Community Mental Health Interest Group
Edited by Geoffrey Nelson
Wilfrid Laurier University
(gnelson@wlu.ca)

I am delighted to introduce TCP readers to the newly formed Transformative Change in Community Mental Health Interest Group. The origins of this group date back to the 2008 International Conference on Community Psychology, where current SCRA President Bret Kloos, José Ornelas, and Geoff Nelson
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began discussions about their mutual interests in promoting community mental health in the field of Community Psychology. While Community Psychology has international roots in community mental health (Reich, Riemer, Prilleltensky, & Montero (2007), and dates back to the 1965 Swampscott conference in the U.S. (Bennett et al., 1966), we believed that the historical focus on community mental health needed to be reinvigorated in Community Psychology. To this end, we started to make presentations at the SCRA biennial conferences, the European Community Psychology Association annual conferences, and the more recent biennial International Community Psychology conferences.

The central themes of our presentations were three-fold. First, people with lived experience of mental health issues are an extremely marginalized group. Second, community psychology can contribute to the emancipation of this marginalized group. Third, there is a need for transformation in community mental health. Such a shift is not just a movement away from the dominant medical model, but also from professional treatment services in the community, to an approach that changes the discourse about “mental illness,” provides opportunities for democratic participation of consumer/survivors in mental health systems and the broader society, and reallocates fundamental resources to this group that enable them to have fuller and richer community lives. Furthermore, such transformational work needs to occur across levels of analysis from individual support to organizational and policy change. In 2010, Bret Kloos organized regular teleconferences to discuss the vision of such a network, which now involved Community Psychology faculty and students from the U.S., Canada, and Portugal.

Vision of the Interest Group

After considerable discussion, the group came up with a declaration that included its vision, which is to strive to establish an alternative paradigm that focuses the promotion of mental health based in community settings based upon the values of citizenship, recovery, empowerment, inclusion, and social justice. This includes the articulation of models, the identification of promising practices, and research to demonstrate the value of this alternative paradigm and its exemplars. Through our status as a SCRA interest group, we strive to support the development of this paradigm and transformative change in mental health systems and communities that includes partnerships with community leaders, consumers/survivors/users, mental health professionals, and social and biomedical scientists from around the world. We aim to find ways to be a resource to groups, individuals, and communities that are interested in pursuing alternative paradigms for the promotion of mental health in community settings.

Core Ideas and Exemplary Practice

Thus far, interest groups members have identified and articulated ideas about transformation in community mental health based on their community research and action experiences. A major focus in transformative community mental health is the notion of citizenship. John Sylvestre (in progress) has shown how different concepts of citizenship (i.e., legal, normative, lived experience) have implications for practice, policy, and research in community mental health. For example, the legal concept of citizenship draws attention to the individual and social rights of mental health consumer/survivors, the need to examine and confront discrimination, and the importance of policies that protect and enhance people’s rights. Another closely related idea is that of community integration. Kloos et al. (2014) have articulated four domains of community integration that transformative approaches should strive to promote: (a) access to community life, (b) responses to social exclusion, (c) systematic efforts to address marginalization, and (d) challenging prejudice and discrimination. These concepts of citizenship and community integration are a central piece of the capabilities framework for community psychology that has been advanced by 2014 SCRA Sarason Award winner, Beth Shinn (2015).

A transformative approach that has captured the imagination of interest group members, that is firmly rooted in these concepts of citizenship and community integration, and that was noted by Shinn (2015) as an exemplar of the capabilities approach is Housing First. SCRA 2014 Practice Award winner Sam Tsimeris (2010) founded Housing First in the early 1990s in New York City with the Pathways to Housing program. Tsimeris brought together several key components in his formulation: (a) housing as a citizenship right, (b) a focus on people with mental health issues who are chronically or episodically homeless, (c) consumer preferences and choice over housing and supports, (d) supported housing (normal housing in the community), (e) an emphasis on strengths, recovery, and community integration, (f) a philosophy of harm reduction in working with people with addictions, (g) the involvement of people with lived experience in all aspects of the program, and (h) the incorporation of evidence-based support approaches. Tsimeris also emphasized the need for research on Housing First and with other colleagues, including Ana Stefancic and Beth Shinn, conducted quasi-experimental and experimental trials of the Pathways program. There
is now robust evidence attesting to the effectiveness of Housing First (Aubry, Nelson, & Tsemberis, in progress). Moreover, knowledge transfer activities have been undertaken to scale up and expand Housing First across the U.S., Canada, Europe, and Australia.

**Interest Group Activities**

The co-founders of the interest group, Nelson, Kloos, and Ornelas (2014), edited a book (the first in SCRA’s new book series), Community Psychology and Community Mental Health: Towards Transformative Change, with contributions from community psychologists, community mental health professionals, and mental health consumer/survivors, who described innovations in research, policy, and practice in community mental health. As well, Greg Townley and John Sylvestre (2014) teamed up to edit a special issue of the Global Journal of Community Psychology Practice on transformative change in community mental health to provide more exemplars of innovation in community mental health that are of interest to community psychologists.

**Invitation**

We are a new group and welcome anyone who is interested to join us. We hold teleconferences four times a year, as well as in-person meetings at the SCRA biennial and international Community Psychology conferences. Please feel free to help us chart the future of this group as we strive to envision a new paradigm for community mental health based on the principles of Community Psychology. Community psychology students and international SCRA members who are interested in community mental health are particularly encouraged to get involved. We want to foster an international and inter-cultural movement for social transformation.

For more information, contact Geoff Nelson, gnelson@wlu.ca.
A Power “To”, “From”, “Over”, and “Within”: Are Sense of Community and Empowerment Really Paradoxical?

Written by Cari Stevenson,
National Louis University
(cstevenson@kcc.edu)

Evelyn was 28 years old raising three young children when she enrolled in classes at the local community college. Like many female community college students she found balancing school work with the responsibilities at home difficult and the lack of support from her family added to her burden. Family members discouraged her from college because she was a mother. To her family, pursuing education when she should be home with her children was to her family, considered selfish. Although her situation was not unique, Evelyn felt quite alone. At one point, she nearly gave up. However, a year into her program, her college experience was transformed when she gained support from three female classmates and found inspiration in a female professor. As she witnessed other women succeeding, she felt less encumbered by gender roles and gained confidence in her own ability. As Evelyn recounts, “Being surrounded by other women helped me feel I could be successful as a woman.” Evelyn flourished in her second year excelling in all her courses, holding leadership positions in four extracurricular clubs, tutoring other students, and even presenting research at a faculty training seminar as well as a professional conference.

Both sense of community and empowerment are phenomena that have dominated research within Community Psychology. Rappaport (1987) describes empowerment as a feeling that one is in control of her own life; and McMillian and Chavis (1986) describe Sarason’s (1974) sense of community as a feeling that one belongs to a group and is valued by its members. Riger (1993) suggests in several ways that these two constructs are oftentimes, at least, in tension, or if using Rappaport’s term, paradoxical in nature. However, what Evelyn’s story illustrates, empowerment and sense of community may be interdependent. This, of course, depends on more clear definitions of what we mean by either empowerment or sense of community.

Despite the many important efforts to measure these constructs, both are complex with the meaning dependent upon the context and the individuals, population and settings studied. In Evelyn’s case, a sense of community was developed through connections with other women through which she felt valued by other members she identified with and thus finding value in herself. Once she found strength among these connections, she began to appreciate her own potential which, in turn, empowered her to persist in her academic pursuits and, eventually, to lead and inspire other women. At the very least, empowerment and sense of community may sometimes, as Evelyn’s example shows, be interdependent, with both necessary to bring about real change.

Although the U.S Department of Education (2012) indicates women outnumber men in college graduation rates, some studies suggests women lag behind men in completion rates at community colleges (Bailey, Calcagno, Jenkins, Leimbach, & Kienzl, 2006; Carbonaro, Ellison, & Covay, 2011). Work/family responsibilities and time constraints, particularly for single-mothers, present exceptional challenges. Both Rappaport and Riger believe empowerment must be a multi-level concept. The concept of disempowerment is often thought to involve an imbalance of political control or intentional subversive social influence; however, ordinary, converging, and cumulative external forces can diminish one’s sense of personal control. Although women are certainly not underrepresented in terms of numbers within higher education, the conditions - the societal, family and school-based obstacles or inconsistencies they face - may become disempowering.

Riger (1993) differentiates between various types of power: power from (suggesting the power to thwart oppressive forces), power over (suggesting the power over resources), and power to (suggesting the power to act more freely). Riger further explains that many interventions enhance one’s sense of empowerment by focusing on power to but fail to address power over or power from. This model may also fall short of addressing a fourth power: power within. In the case of connectedness within learning communities, communion with other women can build a sense of efficacy (power within) insulating a woman (any person) from some debilitating effects of external forces (power from) and enhance her command of course material and knowledge (power over); this in turn, empowers the woman to gain a sense of control over her own life and provide support to others (power to). More specifically, Evelyn, through a communion with other women, found confidence in herself and the determination to succeed (power within). Ultimately it was this power, that emanating from within, that allowed her to resist the debilitating stresses from her family’s discouragement (power from), master her coursework (power over), and provide support to other students by tutoring and influencing...
others through leadership roles in student organizations (power to).

Within an individualistic culture, independence and control are valued above connectedness and interdependence. Riger asserts that community psychology’s emphasis on empowerment maintains this culture and underscores the concept of control over connectedness. However, it could be argued that, for many, particularly those who have been disempowered, connectedness is necessary for any sense of control. Further, instrumental (“doing”) behavior or agency—often associated with male relationships—, and communal (“feeling”) behavior—often associated with female relationships—, may function in tandem, rather than the dichotomy often assumed. When women feel connected, they become empowered to do. Within a communion with others, they can gain a greater control over their own lives.

The concepts of empowerment and sense of community both consider the individual’s perspective, but require an appreciation of settings to fully understand the constructs deeper and more complex meanings. Developing interventions may seem more straightforward in settings of political or organizational injustice, but seem quite evasive when the adverse factors are less tangible. Despite significant progress in the women’s movement, socialized gender roles remain entrenched in our culture. Women have gained considerable presence in the workforce, yet they too often remain as primary caregivers, raising the pressure for them to thrive in multiple realms. The coercive force present in such situations are not that of a perceptible oppressor, but rather more invisible and structural constraints derived from social roles and expectations. The injustice resides in the surrounding environment, peaking out in the form of micro-aggressions and unfortunately portions of the oppressive expectations become internalized in the women themselves. This exceptional pressure can lead many women to doubt their self-efficacy, feel isolated, lose their sense of control—in effect, become disempowered. Together, when they gather with each other as a unified force, women can find strength and inspiration in one another, recognize their own power within, and thus become empowered to achieve mastery over the course of their own lives. As in Evelyn’s case, the external stressors do not necessarily change, but the solidarity within the community provides a rejuvenating power to persist by first generating the power within. Evelyn did not need a hand out, or even a hand up, she just needed a hand.

References

Community Ideas
Gina Cardazone,
JBS International (ginamaria@gmail.com)

Compassionate Communities
What would happen if people came together in communities all over the world with the explicit goal of making their communities more compassionate? What if these compassionate communities were joined in networks that enabled communities to learn from each other? What if community psychologists helped people channel this compassion into coordinated action to address a community’s most pressing needs?

This is already happening. Charter for Compassion has transformed the vision of one woman into a network of active members throughout the world, dedicated to creating Compassionate Communities. In 2008, faced with a world fraught with religious tension, writer and former nun Karen Armstrong received the TED prize and made a wish that people come together to draft a Charter for Compassion. This Charter would restore what she described as the core of all major world religious traditions. Quoting Confucius, Buddha, Rabbi Hillel, and St. Augustine, Armstrong made a strong case for the proposal that compassion is the core of religiosity.

As it turned out, the Charter for Compassion would grow into
something much bigger than even Armstrong envisioned. Inspired by Armstrong, an organization called Charter for Compassion formed and began forging a network of Compassionate Communities throughout the globe. That network now includes towns, villages, and - beginning recently with Botswana - even entire countries.

Marilyn Turkovich and Barbara Kerr of the Charter for Compassion took the time to speak with me about their work. They stated that the designation of Compassionate Community is not a seal of approval. It simply means that there is a group of dedicated people working to bring compassion into their community.

As stated in the Charter itself, compassion cannot merely be felt, it must motivate us to work tirelessly to help others. Those who have signed the Charter and wish to take further action are encouraged to create a plan, rooted in collaboration and respect for diversity, to identify and address community needs. In the last year, in partnership with community psychologists, the organization has strengthened their capacity to support collective action through the formation of the Charter Tool Box.

The Charter Tool Box (CTB) is the product of an intensive and ongoing process among Charter members to develop a resource that can be used by communities to help them create Action Plans that can foster real change. As its name indicates, it draws from the Community Tool Box, which has over 7,000 pages of resources. It is one example of a way that CTB content is being tailored to different community and organizational contexts.

The development of the CTB is also an example of how the Charter for Compassion builds on existing efforts and resources to strengthen the ability of people to improve their communities. As Marilyn and Barbara said, “We don’t want to reinvent the wheel, we want to strengthen it.” At every opportunity, the Charter for Compassion stresses inclusivity and connection to existing efforts. They’re aware that every community context is different, and they spent 6 months (and made countless Google Docs) in a collaborative effort to begin building the CTB into something that is flexible enough to be adapted to radically different community contexts, but also useful enough to engender real community change.

Barbara writes, “The idea is for this to be truly a grassroots effort...Our job is to offer a suggested structure, procedures and the contents of the CTB. We also encourage the local group to bring in partners to their initiative. These partners become local and international partners.” Now, the Compassionate Communities Initiative shares the CTB with any community that signs the charter and wants to take action, as well as groups that have already developed action plans. New and established groups are using the Tool Box and also providing feedback as to how it can be further improved.

In addition to providing a structure for taking compassionate action, the Charter for Compassion provides numerous ways for Compassionate Communities to connect with and learn from each other. Three times a month, they host Maestro calls. This platform allows them to feature guest speakers who share their ideas with up to a thousand people, and has a feature that enables participants to gather into breakout groups to get into more in depth discussions. They also use newsletters, social media, and other means to connect people and communities with each other throughout the world.

For those interested in joining this global effort, Marilyn and Barbara suggest checking to see if there is already a Charter for Compassion group in your community. If so, join it! If not, there are many ways to start one, and many ways to define community. Practitioners can use their contact with community partners to begin their efforts, while community psychologists in academic settings can consider building Compassionate Universities.

For more information, see the website http://charterforcompassion.org/
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Barbara writes, “The idea is for this to be truly a grassroots effort...Our job is to offer a suggested structure, procedures and the contents of the CTB. We also encourage the local group to bring in partners to their initiative. These partners become local and international partners.” Now, the Compassionate Communities Initiative shares the CTB with any community that signs the charter and wants to take action, as well as groups that have already developed action plans. New and established groups are using the Tool Box and also providing feedback as to how it can be further improved.

In addition to providing a structure for taking compassionate action, the Charter for Compassion provides numerous ways for Compassionate Communities to connect with and learn from each other. Three times a month, they host Maestro calls. This platform allows them to feature guest speakers who share their ideas with up to a thousand people, and has a feature that enables participants to gather into breakout groups to get into more in depth discussions. They also use newsletters, social media, and other means to connect people and communities with each other throughout the world.

For those interested in joining this global effort, Marilyn and Barbara suggest checking to see if there is already a Charter for Compassion group in your community. If so, join it! If not, there are many ways to start one, and many ways to define community. Practitioners can use their contact with community partners to begin their efforts, while community psychologists in academic settings can consider building Compassionate Universities.

For more information, see the website http://charterforcompassion.org/
practices of community psychology and evaluation come together to share ideas, knowledge, and experiences for the good of partners and each discipline. There is also a much longer answer that involves competencies, values, and relationships, but I’ll get to the more complicated answer in a paragraph or two.

The AEA CP TIG was formed in 2011 and joined over 50 other topical interest groups that include such areas as independent consulting; youth focused-evaluation; quantitative and qualitative methods; feminist issues; and collaborative, participatory, and empowerment evaluation to name just a few. As articulated by Sheldon and Wolfe (2014) in a special section on community psychology in the American Journal of Evaluation, the four main reasons for establishing the CP TIG were: 1) to introduce community psychology to “an audience known more for its methodological than values focus” (p. 86), 2) many evaluators currently incorporate community psychology values into their work but may be unaware of the connection, 3) conversely, many evaluations could benefit from the use of community psychology values, and 4) to provide a “home” for the many practitioners within AEA who also identify as community psychologists.

CP TIG programming began in 2012 and since then has included coordination of a well-populated and diverse community psychology track at the annual AEA Conference, semi-annual community psychology weeks on the popular AEA 365 Tip-A-Day blog, maintenance of a webpage (http://comm.eval.org/CommunityPsychology/Home/), and other activities to promote the connection between community psychology and evaluation. A highlight of the work done by the CP TIG is the “Walk the Talk” session held at each AEA Annual Conference since 2013. This session embodies the spirit of community psychology in that it allows conference attendees an opportunity to engage with the community in which the conference is held through a visit to a local social action organization. During the Walk the Talk sessions, participants discuss evaluation approaches and challenges with organization staff in order to both learn from and contribute to those who are making a difference in their communities. At the conference in Washington D.C. in 2013, the Walk the Talk session visited the One DC organization, which focuses on neighborhood equity through education, community organizing and alternative economic development projects (“One DC” n.d.). The Walk the Talk session in Denver in 2014 featured the Women’s Bean Project, the mission of which is “to change women’s lives by providing stepping stones to self-sufficiency through social enterprise” (“Women’s Bean Project” 2015).

The CP TIG embraces practitioners from any discipline who are invested in using evaluation to contribute to social justice, community engagement, and/or participatory approaches to improve communities, and, by extension, the lives of the people within them. Additionally, the CP TIG is a place for practitioners of any level of experience - from students who are just learning about community psychology and evaluation to seasoned professionals, many of whom are the preeminent leaders in their fields. The CP TIG includes members who identify as independent consultants as well as those who practice within universities, governmental organizations, or nonprofits, among many other entities. This broad base and openness to all interested persons helps the CP TIG maintain a strong connection to the principles that are shared between community psychology and evaluation.

As I noted in the first paragraph, there is a much more involved answer as to what community psychology and evaluation have in common beyond sharing some of the same dedicated and highly skilled people. First, when one compares the list of competencies and principles for community psychology practice with that for evaluation, there are a number of striking similarities. The foundational competencies/principles of community psychology practice, as articulated by Dalton and Wolfe (2012) are:

1. Ecological perspective
2. Empowerment
3. Sociocultural and cross-cultural competence
4. Community inclusion and partnership
5. Ethical, reflective practice

Additionally, there are 13 other competencies with the 18th being program evaluation, which is articulated as, “The ability to partner with community/setting leaders and members to promote program improvement and program accountability to stakeholders and funders.” (p. 13).

The AEA Guiding Principles for Evaluators (AEA, 2004) encompass values that are inherent in community psychology, especially given the focus on community research and action. The AEA guiding principles are:

1. Systemic inquiry
2. Competence
3. Integrity/honesty
4. Respect for people
5. Responsibilities for general and public welfare

As noted by Sheldon and Wolfe (2014), the principles for evaluators tend to focus more on methodology than do those for community psychology practice, but it is not hard to see that both reflect a strong orientation toward ethical implementation of practices that contribute to the good of those we serve as community psychologists.
and/or evaluators. It is these shared values that bind community psychology and evaluation.

Secondly, the connection between community psychology and evaluation is becoming more relevant as new methodologies emerge or existing methodologies become more popular that focus on documenting processes and outcomes in highly complex community initiatives and settings. Community psychologist practitioners are rarely blessed with straightforward projects in which step A leads to step B and so on… which ultimately leads to outcome Z. Approaches such as developmental evaluation, empowerment and participatory approaches, appreciative inquiry, social network analysis, and systems evaluation address many of the types of issues and settings in which community psychologists often work. Many of those who use these methods identify as community psychologists and contribute greatly to the growth of both fields with their ideas and experiences.

As noted in SCRA’s “What is Community Psychology” handout, “Community Psychologists go beyond an individual focus and integrate social, cultural, economic, political, environmental, and international influences to promote positive change, health, and empowerment at individual and systemic levels.” This eloquent description fits many evaluators as well. While many community psychologists may not realize they are evaluators, and likewise many evaluators may not recognize themselves as community psychologists, the intersection between the two fields is rich in knowledge, creativity, and passion for supporting individual, community, and societal health and well-being. As evaluators who identify as community psychologists or community psychologists who do evaluation, we inhabit the “sweet spot” of a Venn diagram that represents the bridge between research and practice (see Figure 1). The CP TIG exists to expand the recognition of our shared space as well as promote the value inherent in this type of community. Join us in our efforts to ensure the intersection of community psychology and evaluation isn’t merely a space we share momentarily, but one in which we use our best affinities for the good of both fields and, ultimately, our communities. And really, what’s more reflective of community psychology than that?

To find out more about AEA and the Community Psychology Topical Interest Group, go to www.eval.org.
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The International Section for this Summer 2015 issue of TCP includes a brief spotlight on one of our members (and former chair of the committee), Toshi Sasao. For our major article, Back, Williams, and Berardi advocate for the importance of providing access to study abroad programs for underrepresented students, and outline one such program hosted by the authors’ university.

Please send submissions to the International Section to Kahaema Byer at k.byer@umiami.edu

Community Psychology International Scholar Spotlight

Name: Toshi Sasao, Ph.D.
Region/Country: Tokyo, Japan/Opole, Poland
University Names: International Christian University (Japan); University of Opole (Poland)
Dept.: Education (Psychology) & Peace Studies
Type of Work: University Professor and Community-based Researcher/Evaluator
Research Interest: Social capital, well-being, and life resources for disenfranchised and immigrant/migrant communities in multicultural and cross-cultural contexts
Current Issues (Japan): Many social and community problems and issues have become more salient in Japan, calling for alternative approaches (e.g. community and ecological psychology) for adolescents, young adults, and the elderly, perhaps given political and economic instability, social and educational disparities, social injustice, changes with the family relations, work-life imbalance, etc.

Study Abroad for Underrepresented Groups: DePaul’s England Summer Research and Service Experience

Written by Shannon Williams (swilli54@depaul.edu), Lindsey Back (lback@depaul.edu), Luciano Berardi (lberardi@depaul.edu)

Although studying abroad has always been valuable, in recent years it has become an almost essential component of a 21st century college experience. Study abroad programs teach college students cognitive complexity and international engagement (National Survey of Student Engagement, 2007), and also facilitate academic growth (Dwyer & Peters; Hadis, 2005). These experiences act as sociopolitical development for students, allowing them the analytical skills and social awareness to engage thoughtfully and critically with the world, particularly with regard to understanding and resisting extant systems of oppression (Watts, Williams, & Jagers, 2003). These skills are relevant for all college students, and perhaps particularly valuable for those students interested in pursuing graduate education. Despite the widely known benefits of study abroad, participants have remained disproportionately White in comparison to overall demographics of college students. This disparity likely stems from the fact that students from underrepresented groups differ from White students in their social/cultural and financial capital (Salisbury, Paulsen, & Pascarella, 2011). Therefore students from underrepresented groups experience aspects of college differently from the majority group, including the decision to study abroad. These factors must be taken into account in order to effectively address disparities in study abroad participation, particularly for those considering graduate education.

The Center for Access and Attainment at DePaul University, Chicago, Illinois, saw an opportunity to improve this educational disparity by providing fully funded short-term study and research abroad experiences for undergraduate students participating in the Arnold Mitchem Fellowship (sophomore students) and the McNair Scholars Program (junior and senior students). Program students are members of an underrepresented racial/ethnic group, and/or first-generation and low-income students, and plan to pursue doctoral education. While in the Mitchem and McNair programs, students can participate in Summer Research and Service Experiences (SRSE), extracurricular programs designed to meet research and academic goals, including preparation for graduate study. Specifically, this paper will describe the SRSE program as an approach to addressing access to study abroad experiences for underrepresented groups, as well as the ways in which the program facilitates students’ sociopolitical development, a crucial skill for underrepresented students preparing for graduate school.

Since 2010, 43 students have
studied abroad and conducted research through SRSE programs in Argentina, Croatia, Jamaica, and England. Of these students, 28% were male and 72% were female; 93% identified as racial/ethnic minorities or underrepresented groups; and 67% were first-generation, low-income students. The England SRSE was developed with an overarching theme of exploring access to graduate education for underrepresented students in the United Kingdom. This project grew out of a partnership with the University of East London, an institution committed to supporting marginalized groups in their pursuit of higher education degrees, specifically those from low-income backgrounds. Students are trained to conduct a research project on barriers to doctoral education for underrepresented students as part of a short-term study abroad experience designed to expose U.S. college students to the British education system.

Before, during and after the trip, students received research training. DePaul University Center for Access and Attainment and University of East London faculty and staff worked together to develop a mixed methods project to explore experiences of higher education for underrepresented U.K. students, including discrimination, privilege, empowerment, and access to support services, that may have influenced the pursuit or attainment of a graduate degree for low-income students. DePaul students acted as research assistants in the study; they were provided with an opportunity to gain a variety of research skills and interact with students in UK universities. Research methods workshops, data collection and analysis were incorporated into the 2-week experience in the UK.

A primary strength of this educational model is that is collaborative: students were involved in the research process from a very early stage, facilitating their investment in and ownership over the project. Although the project topic was developed prior to students’ application to the program, students were encouraged to contribute their ideas and experiences in order to make the study relevant to their interests and goals. For three months prior to the trip, students participated in weekly introductory seminars on the research process, including conducting a literature review, identifying a gap in the current research, creating an individual research question, and collecting relevant data. Study protocol was adapted based on students’ input. In addition, students reviewed reports on issues of social class in the British higher education context.

At the end of the academic year, students embarked on their journey to England. They participated in sessions introducing them to the English education system, and enjoyed sightseeing. They also received training on research ethics and qualitative data collection. Students from the University of East London and Kingston University completed surveys and participated in 3 focus groups conducted by DePaul students, providing descriptions of the barriers and facilitators to pursuing a graduate degree that they have encountered in higher education. Workshops the following day emphasized using qualitative and quantitative software to analyze data. The program concluded with a ceremony for students and staff. Upon returning to DePaul, students delved into data analysis to answer their individual research questions, guided by weekly workshops. At the conclusion of the summer, students submitted research papers and posters on their topics, and many continue to work on their respective projects.

In 2014, four sophomore students and two junior students participated in the program. Of these students, one was male and five were female; 83% were minority (four Latina, one Black); and 50% were first-generation and low-income. During and following the experience, students completed reflective essays to allow program staff to evaluate the project. Staff and research assistants coded these reflection papers using thematic analysis.

We found students’ experiences important for their sociopolitical development. Following the program, students reported that academic activities and cultural events were complementary, and indicated that they had gained academic and social skills. They thrived in the study abroad research environment. One student reported, “As a scholar my research experience and knowledge have grown and I feel more comfortable with the process as a whole.” Students’ perceived sense of possibility also evolved following the program. One student wrote, “I believe that this program is a gateway to accomplish goals that some may think are impossible.” Another student expressed that the program impacted her understanding of her career: “I am still fascinated by the idea of being able to help people and make a difference through both practice and research, which can help to develop and improve medical practice and medicine.” Another student reported on the knowledge she gained about the education system, “The SRSE England program has helped me understand the similarities in educational progress and where there are challenges. It has helped me understand that education and academia are basically the same in both countries.” One student summed up the overall SRSE program’s impact on her: “[With] an emphasis on professional, social, and academic development, an SRSE program is a wonderful opportunity to dabble into the world.
of academics, gain appreciation, and most importantly become impassioned with the possibilities of higher education.” Students were able to experience a new culture in the context of a familiar topic—access to education. We argue that the SRSE program both addresses issues of access to study abroad for students from underrepresented groups, and facilitates their sociopolitical development in preparation for graduate school.
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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.

To bring attention to the reorganized, online posting of prior issues of The Community Psychologist, found at http://www.scrat27.org/publications/tcp/tcp-past-issues, this installment updates the life of an interviewee featured in a 1994 column. Start with a read of the original column (http://www.scrat27.org/files/8014/1791/6466/TCP_273_Summer_1994.PDF) page 6, and then proceed below to follow the rollout of his life in the intervening years. Past columns of “Living Community Psychology” contain a wealth of information and life advice gleaned from over 50 profiled community psychologists, from graduate students to retirees, representing an invaluable resource for all community psychologists.

Eliot Levine, PhD
Senior Research Manager
Donahue Institute,
University of Massachusetts
Hadley, MA
eleveine@donahue.umassp.edu

When I interviewed Eliot Levine in 1994 for this column as a second year PhD student in clinical/community psychology, he stated his intent to be a high school teacher after obtaining his degree. I was skeptical that a person with a PhD would actually take a job for which a BA degree would suffice. My skepticism continued as he worked for two years at the Harvard Family Research Project (a participant in the prestigious MacArthur Foundation sponsored network on educational reform) and completed a postdoctoral fellowship at Harvard. However, as you will see, Eliot kept true to his original plan (and fooled me!).

Eliot had not heard of community psychology when he applied for clinical psychology programs, although he had, since his sophomore year of high school, filled several volunteer and work roles that exposed him to “the prevention mindframe.” Once introduced to community psychology, the field’s principles resonated with him. Particularly influential was a paper by George Albee entitled “The Futility of Psychotherapy,” given to him by Dr. Albee when Eliot visited the University of Vermont. But it was not until his third year of his clinical/community psychology program (at the University of Maryland, College Park) that he had a “strong suspicion” that he would not pursue a clinical psychology career after completing his training.

Eliot’s clinical internship (1996-97) was performed at Cambridge Hospital (an affiliate of Harvard Medical School), working with low-income populations. While obtaining the necessary clinical supervision, he also worked on his dissertation, which focused on local Latino parents’ involvement in their children’s education. (Encouraged by his Maryland professor, Forrest Tyler, Eliot volunteered for a summer with the Childhope Foundation in Guatemala, working with impoverished street children and their families in a garbage dump community.) His facility in the Spanish language, honed in Guatemala, allowed him to conduct
his dissertation interviews in Spanish, with assistance from a bilingual research assistant. After completing his internship and while working on his dissertation, he remained in Boston (his home town), working as a Research Associate at the Harvard Family Research Project, participating in two initiatives – one related to national family/school partnership programs, funded by the DeWitt Wallace-Reader’s Digest Fund and the other a large MacArthur Foundation-funded longitudinal study of 400 low-income children. Eliot completed his PhD in 1998, about 5 ½ years after starting graduate school.

Eliot’s next professional step was completing a postdoctoral fellowship in evaluation of social programs for children with Carol Weiss at Harvard’s Graduate School of Education. There he conducted a process and outcome evaluation of an innovative urban public high school in nearby Providence, RI. Based on this experience, he published a book on education reform, entitled One Kid at a Time: Big Lessons from a Small School (Teachers College Press, 2002), printed three times in English and translated into Hebrew and Korean. It was named a “Best Book for High School Reform” by the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation.

Eliot then spent two years working for the education reform non-profit, Big Picture Learning, that launched the school he had written his book about and was scaling up its reform model nationwide. He did this part-time, while also staying at home with his toddler son and foster daughter.

Eliot’s earlier search for high school teaching jobs in 1990 had been stymied by his lack of formal certification as a teacher. (This was before the advent of opportunities for non-credentialed teaching aspirants via Teach for America, etc.) New York City had been the only system that was interested in hiring this MIT-trained electrical engineer to teach math. However, teacher union rules in New York City blocked this path. Ten years later, he took a teaching position with the innovative public high school in Providence that he had earlier studied.

The Met School’s highly experimental “curriculum” involved no classes or grading, but a dedicated staff that was determined to “figure it out” and scale up to a national model. Included was a two-day a week internship component, with teachers tailoring internships in the community to each student’s interests. Intended to be much more intense than student service learning programs, with more substantive work experiences and direct mentoring, the students were taught skills in informational interviewing and job shadowing, both preparatory steps in identifying a suitable internship opportunity. He taught at the Met from 2002 to 2006, as the primary teacher for the same student cohort, moving with them from grades 9 through 12, as well as promoting the education reform model throughout the network.

Eliot and his family relocated to western Massachusetts, where, for another 3 years, he taught math, physics and psychology, at a charter high school. That school, another alternative public high school, was affiliated with the Expeditionary Learning national school reform model.

Although he had studied schools intensely for several years, Eliot’s perspective on the education setting changed substantially after he became a teacher himself. “When I was an outside researcher, I did not fully appreciate the challenges that teachers face, even though I had spent more than a year immersed in the Met School one or two days per week. My book would have been very different had I written it after my teaching experience.” He had not understood how difficult it is to be a teacher with the extremely disruptive and academically disengaged students that attended his school, and the challenge of having to be “on” for 6–7 hours every day in a school that had no scheduled planning time for teachers. (Nonetheless, he reports that overall it was a highly gratifying experience, and he still maintains contact with many of his students.) And although he acknowledged that professional jobs typically involve more work than can ever be accomplished (well), requiring constant prioritizing of tasks, he contends that teaching, especially in challenging environments, takes triaging to an extreme. In other words, (fully) understanding context is critical.

In 2009, Eliot left high school teaching after seven years, moving to a research manager position at the University of Massachusetts Donahue Institute. (He subsequently was promoted to Senior Research Manager.) There he designs, manages, and implements applied research and program evaluations for education and human service projects. The Institute is organizationally located in the UMass President’s Office, cutting across the university’s five campuses. As such, the Institute does not follow the model of an academic department, and the salaries are paid by soft money, mainly via grants and contracts.

With a staff of about 110, “we are actively involved in development all the time, responsible for bringing in our own money.” A big part of the Institute’s business is partnering with applicants for Federal and State grants, contracting to design and implement the grants’ required evaluation components. Funding opportunities pursued include those from foundations and state agencies, mostly in Massachusetts and the other New England states, including departments of higher education, public health, secondary and elementary education, and early childhood education. Additional
We are happy to announce the call for awards. All award applicants and nominees must be SCRA members unless otherwise noted. For all awards please send materials by email to awards@scra.org.

**Best Dissertation on a Topic Relevant to Community Psychology:**
The purpose of the Society for Community Research and Action annual dissertation award is to identify the best doctoral dissertation on a topic relevant to the field of community psychology completed between **September 1, 2013 and August 31, 2015** — any dissertation completed within these dates may be submitted. The completion date for the dissertation refers to the date of acceptance of the dissertation by the granting university’s designate officer (e.g., the graduate officer), not the graduation date. Last year’s nominees (excluding the winner) may resubmit dissertations if the dates are still within the specified timeframe.

**Criteria for the award:** Relevance of the study to community psychology, with particular emphasis on important and emerging trends in the field; scholarly excellence; innovation and implications for theory, research and action; and methodological appropriateness.

**Emory L. Cowen Dissertation Award for the Promotion of Wellness:**
This award will honor the best dissertation of the year in the area of promotion of wellness. Wellness is defined consistent with the conceptualization developed by Emory Cowen, to include the promotion of positive well-being and the prevention of dysfunction. Dissertations are considered eligible that deal with a range of topics relevant to the promotion of wellness, including: a) promoting positive attachments between infant and parent, b) development of age appropriate cognitive and interpersonal competencies, c) developing settings such as families and schools that favor wellness outcomes, d) having the empowering sense of being in control of one’s fate, and e) coping effectively with stress. The dissertation must be completed between **September 1, 2013 and August 31, 2015** — any dissertation completed within these dates may be submitted.

**Criteria for the award:** Dissertations of high scholarly excellence that contribute to knowledge about theoretical issues or interventions are eligible for this award.

**For Both Dissertation Awards:** The winners of both dissertation awards will each receive a prize of $100, a one year complimentary membership in SCRA, and up to $300 in reimbursement for travel expenses in order to receive the award at the APA convention in 2016.

**Materials required:** All nominees must be SCRA members at the time of application. Individuals may nominate themselves or be nominated by a member of SCRA. A cover letter and a detailed dissertation abstract should be submitted electronically to the SCRA Administrative Director, Victoria Scott (awards@scra.org). The nomination cover letter should
include the name, graduate school affiliation, and dissertation advisor, current address, phone number, and email address of the nominee. The abstract should present a statement of the problem, methods, findings, conclusions, and include discussion of the project’s innovativeness and relevance to community psychology. Abstracts should range from 5-8 pages and may not exceed 10 double spaced pages, including tables and figures. Identifying information should be omitted from the abstract.

**Evaluation process:** All abstracts will be reviewed by the dissertation award committee. Finalists will be selected and may be asked to submit their full dissertation electronically (finalists whose dissertations exceed 150 pages may be asked to send selected chapters).

---

### SCRA Early Career Award

The purpose of the SCRA Early Career Award is to recognize community psychologists who are making a significant contribution to the field of community psychology and to APA Division 27, Society for Community Research and Action.

**Criteria for the award shall include:**

1. The candidate must be 8 years or less from receiving their terminal degree.
2. Made an important contribution to community psychology. Examples include a research paper, community organizing, or policy change at the local, state or national level.
3. Be an active paid member of the Society for Community Research and Action.
4. Have 2 letters of support.
5. Develop a Significant Contribution statement that includes the following broad headings:
   - Describe your contribution to the field of community psychology and SCRA
   - Describe how your work relates to community psychology
   - Describe how you plan to continue your work within the field of community psychology

Award recipient will receive a fee waiver for registration for the Biennial Conference. The award will be given every year and award recipients will be recognized at the Biennial. Candidates may nominate themselves.

---

### Award for Distinguished Contributions to Theory and Research in Community Psychology

The Award for Distinguished Contribution to Theory and Research in Community Psychology is presented annually to an individual whose career of high quality and innovative research and scholarship has resulted in a significant contribution to the body of knowledge in Community Psychology. This award was initiated in 1974.

**Criteria for the awards shall include:**

1. Demonstrated positive impact on the quality of community theory and research;
2. Innovation in community theory and/or research. That is, scholarship of a path-breaking quality that introduces important new ideas and new findings. Such distinguished work often challenges prevailing conceptual frameworks, research approaches, and/or empirical results; and
3. A major single contribution or series of significant contributions with an enduring influence
on community theory, research and/or action over time.

**Initial nominations should include:**
1. The name and contact information of the nominee; and
2. A 250-500 word summary of the rationale for nomination.

Finalists for the award will be contacted by the committee and asked to provide more information. All nominees need to be members of SCRA.

If a nominee is selected for final consideration and voting, the following must be provided. Materials that exceed the limitations will not be distributed to the Committee:
1. A vita or summary of accomplishments that is no longer than 6 single-spaced pages
2. A letter of recommendation that is no longer than 4 typed double-spaced pages.
3. One work sample may be submitted in PDF format so that it can be shared with all committee members. This work sample may be submitted in the language of the nominee’s choice.
4. Those nominees whose work is primarily in a non-English language or context may submit a second letter of recommendation that can clarify the work sample or further inform the committee about the nature of the nominee’s contribution.

A plaque will be presented to the award recipient at the 2016 APA conference. During this time, the recipient will also provide an address. In addition, the award recipient will have the option to publish his/her address in the AJCP.

---

**Award for Distinguished Contribution to Practice in Community Psychology**

The Award for Distinguished Contributions to Practice in Community Psychology is presented annually to an individual whose career of high quality and innovative applications of psychological principles has demonstrated positive impact on, or significant illumination of the ecology of, communities or community settings, and has significantly benefited the practice of community psychology. The person receiving this award will have demonstrated innovation and leadership in one or more of the following roles: community service provider or manager/ administrator of service programs; trainer or manager of training programs for service providers; developer and/or implementer of public policy; developer and/or implementer of interventions in the media (including cyberspace) to promote community psychology goals and priorities; developer, implemeter, and/or evaluator of ongoing preventive/service programs in community settings; or other innovative roles.

**Criteria for the award include the following:**

The first two criteria apply in all cases; one or more of the remaining criteria must be present:
1. Nominators must be SCRA members.
2. Nominees should be engaged at least 75% time, for a minimum of 10 years, in settings such as government, business or industry, community or human service programs, in the practice of high quality and innovative applications of psychological principles that have significantly benefited the practice of community psychology; past winners cannot be nominated;
3. Demonstrated positive impact on the natural ecology of community life resulting from the application of psychological principles;
4. Challenged the status quo or prevailing conceptual models and applied methods; and
5. Demonstrated personal success in exercising leadership based on applied practice.

Nominations should include:
1. The name and contact information of the nominee.
2. A statement, which can be from the nominee, that clearly specify his or her eligibility for this award by describing how he or she is “engaged at least 75% of the time, for a minimum of 10 years, in settings such as government, business or industry, community or human service programs, in the practice of high quality and innovative applications of psychological principles that have significantly benefited the practice of community psychology.” This statement can consist of a brief list of the years, the settings, and the activities, but it should be sufficiently detailed so that there is no doubt about the eligibility.
3. A vita or summary of accomplishments that is no longer than 6 single-spaced pages.
4. A letter of recommendation that is no longer than 4 typed double-spaced pages.
5. One work sample may be submitted in PDF format so that it can be shared with all committee members. This work sample may be submitted in the language of the nominee’s choice.
6. Those nominees whose work is primarily in a non-English language or context may submit a second letter of recommendation that can clarify the work sample or further inform the committee about the nature of the nominee’s contribution.

Note: Committee members are free to seek out additional information about nominees, and a second letter may be helpful if a candidate’s body of work may not be accessible to many committee members because of language differences or the nature of the work not being represented in typical publication or internet outlets. Submitting a second letter is at the discretion or the nominator/nominee.

A plaque will be presented to the award recipient at the 2016 APA conference. During this time, the recipient will also provide an address. In addition, the award recipient will have the option to publish his/her address in the AJCP.

The Ethnic Minority Mentorship Award
The purpose of SCRA’s annual Ethnic Minority Mentorship Award is to recognize an SCRA member who has made exemplary contributions to the mentorship of ethnic minority persons. Mentorship may be provided in various forms. It may entail serving as the academic advisor of ethnic minority graduate or undergraduate students; developing strategies to increase the acceptance and retention of ethnic minority students; involvement in efforts to recruit and retain ethnic minority faculty members; or providing opportunities for ethnic minority persons to become involved in positions of leadership within community-oriented research or intervention projects.

Specific criteria for the award include two or more of the following:
1. Consistent, high quality mentorship and contributions to the professional development of one or more ethnic minority students and/or recent graduates involved in community
In addition to evaluation studies, he also conducts research such as his current project for the Nellie Mae Education Foundation, “Competency Education through Online Courses for Credit Recovery and Acceleration,” that is a component of Massachusetts’ high school graduation initiative. In this study, using a quasi-experimental design, his team is quantitatively assessing impacts on academic outcomes and is using qualitative interviewing, observation, and student focus groups to investigate program implementation and policy issues. “We proposed additional research questions to extend the range of the Federally-funded evaluation study.”

In discussing tools available for his work, Eliot observed that, in the evaluation field, the qualitative analysis software has become very sophisticated, and the stakes have been raised substantially around funders’ expectations for quantitative analyses. For example, the US Department of Education’s Institute of Education Sciences has developed a very rigorous set of expectations for studies featured in their What Works Clearinghouse. “Much of the research that still goes on in the world of education is the more feasible, smaller scale studies that often won’t meet those rigorous quantitative criteria. But the smaller studies are very informative for the different organizations or state agencies that are trying to understand what’s happening in the programs, how to improve them, and whether to continue them or not. So although there has been an escalation in expectations to some extent, especially with the larger federal grants, a lot of the work out there is still using similar methods that many social scientists have been using all along.”

A major reason for selecting Eliot to re-interview was to explore the reasons that community psychologists, like him, have left the orbit of SCRA. In considering this question before our interview, Eliot had looked at the “What We Do” and “Where We Work” sections of SCRA’s website, and he noted that much of his work has aligned with the content areas and organizational settings of community psychologists. However, he dropped his membership to SCRA long ago. He attributes this in part to working in the fields of education and evaluation for so long, where professional organizations such as the American Evaluation Association and the American Educational Research Association are more closely aligned with the work he does. However, he also noted that involvement in academically-focused professional organizations such as SCRA may be less aligned with the contingencies of non-academic researchers.
One example is that the nature of his work may make attendance and presentation at professional conferences less practical than for an academic community psychologist. Much of his group’s work is presented directly to the funding organization, but is not necessarily intended for public consumption. Also, in order to present his work at a conference, the expenses typically have to be budgeted for when the grant or contract is awarded.

Aware that SCRA’s 2015 biennial conference is to be held only two hours from his home, Eliot noted that the timing of these conferences, in late June, is geared more to the academic calendar than to those, like himself, for whom Fiscal Year timing is critical. Major deliverables for most of the projects for which he has managerial responsibility are due June 30 (the end of the fiscal year in most states), making attendance at the SCRA biennial conference impossible.

Eliot noted another interesting difference between his work and that of many academic researchers, which is that his work products typically do not carry his name. “We typically prefer to represent our organization, not ourselves as individuals.” Almost the only occasion for identifying himself or his qualifications is when his CV is included in the Institute’s grant applications or contract proposals. With rare exceptions, he and his colleagues do not publish in journals, more commonly producing evaluation reports and technical reports for clients, or evaluation and policy briefs targeted to practitioner audiences. He also typically reads evaluation and policy reports more than peer-reviewed journal articles. “We are familiar with the relevant literature, but few of our projects have extensive literature reviews as a priority. Our work emphasizes the priorities of our funders, which tend to be the evaluation of a specific program.”

“One advantage of my job is that the hours are manageable, typically a 40-hour week, although that varies with proposal and deliverable deadlines.” This is important to Eliot, because he is very devoted to his family, including his son, Jesse, and his former foster daughter. His wife Madge has worked for 20 years as an English, reading, and ESL teacher; for the past 5 years, she has taught at an agricultural and vocational high school. Jesse, “a great kid,” is a tenth grader at a local high school, currently taking driving lessons. Using his experience in crafting internships for high school students, Eliot worked the system by getting permission for Jesse to earn independent study credits in computer programming, his passion. Their former foster daughter, now age 14, is no longer in the family’s custody. However, she has lived with them for the past five summers, and they see her often and work closely with her school. “We are trying to help her find a path from her difficult life, working with people and systems to help her beat the odds.”

Eliot’s family lives in Haydenville, MA, a sparsely populated and socioeconomicrural/suburban community. (I learned in our interview that Jesse has Madge’s last name. Eliot didn’t want his own last name to be the default, and neither parent wanted to hyphenate, so they put their last names in a hat and picked one out.) Haydenville is well located for his family’s preferences, within a half-hour radius of multiple colleges and universities and 25 miles from Springfield, a medium-sized city. One aspect of his community involvement is through a local abortion rights fund. “When I noticed that the group hadn’t participated in a major community-wide fund-raising event for hundreds of local nonprofits, I offered to do the work needed for them to participate in future years. Now I serve on the Board. At age 48, I am the youngest Board member, whose median age is probably about 70.” Eliot has instituted the use of social media and a new system for online donations to the organization. Among his other activities are biking, yoga, and year-round backpacking solo and with his family.

Reflecting back on his career, Eliot acknowledges that an Ed.D. degree may have been a better fit with his current career path. Yet, although neither his electrical engineering degree nor his clinical or community psychology training were requisites for his subsequent work, he nonetheless sees great value in the education he received and its contributions to his personal and professional life. In particular, he credits his community psychology-derived appreciation of immersion in settings, and his clinical training for his observational and interpersonal skills. He also appreciates the training in systematic and critical thinking that were central to his graduate education.

All have been invaluable to the work he has done in program evaluation and education reform. When asked what other organizations might have opportunities for community psychologists interested in evaluating education reform initiatives, Eliot mentioned the American Institutes for Research, the Education Development Center, SRI International, and WestEd.

Public Policy
Edited by Melissa Strompolis,
Children’s Trust of South Carolina
(mstrompolis@gmail.com)

Greetings SCRA! The Policy Column of the TCP is an important outlet to disseminate policy- and advocacy-related activities and accomplishments. Below you will find a snapshot of the recent endeavors of the Policy Committee:

- The Policy Committee and SCRA recently reviewed and supported a call-to-
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action regarding the one year anniversary of the abduction of the Nigerian schoolgirls. For more information, please read the call-to-action in the Rapid Response Actions section on the Policy webpage (http://www.scranet.org/what-we-do/policy/).

- A rapid response proposal regarding the endorsement of the juvenile justice reauthorization act is being reviewed by the Policy Committee. The authors of the proposal are asking SCRA to endorse the statement that includes support for the reauthorization and to emphasize the need for sufficient appropriations and prevention services, increased engagement of parents and communities, and reducing risk and promoting protective factors.
- The Policy Committee has been informed that the Mass Incarceration Taskforce will soon submit a policy statement regarding equity and social justice issues ranging from police arrests to criminal sentencing. The Policy Committee is also reviewing a statement from the Immigration Interest Group (see paragraph below).
- A special policy issue from the Global Journal of Community Psychology Practice is slated to be released at the end of 2015. The editors of the special issue received many policy and advocacy abstracts and invited 14 papers for full submission.
- A link to the Connect to a Practitioner guide was added to the Additional Resources section of the Policy webpage. The guide can be used to identify individuals with policy and advocacy experience!
- Be on the lookout for the next call for Policy Committee Student Practicum Positions.

Since inception of the program two years ago, FIVE doctoral students have applied and accepted practicum positions on the Policy Committee. Some have even received course credit from their educational institutions!

In this Policy Column, Patricia Esparza highlights the psychological and social effects of detention on children and families. Patricia is a doctoral student at the University of Maryland – Baltimore County and has been working with the Policy Committee for the last year as a practicum student. Patricia was able to use the Policy Committee Practicum as a credit requirement for her program and worked with Fabricio Balcazar and others on a policy statement regarding the incarceration of undocumented migrant families. The piece below, written by Patricia, is one component of the entire statement (the statement is currently being reviewed by the Policy Committee). Interestingly, the piece also includes research that was conducted in Lowell, Massachusetts, the site of this year’s SCRA Biennial Conference.

**Psychosocial Effects of Detention on Families: A Brief Overview**
*Written by Patricia Esparza,*
*Doctoral Student,*
*University of Maryland,*
*Baltimore County Practicum Student,*
*SCRA Public Policy Committee (patricia.esparza88@gmail.com)*

Family detention is the practice of detaining families (mothers and their children) at detention centers by the United States government. Families enter detention after being arrested by local law enforcement or Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE). The families are held in these detention centers while they await deportation hearings. Several advocacy groups have called on the U.S. to stop this practice due to the noted human rights violations that have occurred at these facilities (Detention Watch Network, 2014; Lutheran Immigration and Refugee Service, 2014). While research on the family detention experience is limited, especially in the U.S., the information available suggests that family detention impacts families and communities in several ways. Social scientists have documented multiple effects of parental detention, or even the threat of it, on children and parents across the U.S.

The process and duration of detention can be stressful for every member of a family.

Children of parents who have been detained tend to experience feelings of depression, anxiety, and even post-traumatic stress symptoms (Brabeck, Lykes & Hunter, 2014; Chaudry Capps, Pedroza, Castaño, Santos, & Scott, 2010). Researchers have found similar findings in the mental health of detained asylum seekers (Physicians for Human Rights & Bellevue/NYU Program for Survivors of Torture, 2003). These findings parallel research in other countries. Interviews with 14 adults and 20 children at a remote immigration detention center in Australia revealed that each person met criteria for at least one psychiatric disorder at the time of the interview (Steel, Momartin, Bateman, Hafshejani, Silove, Everson, Roy, Dudley, Newman, Blick & Mares, 2004). Furthermore, prolonged detention has been shown to have a long-term effect on the psychological health of refugees that persists after the detention (Steel et al., 2004). Again at an Australian detention center, among the 16 adults and 20 children interviewed, all of the children had at least one parent with a psychiatric disorder (Mares &
Jureidini, 2004). Of the 10 children (ages 6-17 years old) that were able to undergo a psychological assessment, 100% met criteria for both post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) and major depression, 80% exhibited self-harming behaviors, and 70% exhibited symptoms of an anxiety disorder. The children also reported trouble sleeping, poor concentration, little motivation to study, a sense of hopelessness, overwhelming boredom, thoughts of death and dying, and recurrent para-suicidal ideation (Mares & Jureidini, 2004).

In addition to such direct impacts to family members, researchers have examined how the presence of ICE and/or the threat of detention or deportation can be enough to cause significant negative psychological outcomes. For instance, greater vulnerability to the threat of deportation and detention has been associated with negative impacts on the mental health of parents and children (Brabeck & Xu, 2010). In terms of parental impact, greater levels of vulnerability was related to negative emotional well-being, decreased financial stability, and poor parent-child relations. Similarly, children with vulnerable parents were more likely to experience decreased emotional well-being and poor academic performance (Brabeck & Xu, 2010). Furthermore, immigration policies and enforcement of those policies tend to aggravate the mental health problems of undocumented youth and children of undocumented parents (Delva, Horner, Martinez, Sanders, Lopez, & Doering-White, 2013).

The mere presence of ICE in Lowell, MA and nationally, was shown to have spread fear throughout the migrant community (Sládková, Garcia-Mangado, & Reyes-Quinteros, 2012). This fear was described to have shaped the behavior of the people in that community as evidenced by increases in crime overall, fewer filed reports of crimes, direct and indirect health issues and created instability within businesses, schools, and available human services. Furthermore, local community organizations were also impacted in that they lost some program participants, had limited resources to address deportation issues, experienced greater financial burdens, and had to add to the workload of staff (Sládková, et al., 2012). Thus, the mere threat or possibility of detention or deportation can have deleterious effects on the well-being of parents and children and the communities in which they live (Dreby, 2012).

In addition to the limited research on the impact of family detention, children’s voices are notably absent from this literature. Brabeck, Lykes and Hunter (2014) have extensively documented the effects of detention and deportation on children that are separated from their parents and call for more research that offers children an opportunity to tell their stories in their own voices. Undoubtedly, the experiences of children held in these various detention centers throughout the U.S. would help to increase our understandings of current policies and practices on children’s well-being. It would also be valuable to understand how advocacy group efforts have been successful in working toward their goal of closing family detention facilities.
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Regional Update
Summer 2015
Edited by Regina Langhout,
Regional Network Coordinator,
University of California at Santa Cruz
(langhout@ucsc.edu)

The regions are getting ready for the SCRA biennial and fall events! See below for more information about how to connect. Also, I want to thank Mary Ivers, who has been filling in as the International Liaison for Judy Lovett (UK and Republic of Ireland), who has been on maternity leave. Finally, congratulations to Judy Lovett!

Canada
International Regional Coordinator:
Robb Travers;
rtravers@wlu.ca:
Wilfrid Laurier University

News from Canada
Written by John Sylvestre,
Centre for Research on Educational and Community Services
University of Ottawa

To join the SCRA Policy Committee please contact the chair at publicpolicy@scra27.org or visit the Policy webpage of the SCRA website http://www.scra27.org/what-we-do/policy/ to learn more.


Changes at the Canadian Journal of Community Mental Health
On March 31, I stepped down after 5 years as a Senior Editor of the Canadian Journal of Community Mental Health (CJCMH). The CJCMH was founded in 1982 by community psychologists Edward Bennett (Wilfrid Laurier University), Maurice Payette (Université de Sherbrooke), and Barry Trute (University of Manitoba). The CJCMH has remained Canada’s only academic journal publishing in the area of community mental health and has provided an important outlet for community psychologists, as well as researchers from other disciplines. The CJCMH has provided a bilingual forum for Canadian scholars and practitioners with interests in the promotion of positive mental health, the prevention and treatment of mental health problems in community settings, and the sharing of knowledge about the mental well-being of Canadians and their communities. Throughout its history, the journal has remained independent, unaffiliated with any particular national organization, university, or publisher.

Soon after stepping into my role the journal was faced with the loss of core funding as the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada decided to pull funding from journals with health-related content. Rather than retrenching, our leadership team took this as an opportunity to renew and reinvigorate the journal. Building on a solid foundation left by our predecessors, we launched a partnership with Canada’s leading non-profit science publisher, Canadian Science Publishing, to provide the journal a more stable, dynamic and visible home (www.cjcmh.com). We developed a mixed business model for the journal that includes subscriptions along with open access publishing of individual articles and sponsored issues. We began to publish four times a year, rather than two, to reduce our publication lag and to provide our readers more regular content updates. We have also aggressively pursued sponsored issues that have brought more attention and readers to the journal. Just recently we published an issue on the At Home / Chez Soi.
project in Moncton, New Brunswick, and are producing two issues sponsored by the Mental Health Commission of Canada to examine its mental health strategy for Canada. We have revisited our editorial team’s structure, adding an Editor-in-Chief position to focus on the management, administration and strategic growth of the journal. Finally, we have created a new Senior Editor position to manage a new section we will be launching on “Practice Innovations.”

With these changes I am confident that we are leaving our new editorial team in a strong position to navigate a number of remaining challenges. Some of these challenges are being confronted by all journals, such as the quest to include more open access content while still being able to balance the books. The CJCMH itself will have to find ways to continue to be relevant to its readers and to build stronger relationships with the practice community. Despite these challenges, the journal has found sure footing and has great promise for continuing to be a significant part of the academic publishing community in Canada.

http://www.cjcmh.com

---

Australia/New Zealand and the Pacific
International Regional Liaison
Dr. Katie Thomas:
katiet@ichr.uwa.edu.au
University of Western Australia
Student Regional Liaison
RahmanGray,
rahman.gray@live.vu.edu.au; Victoria University

---

News from Australia
Written by Katie Thomas

Global Connections and Opportunities

Antipodean members are reminded that SCRA offers 41 grants for members who are presenting at the conference in the categories of: Graduate Students, Early Career, International, and General Members. SCRA Australia will be hosting a mini-conference for members across the Australian, New Zealand and Pacific region on Friday June the 26th to be in concert with the larger SCRA Biennial in Massachusetts. For regional members unable to go to Massachusetts this June, this teleconference will facilitate real-time consideration of the conference theme “Celebrating 50 Years of Community Psychology: Bridging Past and Future.” If you have any questions about the travel grants, please email SCRAtravel@SCRA27.org.

This Auz/NZ/Pacific teleconference will be an opportunity for members to come together and discuss the state of Community Psychology in our region of the Southern Hemisphere and where we need to direct our energies. This will be a great opportunity to brainstorm together and talk about our experiences, needs and directions, and to communicate those to the wider SCRA community. This may result in some internship/exchange ideas that can be made actionable for future student opportunities. Included for consideration will be the possibilities for exchange/internship that could help the student cohort. The Teleseminar format will enable the inclusion of as many SCRA representatives as possible. It will be an opportunity for established academics and practitioners to voice their visions, their resources, and their capacity to mentor and support other Community Psychologists in the region. We will conduct an analysis of the strengths, weaknesses, challenges and opportunities of our current formations and where we would like to focus our energies for the profession. If you are would like to join the teleconference please contact Katie Thomas at mothercarematters@gmail.com. This will be a great opportunity to review where we are currently and to choose the direction and momentum we want for our discipline in the future. All members are cordially invited to attend.

---

Europe/Middle East/Africa
International Regional Liaison
Hana Shahin,
hshahin@aucegypt.edu,
The American University in Cairo, Egypt

---

News from Lebanon
Written by Ramy Barhouche

I am a project coordinator on the Rainbow of Hope (RoH) project, for Search for Common Ground (SFCG) - Lebanon. The Project began operating 6 months ago, in 25 locations across the country. 25 teachers and 50 animators were chosen and trained by the SFCG team to teach and use recreational activities to advocate for conflict resolution, equality, and diversity. Each location has 24 students attending the English sessions, and in addition, 28 of their siblings or friends joined them in the weekend recreational sessions. The English
curriculum was designed to comprise 25 stories through a 25-week period. The recreational activities included games, among other activities, led by animators. So far the project has been very successful, earning the positive feedback of teachers, animators and students alike.

Southeast Region, U.S.
Regional Coordinators
Sarah L. Desmarais, sdesmarais@ncsu.edu; North Carolina State University
Courte Voorhees, c.voorhees@miami.edu; University of Miami
Student Regional Coordinators
Natalie Kivell, n.kivell@umiami.edu; University of Miami
Candalyn Rade, cbrade@ncsu.edu; North Carolina State University
Jaimelee Mihalski, jmihalsk@uncc.edu; University of North Carolina-Charlotte
Dominique Thomas, dthomas60@student.gsu.edu; Georgia State University

News from the Southeast
Written by Jaimelee Mihalski

Southeastern ECO 2015 Announcement
Community psychology then and now: From the “Swamp” to the city. Charlotte, NC October 23-25, 2015
This year marks the 50th anniversary of community psychology in the U.S. The field grew out of disenchantment with psychology’s historically close focus on the individual to the exclusion of the social and environmental realities in which individuals are embedded. In the U.S., community psychology has shifted our collective attention to context and promoted collaborative, research-driven problem solving at the grassroots level. In keeping with this vision, ECO conferences have created de-professionalized spaces, often in rustic settings, for students and faculty to share their research informally. Although the field of U.S.-based community psychology has evolved since its birth at Swampscott, its emphasis on contextual factors remains as salient as ever, as human ecological settings – from rural, urban, suburban, to exurban, to online spaces – become ever diverse. This year, we maintain the de-professionalized nature of past ECO conferences and celebrate community psychology’s original vision by highlighting the diversity of human ecology and taking conference goers from the rustic roots of the ECO conference to an urban landscape: Charlotte, NC.
Call for proposals coming soon. Please follow our Facebook page for regular updates: https://www.facebook.com/se.eco.2014?ref=ts

Northeast Region, U.S.
Regional Coordinators
Suzanne Phillips, sphillips@ccsnh.edu;
White Mountains Community College
Bronwyn Hunter, bronwyn.hunter@yale.edu;
Yale University, The Consultation Center
Christopher Beasley, cbeasley2@washcoll.edu;
Washington College

(Not much) News from the Northeast
Written by Suzanne Phillips

We continue to look for 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 last Biennial, Suzanne 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 contact Suzanne Phillips at sphillips@ccsnh.edu.

Midwest Region, U.S.
Regional Coordinators
Olya Glantsman, oglantsman@gmail.com; DePaul University
August Hoffman, august.hoffman@metrostate.edu; Metropolitan State University
Luciano Berardi, lberardi@depaul.edu; DePaul University
Student Regional Coordinators
Jaclyn Houston, jhoust12@depaul.edu; DePaul University
Abigail Brown, abrown57@depaul.edu; DePaul University

News from the Midwest
Written by Olya Glantsman (DePaul University)

MPA Report Back
The Midwest region held its annual conference during the SCRA-affiliated meeting at the Midwest Psychological Association on May 1, 2015. The SCRA-affiliated meeting included 75 total presentations: 20 roundtables, 12 symposia, and 43 posters presented by undergraduate and graduate students from across the region. The quality of the posters presented by students was remarkable. Awards for student poster presentations went to: William Lopez, Melanie Harner, Laura Sanders, Charo Ledon, Adreanne Waller, Mikel Llanes, Daniel Kruger, Kathryn White, Bene Rigdon, Susan R. Torres-
Harding; and Fatima Sozzer, and Kathryn E. Grant. Congratulations!

Some of the represented affiliations at the event were: University of Michigan, Roosevelt University, DePaul University, National Louis University, Metropolitan State University, University of Illinois Chicago, College of Dupage, Kankakee Community College, Prairie State College, Illinois State University, University of Southern Indiana, Universidad Popular, Lake Forest College, Adler School of Professional Psychology, Loyola University at Chicago, and Northwestern University.

After the SCRA-affiliated meeting concluded, a social event at a nearby restaurant, Exchequer, allowed members to have an informal opportunity to meet with students, practitioners, and faculty from across the region. This was a time to eat, drink, and relax with fellow members.

ECO 2015

This year’s Midwestern Eco will be hosted by UW Madison. Hope to see you there.

Community Development

May 18-28, 2015, six Metropolitan State students and Psychology Professor August Hoffman travelled to Guatemala to participate in a community development project with The Fruit Tree Planting Foundation. Over 600 fruit trees were planted in rural villages to help provide healthy and nutritious foods to community residents.

June 16-18, 2015, students and community members will be travelling to Red Lake, MN to plant 50-100 apple trees with the Red Lake Tribal Nation. We are especially grateful to SCRA for donating $300.00 to help purchase trees that will make this project successful.

Regional Coordinator Search

We are searching for another Midwest Regional Coordinator to begin September, 2015. Serving as a Regional Coordinator is a wonderful way to become more involved in SCRA and to connect with colleagues. For more information, or to send nominations (including self-nominations), please contact Olya Glantsman at oglantsman@gmail.com or August Hoffman at august.hoffman@metrostate.edu.

SCRA Biennial 2015

Don’t forget to send us your pictures from the SCRA Biennial Conference (June 25-28) for a chance to be featured in the regional column of the next TCP.

Announcements and information for inclusion in future Midwest updates should be sent to Olya Glantsman (oglantsman@gmail.com).

Self Help & Mutual Support

Edited by Greg Townley and Alicia Lucksted

An Evaluation of the Living Room: Members’ Experiences of Hopefulness

Written by Robin Robberson
(Robin.Robberson@cccconcern.org), Living Room Coordinator Central City Concern, Portland, OR

Acknowledgements:
Kari Nilsen,
Erica Meadows,
and Joan Ayala

Overview and Purpose

Central City Concern (CCC) is a 501(c)(3) nonprofit agency serving single adults and families in the Portland metro area who are impacted by homelessness, poverty and addictions. Founded in 1979, the agency operates a comprehensive continuum of affordable housing options integrated with direct social services including healthcare, behavioral healthcare, recovery, employment, and peer support. The agency serves approximately 13,000 people annually. In 2008, Multnomah County asked Central City Concern to assume operations of a downtown outpatient mental health program, and the Living Room was created in 2009. The Living Room currently reaches upwards of 400 people annually.

The philosophy of the Living Room centers on the idea that we are all equally important, although each member may have a different role.

We use the term “member” to describe a person utilizing the Living Room programming, avoiding the word “client” to promote a more equal power dynamic. We do not know the diagnosis of those we work with as peers. Further, discussion of medications is discouraged in the larger forum, and case management by clinical staff is not allowed within the space. The goal is to have a peer-guided, member-run center where rules are created by consensus in the community, and where transparency is critical. Everyone has a voice and is encouraged to work to better their community.

As a program, the Living Room seeks to inspire hope and recovery through peer relationships, groups, and activities that support members in their development of a spiritual identity. Numerous studies have led to the endorsement of hope as an essential factor in recovery from mental illness (Bonney & Stickley, 2008; Mashiach-Eizenberg, Hasson-Ohayon, Yanos, Lysaker, & Roe, 2013; Waynor, Gao, Dolce, Haytas, & Reilly, 2012). Increased hope is related to a variety of positive outcomes in people with mental illness, including reduced symptoms, improved psychosocial functioning, and better treatment outcomes (Schrank, Stanghellini, & Slade, 2008).
Objectives

This preliminary evaluation aims to provide a snapshot to assist in determining our next steps toward program expansion. It will also provide a benchmark of comparison for further evaluation.

Methods

Participants

A total of 27 participants were recruited during the operational hours of the Living Room. All members were approached except those who were visibly experiencing psychotic symptoms.

Materials and Procedures

We used the Integrative Hope Scale (IHS), first developed by Schrank and colleagues (2010) and then adjusted for use with participants experiencing psychosis (Schrank et. al., 2012). The IHS comprehensively measures the multifaceted concept of hope: trust and confidence, perspective-taking, positive future orientation, and social relations and personal value. We also wanted to capture the language and lived experiences of our members through a semi-structured interview. This qualitative evaluation consisted of 10 questions, the majority adapted from The Recovery Interview (Heil & Johnson, 1998); and the remainder created to reflect the four components of hope identified by Schrank and colleagues (2008): affective, cognitive, behavioral and environmental. Research assistants who had previously volunteered with the Living Room administered the informed consent, IHS, and qualitative interview with participants. The interviews were audio recorded and destroyed after transcription.

Results

Demographics

Twenty-seven members completed the IHS and six members completed the interview. Demographic information was obtained to gather a snapshot of the members of the Living Room. The majority of the participants were male (81.5%), between the ages of 45-54 (40.7%), White (44.4%), and reported living in a house/apartment (81.5%).

Quantitative: Integrative Hope Scale (IHS) Results

The mean total hope score was M=91.52 (SD=15.53; N=27) which was 69.33% (SD=11.77) of the total possible hopeful score. Scores ranged from 57 to 118 (50% of the participants scoring above and below this range). Our population’s mean hope score of 69.33% (M=91.52, SD=15.53, N=27) was slightly higher than found in the general population of Austria (67.96% ; M=93.78, SD=12.83, N=489) (Schrank et. al., 2011) and in participants diagnosed with schizophrenia or schizoaffective disorder (68.64% ; M=94.72, SD=4.8, N=200) (Schrank et. al., 2012)

Qualitative Interview Results

A thematic analysis was conducted on the 7 open-ended responses contained in the semi-structured interviews with the goal of understanding participants’ experiences in the Living Room and how this relates to their overall experience of recovery. The following thematic categories were identified:

Definitions of Recovery

Participants were asked to define what recovery meant to them. Their definitions covered a diverse array of ideas, including an end to destructive actions (e.g., using drugs), a change in thinking and relating to the world (learning how to deal with trauma, unlearning negative thinking patterns), and an end to pain.

Social Support

Participants spoke often about the value of social support for their recovery, as well as the ability of the Living Room to provide them with that social support. One stated, “It helps me here because it’s a safe place for me to go…I’ve got buddies here.” Another said, “Well, sometimes I feel alone, so it’s given me a place to go with a peer group [which] is really cool.” More specifically, participants identified value in the Living Room’s peer-support model. One participant said, “I know a few people… and it’s nice to talk to them. Having a relationship with them… kinda brightens up their lives and my life.”

Positive Feelings

Participants discussed having positive feelings when at the Living Room. “I feel better,” said one. “When I leave the Living Room, I feel better than I was”. Another said, “I feel good. I feel like I can go home. I am adjusted better, and I feel like I’ve brightened up my day.”

One participant also described the mechanism of these positive feelings: “Because it gets me out of isolation, just staying home and contemplating my navel or twiddling my thumbs. I am more, I’m better. I function better, you know?”

Proactive Behaviors

Some participants mentioned how the Living Room has supported them in taking on more responsibilities and feeling empowered: “Well, like, they [the Living Room staff] put me on the committee to pick out the art for the clinic. It makes me feel really good. They like my feedback.” Additionally, participants mentioned appreciating the activities offered in the Living Room: “I like the yoga and meditation. Cause meditation is much more powerful when it is in groups.”

Motivation

Participants spoke to the ways the Living Room helps them feel motivated. Several participants mentioned that simply showing up to the space gives them a sense of accomplishment. For example, one participant said, “Cause normally what gives me enough energy to get up and get dressed to do things in the morning, if I go through all of that work, it’s usually because I’m driven by something inside that I feel needs
attention. And I come here for specific reasons sometimes.”

**Decision-making**

Participants spoke about the ways that their experiences in the Living Room have helped them to make positive decisions in their lives. In the words of one participant, “It’s changed the way I think about past experiences, more so than it helps me make good choices around situations that come up in my life right now.” Another participant, when asked how the Living Room has helped in their recovery process, responded, “I can find out better ways of doing, organizing my time…and more wise decisions”.

**Positive Environment**

A number of participants described positive aspects of the environment at the Living Room, many focusing on how it is a safe space. One participant stated, “It helps me here because it’s a safe place for me to go.” Another stated, “I come back for the sanctity, for the safety”. Other participants used words like “refuge” and “safe place” to describe the environment. Factors that they mentioned included the lack of drug use and violence in the space and the cleanliness of the space. Others discussed how they felt respected and “welcome” in the space. When asked if the Living Room has hindered their recovery in any way, a participant responded, “It hasn’t. Because there’s no pressure, nobody bothered me or nobody told me to shut up when I’m talking. It has not hindered me.”

**Negative Factors**

Though the majority of comments about the Living Room were positive, a few participants mentioned negative experiences with the program. One participant stated that they did not like it, “when people argue” in the space. Another described a staff member who tells them ‘no’ a lot. These two negative examples indicate violations of the intended use of the space: the first, a lack of safety in the space and the second, a staff/client hierarchy that the Living Room works to eradicate.

**Discussion**

**Quantitative**

This evaluation was a point in time collection of data to provide a snapshot of the levels and experiences of hopefulness for the members of the Living Room. It is promising that the amount of hopefulness represented by the IHS percentage score for members of the Living Room is comparable to, and in fact greater, than those among members of the general population. Cultural differences may contribute to this difference in hopefulness. For example, one important difference in Living Room participants compared to participants in Shrank’s (2012) study was that substance abuse disorder was an exclusion criterion for participation in Shrank’s study but not in our study. No conclusive remarks can be made regarding this difference, but it would be interesting to see how another set of participants with co-morbidity of substance abuse disorder and another mental health disorder would score on the IHS scale, as well as how a population with only substance abuse disorder would score.

**Qualitative**

Participants’ responses reflected positively on the Living Room program. Participants spoke to the many ways that the program helps them in recovery. Additionally, these responses largely reflected the components of hope outlined by Schrank et al. (2008), including the importance of social support and personal motivation. Participants were able to articulate ways that their experiences in the Living Room reflect Schrank et al.’s model for fostering hope in recovery.

**Future Directions**

This evaluation brought to light areas for us to work on. Although members who participated in the evaluation had a great deal of positive feedback, it was noted that Living Room participants do not differentiate between types of employees. Everyone is considered to be a counselor, and they did not recognize, understand, or value the intention of having peer staff. Since this evaluation was completed, we have worked to clarify what it means to be a “peer”, as the word may not be the best descriptor for our population. Ultimately, staff members are required to wear a badge, and that may work against eliminating power differentials in the space; however, we will continue to work toward an egalitarian structure. In addition, a Peer Leader program has been developed to recognize and encourage members who excel and wish to be of service to their community.
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Introduction

Homelessness in the UK is sometimes directly linked to people sleeping rough. However, those people sleeping rough as the evidence suggests are only partial representation of the problem of those without secure accommodation (Wright and Tompkins, 2006). That is, there are also some people that are staying in emergency hostels, there are refuges and there are people that are not sleeping rough but do not have any permanent accommodation such as people temporarily with friends, squatting or as part of a travelers community. Homelessness is a common story of current UK’s society. In England alone, there are approximately 61,000 households were documented as newly homeless in 2010, with over 2,100 individuals sleeping on the streets during Autumn 2011 (Department for Communities & Local Government, 2012a,b). There are a wide variety of reasons people become homeless such relationship break down, domestic violence and substance misuse, people that are release from prison, people that are release from psychiatrical institutions, people in debt, children that are institutionalized as asylum seekers and refuges (Wright and Tompkins, 2006).

Emmaus Communities are predominantly self-funded through the sale of donated and recycled goods with Companions contributing through work as much as they are able with profits going to help others in greater need. Solidarity is at the heart of the Emmaus movement and is interpreted as meaning “helping those who suffer most” - a statement which you will see is written above the doors to our loading bay at the entrance to the Community. The belief is that once a Companion has a place in an Emmaus Community, they are provided with shelter, food, warmth, companionship, but, there are others who are in greater need elsewhere in the community. Companions are encouraged to actively get involved in solidarity work. This occurs on a local, national and international level. Some examples of the types of projects supported by the Emmaus Brighton & Hove Companions are: Local: Soup Run on the seafront, giving sleeping bags, warm clothing, footwear to local charities working with rough sleepers, maintenance projects at Brighton Voices in Exile and Off the Fence. Emmaus Brighton & Hove is committed to working as a Community, sharing a life where everyone is treated equally, and living together in harmony and with dignity by helping those less fortunate than ourselves.

Purpose of the study

To provide the Emmaus Brighton & Hove management committee and Board of trustees with a report (to follow up from last year’s report) conducted with the Companions (residents) to explore the social side of life in the Community. The aims were three-fold: To explore what are the advantages and disadvantages of living in a Community of 48 people, looking also if the Community has reached its maximum capacity looking mainly at the sense of community provided at Emmaus. To evaluate if the Community has reached its maximum capacity interrogating how that could affect the sense of community and open the scope for the possibility of expanding the model and to explore the sense of community at Emmaus Brighton.

Methods

Between January, 2015 and April, 2015, questionnaires and semi-structure interviews were carried out with residents (Companions) of the Community. Out of the 48 Companions, 19 of them answered the questionnaire which was followed by 5 in depth semi-structured interviews. It is important to note that the researcher and the organization developed in collaboration both the questionnaire and the interview questions. Participants were recruited through an open invite to all residents of Emmaus, explaining the purpose of the research and asking if they would like to take part. The participants varied in the length of time they had been living in the Community ranging from a few weeks to sixteen years.

Findings

From the range of the questionnaires it became clear that the participants had great sense of community. In addition, there is mutual feeling that the community is on just the right size which contrasts with last year’s research that indicated that the community was on the verge of becoming over-stretched. This section will be focusing on primary 5 questions of the 16 questions.
asked on the questionnaire. Firstly, that the questionnaire findings suggest that the Companions who answered the questionnaire (which were 19 companions) indicate that there has been an increase of those experiencing a sense of community at Emmaus Brighton. Moreover, it became clear that from the sample of Companions that had taken part in the questionnaire that there is great sense of community. Eighteen of the 19 participants answered that they strongly or somewhat agreed that they feel that there is a sense of a community at Emmaus Brighton. Only 1 of the participants said that s/he somewhat disagreed that there is a sense of a community at the organization. A person’s membership in a group is the most important source of power in modern society, contending that the homeless person without a stable social network is powerless and socially disaffiliated (William and Stickley, 2011). The evidence suggests, based on this current data, that there is a strong sense of community at Emmaus Brighton and it has increased. Secondly, that the 2014’s questionnaire findings suggested that the Companions believed that the Community has reached its maximum capacity with its 48 residents. The evidence indicates that still the case as 80% of the participants either strongly agree or somewhat agree that the Community is stretched given the number of Companions. The reasons of why the participants think that the Community is stretched will be explored on the interviews.

The questionnaire in 2014 revealed also that 80% of the participants agreed that the transition to semi-independent accommodation is something of importance for the Companions. This year’s questionnaire revealed that 100% of the participants agreed that the transition to semi-independently accommodation is something of importance for the Companions and that it is something that Emmaus should do more of and that fits well with the wider literature on the topic. It indicates that the Community is growing stronger as the sense of community and the possibility of independently living has increased. For example, one study presented in the Journal of Community Psychology by Patterson and Tweed (2009) identified key factors facilitating escape from homelessness. In Section 1, 58 homeless individuals rated possible facilitators of escape (factors they believed would help them become more independent and self-sufficient). In Section 2, 80 participants who had already escaped homelessness rated the same facilitators, factors that would have helped them become more independent and self-sufficient, and the importance of actual factors that facilitated escape (Patterson & Tweed, 2009). In addition, in 2014 when Companions were asked [see charts below] what aspect of Emmaus was the most important - sense of community (32%), friendship made at Emmaus (16%) and skills learnt (16%) also come out as the three most important factors for the participants. This year Companions answered that the most important is still the sense of community which remained at 32%, skills learnt (26%) and financial rewards (21%), come out as the three most important factors for the participants. There is a correlation suggested by the data that links with Patterson and Tweed (2009) study that formerly homeless people who reported perceived facilitators of escape, however, also reported that their escape was facilitated by realization of their own abilities and potential to offer something to the world. The findings have implications for the design of community interventions helping individuals who are homeless (Patterson & Tweed, 2009; Daly, et al 2012).

This sense of community is important for the Companions to overcome the difficult time that they had. Thus, this sense of community found at Emmaus is significant to help Companions to regain their sense of identity. For Example, Participant 2 said that the sense of community at Emmaus - “It is like being part of a big family here - there is always someone who you can talk to. You are never alone and we understand each other.” The sense of community found at Emmaus is still an important factor for the Companion’s well-being because many people who are homeless have very little social support. Up to half of the people staying in hostels have no recognisable social contacts with family or friends. Social networks are even more restricted for people with mental illness. These contacts are often restricted to people such as other hostel residents, and tend to diminish over time (Read, 2008). In addition, 18 out of the 19 interviewees either strongly agree or somewhat agree that there are enough leisure activities organised by the Community which can be also seen as a positive aspect in regards to community well-being. Three themes will be explored during the interviews that could help the Community overall follow up from last year’s report. Firstly, it seems that there is a consensus among the Companions that there is a sense of community, but what is a sense of community for the Companions and how can it be empowered more? Secondly, what opportunities should Emmaus offer to help Companions to develop their skills in the work place? Finally, how can new Companions been encouraged by staff and other members of Emmaus to join and experience the sense of community? The evidence presented in this report indicates that a range of key psychological experiences can be regarded as
positive for the Companions linked to mental well-being provided by the Community, and are sensitive to a steady progress. It is therefore crucial that Emmaus keep researching those themes annually, considering the psychological impacts of current and future policies. Emmaus is creating the conditions for wellbeing and resilience directly helping to prevent distress in the short and long term. Human well-being, Community emancipation and social justice are framed as a utopia by the dystopia of ‘long term economic plan’.

However, Emmaus is a community that significant social change is possible. The less and less power that the people have the more valid a system is faked to be. The death of community empowerment and human solidarity has been for the last 30 years also so a project designed, legitimized, normalized and imposed. Community is to be feared by any oppressive system because it is too powerful because community action can shape society and the world but than many political policies or many psychological therapies. The system is there to silence community but community is there to change the system and its oppression such as homelessness. Emmaus Brighton is to some extent a historical embodiment people’s power shaping their world.
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