I will never forget lying in bed—unable to fall asleep—the night that Senator Barack Obama was elected to the White House. Beyond the rush of having voted for a winner, beyond the gratification, indeed vindication, of knowing that grass-roots organizing was critical to the victory, beyond even the thrill of knowing that we were witness to a landmark historical event, one that portends a different future, it was Obama’s call to hope that kept me awake. Like many, perhaps most community psychologists, I generally think of myself as optimistic, positive and hopeful. But that night, to my tearful surprise, I discovered how much, little by little, over the years I had come to hold back, to guard against the pain of dashed hopes. What led me to tears that night was the overwhelming sense of new possibility for our nation and for our field—a sense which strained and eventually broke through the simultaneous impulse I felt to be measured, circumspect, realistic.

This abiding tension is familiar to those who labor for social change. Our hopes and dreams for a different tomorrow drive us forward. But what keeps us going over the long haul are our capacities to pace ourselves, to steel ourselves against our inevitable failures, to be clear headed about the nature and magnitude of the challenges we face.

As I begin my stint as president of SCRA, a mere eight months into President Obama’s administration, these tensions come into sharp relief. I anticipate that conditions that gave rise to Obama’s victory—a deep financial crisis that promises to reverberate through the global economy for many years, anger over domestic policy aimed to benefit the elite while others fall farther behind, and growing dissatisfaction among Americans with a US doctrine of leadership by force—are bound to shape community psychology in the coming decade. I anticipate that these conditions will pose both great challenges and opportunities for our field. And I am increasingly confident that we will meet the challenges and exploit the opportunities provided by this shift in the prevailing social and political winds.

Of course, I am mindful that one-year passes very quickly. This is one of many reasons I am grateful to follow my highly committed and effective predecessors in this office, most recently Anne Bogat and Mo Elias, and to be part of a hard working, forward looking and dedicated Executive Committee in continuing and expanding the work they started. The EC’s current goals grow seamlessly from our work in recent years and project forward for several years more. Our future accomplishments depend on sustaining a long-range view and strategies.

Along these lines, I am happy to report on progress made on several commitments the EC made at the Biennial conference in Montclair in June. Under the leadership of Anne Bogat, we have been exploring various options for providing increased staff support to SCRA committees and membership. By the start of the new calendar year, we anticipate having in place new personnel resources to assist us with a wide variety of tasks, including managing our finances, website, membership services, E-Newsletter, and planning and running our biennial conferences. Such support will also help us to “mind the store” by monitoring and supporting on-going SCRA activities of the members of the Executive Committee and committee chairs. We believe this will free EC and committee leaders to focus more energy on our policy initiative.

The newly created EC Finance Committee has begun its
SCRA’s policy initiative moves forward. The EC has established a liaison to increase its capacity to work closely with SCRA’s Public Policy Committee (thanks to Steve Howe and Nicole Porter for stepping into this role). The EC and Public Policy committee have continued discussions about how we will make the work of SCRA members visible and relevant to policy makers. We fully believe this is something that can happen at the level of the EC, Committees, Interest Groups, Task Forces, and individuals and research/action teams. The Public Policy Committee is making progress on the development of a policy template that will be but one vehicle for committees and members of SCRA to share the policy relevance of their work. Here I reissue Mo Elias’s call for all SCRA interest groups and committees to consider how they might connect to and support SCRA’s new policy focus.

I am also very happy to report that the SCRA International Task Force will continue its work this year with renewed EC support. Under the leadership of Rod Watts and Stephanie Riger, the International Task Force, in cooperation with the SCRA International Committee, is pursuing several initiatives to enhance SCRA’s international competence. Among other goals, I am very excited that the task force is planning to (1) increase our web based resources for enhancing international connections and opportunities for learning and collaboration; (2) translate into English seminal publications by community psychologists around the world; (3) increase SCRA’s capacity to support the travel of international community psychologists to the SCRA biennial; and, (4) work with the biennial planning committees to make it easier for international colleagues to participate in our conference. I am certain these activities will help SCRA more fully embrace the global nature of our interests and concerns. I am convinced there is much we must learn from, with, and about our international neighbors. The International Task Force will help us to meet the challenges and opportunities that the global context of our work poses to our theorizing and practice. I encourage you to attend the upcoming 3rd International Conference of Community Psychology to be held in Puebla, Mexico, June 3–5, 2010.

In closing, I want to call attention to the ongoing work of the SCRA Practice Group. Since its inception the practice group has worked tirelessly to articulate ways to bolster the practice of community psychology and to identify ways that SCRA can continue to deepen its support for community psychology practice and for community psychologists who work outside academic settings. I am very excited to see the collaboration between this body and the Council of Education Programs represented in the special section on Infusing Community Practice into Graduate Training. This is the beginning of a very important and I trust fruitful discussion.

As SCRA and community psychology emerge from a period in our nation’s history that, arguably, was not particularly friendly to our interests, we can rightfully aspire to bigger and better things. I look forward eagerly and rest peacefully these days, trusting in the words of Myles Horton, founder of the Highlander Institute—we make the road by walking. ☺
Aloha from Hawai‘i!

Thank you to the SCRA Publications Committee and the SCRA Executive Committee for granting me the privilege to serve as the Editor of The Community Psychologist (TCP) for the next three years. Along with the critical assistance and support of David Jackson, the Associate Editor, I am very excited about the opportunity to be a part of the evolution of this newsletter/quasi-journal. In addition to doing my best to maintain the quality and high standards of the previous Editors, I had been asked to investigate the possibilities of giving TCP a larger presence on the SCRA Website. In the Winter 2010 issue, we will be providing you with a link to an electronic survey to allow you to provide feedback on this and other potential enhancements.

On a related note, I would like to share my thoughts with you after having gone through my very first attempt at putting together an issue of TCP. It has been both a thrilling and daunting task. I would have fallen flat on my face without the guidance and graciousness of Elizabeth Thomas, the Past Editor, and her wonderful team. They showed much patience and compassion as David and I muddled our way through. When I first “met” Elizabeth on the phone to learn more about the job, I immediately had a deep respect for all of the hard work and care she had put into each issue. Now having actually gone through the process, I admire her even more.

To make each issue of TCP the best ever, please assist me and David by following the author guidelines on the back cover. We would greatly appreciate if you stick to the deadlines as closely as possible, use APA format, and limit your column/article length to no more than five double-spaced pages. As always, exceptions can be requested. Please contact me at least one month prior to each issue’s deadline if you would like to submit longer works or feature a special section. And, please note that there is about an 8 to 10 week delay from the issue deadline to publication.

I hope all of you enjoy this first issue from Hawai‘i. Thanks to my boss, Dr. Danny M. Takanishi, Jr., M.D., FACS, Chair of Surgery at the University of Hawaii Medical School, for granting me permission to serve as the Editor. He immediately recognized the significance of TCP and insisted that I pursue this opportunity. And, thanks to SCRA President Mark Aber for his sense of humor over the past few months. (He knows what I am talking about.) I look forward to meeting him and as many of you as possible through the columns and in person at SCRA events.

Mahalo for your patience. We promise to do our absolute best for all of you. ☀️
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Inching Along the Continuum of Progress: Expanding Practitioner Training Through CP Conference Workshops

Written by Christopher Corbett

In the Spring and Fall 2008 issues of *The Community Psychologist* (41[2] & [3/4]), I described some Summit activities from the 2007 Biennial First Ever Summit on Community Psychology Practice, five goals (Corbett, 2008a, p. 66), and recommendations to fulfill goals (Corbett, 2008a, p. 67, 2008b, p. 78–79). The Summit attracted researchers and practitioners from applied and academic settings, and graduates and students of community psychology (CP). (Also see *The Community Psychologist* 41[1], p. 40–41; Summit Summary by Meissen, Hazel, Berkowitz, & Wolff, 2008; and future vision, see Wolff & Snell-Johns, 2005; Wolff, 2006.)

The sub-group I volunteered for focused on the third of three domains: establishing, promoting and supporting CP practice. We started with five goals and expected outcomes (Community Practice Summit Notes, 2007; Corbett, 2008a, p. 66). Our group selected Goal Two:

- **Goal**: Community practitioners are integral, active participants in SCRA. SCRA activities support practitioners who will see SCRA as a valuable support and seek professional affiliation.
- **Outcome**: A 50% increase in SCRA membership by community based practitioners.

We developed ideas and action steps towards a 50% increase in membership. We decided SCRA must greatly increase its value to practitioners, identifying CP conferences as an effective way for SCRA to more effectively serve practitioners. We developed action steps, particularly expanding workshops to support CP practice. We proposed a 100% increase in workshops of value to community practitioners, emphasizing the core competencies (Community Practice Summit Notes, 2007) to serve professional development needs.

The articles recommended a short term goal of twelve workshops at each conference (Corbett, 2008a, p. 67, 2008b, p. 78) and that workshops be welcomed on various conceptions of core competencies, such as Ramos (2007) and Scott (2007a, 2007b), and other international views such as from Francescato (2007), Bishop and Dzidic (2008) or Francescato (2008).

The articles explained opportunities, identified workshop types, and proposed a future vision to advance continuing education and professional development goals, describing the essential need for more workshops at all CP conferences. Volunteers to deliver workshops are needed. The article urged academics, researchers and practitioners to present workshops in a core competency. One key reason is many of us benefit from the field greatly—personally, professionally and financially; offering a workshop is a golden opportunity to give back to the field and build it for the future (Corbett, 2008a, p. 67).

**Purpose of This Article**

This summarizes prior articles and describes progress at the SCRA conference in Montclair regarding its workshop offerings. Also, recommendations are made to build on the progress thus far, from my perspective as a master’s level practitioner. This should better serve practitioners and promote professional development and affiliation, as well as serve employers and sponsors needed to help fund costs associated with membership, conference registration, travel, lodging and related costs. These are substantial for practitioners and often unreimbursed, creating barriers to affiliation and membership. Training opportunities, as presented here, should increase practitioner skills in the core competencies and result in incremental progress towards the 50% membership growth objective, while promoting further evolution of the field.

**Promoting Continuing Education & Professional Development: A Future Vision**

While many think of designing workshops to meet individuals’ professional development needs, serving the community and organizations that hire practitioners is important, too (Corbett, 2008b, p. 80). This is another way to serve the community. This not only helps further CP directly into communities, advancing knowledge and skill development and promoting highly desirable Level III consultation (Parsons & Meyers, 1984, p. 159), it also creates new linkages to increase SCRA membership (Corbett, 2008b, p. 79) and promotes hiring of practitioners by nonprofits or NGOs (nongovernment organizations), government, or for profit organizations. An illustration is evident from the International Conference in Lisbon, which incorporated pre-conference opportunities aggressively, providing eight pre-conference institutes lasting one or two days (Second International Conference Program, 2008). An essential feature is they were inclusive of the community, serving 300 attendees (Ornelas, 2008). Also, they were structured for fee, at 75 € per day (Corbett, 2008b, p. 79). This serves the community, field, individuals, employers, and potential employers and should bolster individual and organizational memberships. Moreover, it is readily incorporated into a future vision for conference workshops to substantially advance continuing education and professional development goals.

Following is a future vision as previously proposed:

A future vision for conference workshops is, first, that all registrants will have the option and choice of attending core competency workshops during both morning and afternoon sessions and on all days of a conference, and, second, that all attendees will have some choices regarding depth of training, ranging from exposure to a core competency,
to developing or maintaining proficiency, to finally, expertise. Further, this vision may be accomplished with a combination of conference and pre-conference workshops or institutes, with or without fee, inclusive of, and open to, community practitioners and any organizations that employ, support, or fund community practitioners in the communities or locales of future CP conferences or who otherwise support the mission of SCRA. This may also include the use of electronic media, teleconference or other technologies that promote distant participation by interested practitioners, researchers, academics and organizations that serve communities consistent with the values of the field of community psychology. (Corbett, 2008b, p. 80)

Workshops at the Montclair, N.J. Conference

As noted earlier, the recommendation was to increase conference workshops by 100%, from a recent level of five (at La Verne; Conference Program, 2007) to at least ten, or preferably twelve, ideally focusing on core competencies to serve practitioners (Corbett, 2008a, p. 67, 69).

A Program review from Montclair (Conference Program, 2009) indicates a significant number of workshops were offered: four Pre-Conference Workshops and at least eight during the Conference.1 Workshops offered increased from five to eight, or 60%. This represents significant progress in teaching practitioner based skills. Further workshop growth should help promote affiliation with SCRA and progress towards the 50% membership growth goal.

A review of all workshops appears to indicate attention to the core competencies, including those identified by Scott (2007a). While some subjectivity exists, the following is a listing of workshops by type, title (abbreviated) and some core competencies covered, based upon a review of the workshop descriptions contained in the Conference Program (2009) (See Table 1).

Aside from a significant increase in regular conference workshops, a review of descriptions is impressive. First, many workshops addressed various core competency areas. Most addressed two or more, such as proposed by Scott (2007a, 2007b). Second, there were at least four regular conference workshops on public policy (including Corbett, 2009), a longstanding, though sorely neglected, priority of many SCRA leaders, as noted in their President’s Columns (Bond, 1998; Maton, 1998; Solarz, 2000; Toro, 2003, 2005) and by Elias (2009a, p. 2). Public policy activism was proposed in 1965, the apparent birth of the field (Bennett, Anderson, Cooper, Hassol, Klein, & Rosenblum, 1966, p. 5; Corbett, 2006, p. 12). Third, regarding opportunities to increase value to practitioners—offering credit courses, continuing education, or certification for skill development (Corbett, 2008a, p. 68)—some offerings were for continuing education development, qualifying for CE credits (Conference Program, 2009). Sessions included: The Future of CP in Global Perspective; Ethical Considerations in CP; Providing Multicultural Outreach Programming; Public Policy 101; Public Policy 201; and the Plenary Session/Keynote Address: Capability Theory and CP (Conference Program, 2009, p. 158). While such credits are for “Ph.D. Psychologists” co-sponsored through the N.J. Psychological Association and SCRA (Conference Program, 2009, p. 158), they illustrate that continuing education for-credit mechanisms can be created and delivered at CP conferences, and that other avenues or options for practitioners can readily be constructed. For example, SCRA could develop its own Continuing Education Credit Program, using a core competency paradigm. Providing ongoing credit training to practitioners would surely: 1) bolster value of future CP conferences, 2) increase value to practitioners and employers, and 3) increase value of professional affiliation with SCRA. This would create a great opportunity for progress towards the 50% increase in SCRA membership and professionalizing the field, and is strongly recommended here.

SCRA could also, beyond developing its own for-credit standards, accept APA-related continuing education credits as well. Under such a paradigm, a total of six sessions3 including three workshops presented at Montclair—Ethical Considerations in Community Psychology and Public Policy 101 and 201 (Conference Program, 2009, p. 158)—would have potentially qualified to provide community practitioners valuable credit for attending such sessions.4

Conclusion: Second Order Change Implications for SCRA

Clearly, increasing workshop offerings, focusing on core competencies as occurred in Montclair, is a very valuable step for improving future CP conferences. Further expansion of for-credit workshops, particularly on core competencies, will advance practitioner training, as well as increase value to practitioners, employers and community organizations alike.

Actions such as these will increase the value of affiliation with SCRA and extend beyond practitioners to organizations that employ them. These recommendations not only advance Goal Two, as described above, but should advance three of four additional Goals and Expected Outcomes by increasing communities’ exposure to the field, creating direct links with new constituents through membership and establishing mutually reinforcing exchange relationships between resources of the field and resources of community players. That is, those goals include: increasing visibility of and demand for the field, with skills and knowledge of CP sought by employers (Goal 1); increasing connections of practitioners from diverse fields and providing professional development with SCRA as a linchpin (Goal 4); and creating multiple local, regional and national opportunities for sharing expertise, networking and professional development at affordable rates (Goal 5; Community Practice Summit Notes, 2007; Corbett, 2008a, p. 66).

To achieve these ambitious goals, and implement enduring second order change, SCRA could develop its own Continuing Education Credit Program to serve all levels of community practitioners and to fulfill and advance the goals noted above, and is highly recommended here.

SCRA can be a linchpin in professional development and increase practitioners desire to affiliate. To illustrate, the American Psychological Association (APA) provides professional development through many continuing education workshops for its member Ph.D. Psychologists, offering over 65 workshops, during all days of...
ultimately promote intercultural, interdisciplinary, and intersectoral premises, methods, and interventions. This will forward-looking observations on education and training for a global future vision goals (#1 & #5), while advancing professionalization of practitioner training (#4), to bolster membership (#2) and achieve These recommendations will enable SCRA to play a linchpin role in practitioner training, APA provides many Continuing Education Credits for its members; SCRA must do so as well. If not SCRA, then who will serve this essential role?

AJCP revenues can fund this critical, sustainable, second order change initiative. SCRA is well resourced and able to afford a fair portion to implement the global vision. An allocation of just half the annual revenues, estimated at $200,000 by Elias (2009b), would yield $100,000, which should allow SCRA to evolve, and is highly recommended here. This would expand SCRA support to international CP conferences, supporting resource challenged international practitioners, propagating CP values globally. This is a variation on a recommendation noted by Elias from SCRA’s Past Presidents which is to provide small grants for research and practice that involve collaboration (p. 2); that is, instead, provide substantive grants and support to fund the continuing education of all community practitioners, which is strongly recommended here. These recommendations will enable SCRA to play a linchpin role in practitioner training (#4), to bolster membership (#2) and achieve future vision goals (#1 & #5), while advancing professionalization of the field without charging burdensome continuing education fees.

It also should further Marsella’s views (1998), particularly his forward-looking observations on education and training for a global CP (p. 1288–89). Beyond providing guidance on curriculum, he states: “The training must involve multi-cultural, multi-disciplinary, and multisectoral premises, methods, and interventions. This will ultimately promote intercultural, interdisciplinary, and intersectoral thinking” (p. 1289). While curriculum development has a place in core competency training for practitioners in academic settings, what Marsella describes appears very well suited to the far different behavior setting of a CP conference—particularly one with diverse practitioners and properly structured workshops. Another benefit in using the workshop venue as a primary vehicle for institutionalizing continuing education is that it adjusts for international conferences. Marsella (p. 1289), in citing Moghaddam (1997) notes third-world psychologists may require a different type and content of education and training, using materials and research that are culturally appropriate. While Marsella’s article is a decade old, it reflects great foresight not only into the need for a global CP but very specific insight into the resulting education and training implications of a global vision. Marsella’s comments were excerpted from his Address for the Award for the International Advancement of Psychology at the 105th Convention of the APA, Chicago, Illinois, August 17, 1997, while at the University of Hawai’i. Moghaddam’s contributions result from his recommendations for the training of developing world psychologists. Clearly, global perspectives from long ago appear highly relevant today. Those of us trying to look forward might well benefit from spending more time looking back.

Just half of SCRA’s new found resources, if applied to institutionalize continuing education for practitioners in core competencies at all CP national and international conferences, will advance many future vision and training goals as articulated by Wolff & Snell-Johns (2005), Hazel (2007) and Marsella (1998). Side benefits include enabling SCRA to become a linchpin in the continuing and professional development of community practitioners, increasing the desire of community practitioners and employers for professional affiliation. This will help convert the 50% membership growth goal into a sustainable, funded initiative, greatly improving the prospects for incremental success, while institutionalizing professionalization.
of the field. Please feel free to forward any comments regarding these views and recommendations to chris_corbett1994@hotmail.com and I will answer any questions you may have.

Footnotes

1 Due to the structure of the Program, the workshops were not fully listed separately. Also, some workshops did not contain that designation in their title, requiring a reading of the individual Program descriptions. As a result, one or more additional workshops might exist that were missed in the Program review.

2 Ethics is identified by Curris (2007) as one of four essential ingredients necessary for a field of study and practice to be viewed as a disciplinary or interdisciplinary profession and it seems to qualify as a core competency (Corbett, 2008a, p. 68).

3 While in the Conference Program (2009, p. 158) a total of eight sessions were listed as qualifying for Continuing Education credits, the Program Supplement (2009; green sheet) indicated that two sessions were removed from qualifying.

4 Credit qualified training provides a powerful and critical basis for practitioner reimbursement, potentially for airfare, hotel, conference registration, tuition and ancillary costs by sponsors or employers whether government, nonprofit or for profit. Practitioners, however, that request reimbursement for continuing education cruises, even credit based, do so at their own risk!
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**Special Section**

Edited by James Dalton and David Julian

**Infusing Community Practice into Graduate Training: Broadening the Conversation**

**Editors’ Introduction**

A recent survey found that among graduates of master’s and doctoral programs in our field, over half find employment in community settings, not academia (Hazel, Pilaczynski, & Meissen, unpublished data from the 2005 SCRA survey of graduate programs).

Wherever they work, in community settings, academia, or elsewhere, our graduates engage in community practice whenever they are involved in community research, intervention, advocacy, or collaboration with community organizations.

Are we providing comprehensive training in community psychology practice to our students? Data reported in the lead article in this special section suggest that, in general, community practice often is not specifically defined and its key skills often are not addressed systematically.

The SCRA Practice Group and Council on Education Programs have opened an ongoing conversation about linking community practice more closely with graduate education. David Julian, Raymond Scott, and Kelly Hazel opened this conversation with articles in The Community Psychologist in 2006–2007. This conversation also is related to the current SCRA effort to write a “Value Proposition” that would present to prospective employers the skills, resources, and perspective that community psychologists can bring to community settings of many types.

In this special section, co-edited by the editors of the Education Connection and Community Practitioner columns, Oliwier Dziadkowiec, Tiffeny Jimenez, and a panel of commentators consider the findings of a recent survey on how community psychology practice is addressed in graduate programs in our field.

Our goal is to broaden and deepen the conversation on linking graduate education with community practice.

This effort is not intended to lead to top-down professional accreditation requirements for graduate training. Our field thrives on its diversity of perspectives and training approaches. We often note the ironies of trying to define “community psychology” and “community research and action.” Yet that creative diversity co-exists with a hazy public understanding of what practitioners in our field do. Students considering or entering our field often ask for a clearer idea of what community psychology practice involves. Prospective employers of our graduates, and prospective collaborators in our work, often ask the same thing.

Many of us in SCRA have a sense that community psychology practice can be simply and usefully defined, and a core set of skills for community psychology practice articulated. We can do this in ways that respect our field’s creative diversity yet also strengthen our graduate training programs, link our students’ ideals with training for community practice, and inform prospective employers of our graduates’ skills and potential. That process of definition will take
a conversation, indeed many conversations. Now is a good time to broaden the conversation.

In future columns, we will take up core competencies or skills for community psychology practice, one at a time. For each skill, we will present examples of how students can develop that skill, especially through innovative training experiences and curricula.

We encourage you to participate in this conversation, and we solicit your ideas for articles or commentaries.

---

**Educating Community Psychologists for Community Practice: A Survey of Graduate Training Programs**

Written by

Oliwier Dziadkowiec, Wichita State University, and Tiffany Jimenez, Michigan State University

Questions about the role of practice in Community Psychology have endured for years (Hazel, Meissen, Snell-Johns, & Wolff, 2006; Prilleltensky, 2001; Wolff, 1994). Recent discussions have focused on three key issues: defining community psychology practice (Julian, 2006), identifying core competencies or skills inherent in the work of community practitioners (Scott, 2007), and considering how to infuse community psychology practice or community-based practice into graduate education (Hazel, 2007). This article adds to this literature by presenting specific findings from a recent survey of SCRA graduate training programs.

In 2008, the SCRA Council of Educational Programs and Practice Group surveyed SCRA graduate (doctoral and master’s level) programs concerning training of students for community-based practice. The survey specifically asked a representative of each program to describe the definition that the program uses for Community Psychology Practice (CPP); how they evaluate their effectiveness in training students for CPP; the skills that these programs train their students to be competent in; and the extent to which they train their students on some identified core competencies for CPP. Overall, out of 70 programs contacted, 68 responded to the survey, 23 were free standing community programs and 17 were clinical- or counseling-community programs. Other responding programs included programs from other disciplines as well as other psychology sub-disciplines, for instance: Organizational Development, Applied Behavioral Science, Health Behavior and Health Education, Human Development and Family Studies, Community Research and Intervention, and International Family and Community Studies. Non-respondents were programs that do not have a strong community emphasis (K. Hazel, personal communication).

**How Community Research & Action Programs Currently Define Community Psychology Practice**

One part of the 2008 survey aimed to understand how programs conceptualize or define CPP. Nineteen programs (34% of 56 responding to this question) have specified definitions of CPP. Despite the high percentage of programs that do not have a specified definition of CPP, 62% (33/53) of programs say they have “High” or “Very High” success in training community psychology practitioners (CPPs). Using cross-case analysis (Patton, 2002), we qualitatively explored the open-ended responses of the specified definition of CPP that programs use and how they judge the effectiveness of their programs to train CPPs.

Twenty-five programs either provided a statement of how they define CPP, or commented on their lack of definition. Of these 25, 19 programs stated that they have an articulated statement of CPP that guides their curriculum and pedagogy. Interestingly, some of these 19 statements were not definitions but descriptions of training practices. Overall, three categories emerged across program type: 1) CPP is the Application of Community Psychology Theory & Values; 2) CPP is a Combination of Research & Social Action; and 3) Community Practice Education is gained in the Community.

**I. CPP is the Application of Community Psychology Theory and Values**

Some programs that have specializations, such as in public health or clinical practice, described how community psychology values were embedded in their specializations and are used as their definition for CPP.

“We have a definition of integrated Clinical-Community practice that guides the curriculum.”

“It is a fundamental part of public health education so it is not really necessary.”

Other programs mentioned using the values of Community Psychology or certain theories from community psychology in understanding organizational life within the community.

“A broad strength-based ecological model.”


**II. CPP is a Combination of Research and Social Action**

Some programs did not distinguish CPP from research and described them complimentarily.

“The practice aspect of [our] program is action research conducted in community settings outside [the] University. Community, then, means real-life settings, in the local [city] community, throughout the state..., throughout the United States, and internationally.”
“We focus on three areas of community research and practice: 1) Methods of Community-based Participatory Research (CBPR), 2) Core competencies for promoting community health and development (e.g., community assessment, analysis of problems/goals, intervention, participatory evaluation, social marketing, planning for sustainability), and 3) (for those in the joint Ph.D.-P.M.H. Program) Core methods of public health (e.g., epidemiology, health promotion, environmental health, biostatistics).”

Three programs simply used a definition of Community Psychology as their definition of CPP and one stated that Action Research is CPP.

“Community psychology is devoted to research and social action to promote well-being, increase empowerment and prevent the development of problems in communities, groups and individuals.”

III. Community Practice Education is Gained in the Community

Other programs did not clearly state a definition of CPP but instead described how they have designed program structures that lead to learning about how to perform CPP in the community. These included practicum experiences where students got to apply what they’ve learned, and had opportunities to practice the various roles a community psychologist plays in the community.

“The Practicum is a capstone experience within [our] Master’s Program... The primary purpose of the Practicum is two-fold: 1) to allow students to apply, integrate, and evaluate the information and skills they have acquired in their masters-level academic course work, and 2) to gain new understandings and competencies as community social psychologists while contributing to a field setting. Students participate in community placements for 10-12 hours per week as well as attend an on-campus seminar designed to support their applied work.”

“For each of the practica, we give a description of the roles of the community psychologist, i.e. in evaluation, intervention (prevention and working with diverse population) and consultation.”

“For [our] program, practice entails applied work in the [city], the broader [state], the national, and the international community.”

Summary: Definitions of Community Psychology Practice

It is clear from these findings that a specific definition of CPP is currently not widely shared among existing programs and brings to light the inconsistent understanding of what CPP is across our field. The use of the definition of Community Psychology as their definition of CPP by several programs suggests that some programs do not think a separate definition of CPP exists apart from the research components of their work as Community Psychologists.

The fact that some programs did not provide a definition of CPP and instead described program structures where students are supposed to learn CPP skills suggests that little if any effort is made to train students specifically about CPP within the academy. This seems to assume that CPP skills will be developed upon personal experiences within the community. Without a clear understanding of what CPP is, how can training programs proceed to measure their effectiveness in training CPPs?

How Programs Evaluate Effectiveness in Training Community Psychology Practitioners

Of the total number of programs that responded to the survey, 62% (33/53) of programs say they are successful in training CPPs. These data show how programs are evaluating their effectiveness in training CPPs. Of 29 programs that say they train CPPs at a “Very Successful” and “Highly Successful” level, 4 categories emerged regarding how they judge their effectiveness: 1) Curriculum Facilitates Student Learning in CPP, 2) Competent Faculty & Community Connections Facilitate Student Competencies, 3) Students from the Program have a Good Reputation among the Community, and 4) Graduates are Employed in Community Practice & Research Positions.

I. Curriculum Facilitates Student Learning in CPP

Some programs did not explain how they determine whether they are successful in training CPPs and instead described what the program does to facilitate the acquisition of individualized CPP skills experientially. Programs explained opportunities for students throughout their training, where students needed to learn individually what CPP skills were needed for their specific work goals and how to master them in context.

Some programs have required courses or assistantships that provided a base of information about organizational and community development as well as information on CPP roles, and assumed that they will prepare students to employ CPP skills as needed in their community work:

“The six required Core Courses promote a wide range of explorations designed to provide a fundamental understanding of organizational development. These become the foundation from which students build their own individualized studies within the concentration, tailored to explore the questions, issues and populations of primary interest to them.”

“Students take courses in consultation, program evaluation and a number of courses before students conduct a year-long fieldwork project. In this project, students gain entry into a setting, informally assess the organization setting and needs, negotiate a contract with the agency, conduct a project and then present and submit a product to the agency. Students projects have varied from training to community members, writing grant proposals, to conducting program evaluation. Students obtain weekly supervision in their project throughout the whole year.”
Further, students are expected to apply what they’ve learned in their community psychology courses to their work. I think this is a great way for students to learn community-based practice.”

“They receive rigorous training in coursework and integrate this model throughout their clinical training and research including the dissertation.”

A couple of programs reported teaching a combination of theory, research and practice that students can apply as needed, and therefore it might be inferred that CPP training is thought to occur through the integration of research and practice:

“Our program offers practica in community psychology that involves the integration of research and practice. Our program offers courses in community psychology, social systems assessment, etc. that are both scholarly and applied. Our students are active participants in community collaboration from the start of their graduate careers.”

“Students have a combination of theory, research, and practice through coursework, fieldwork, and assistantships. Students have the opportunity to implement what they learn in the classroom in their work with community-based organizations.”

Since some programs, based on student’s interests, allow individual projects to focus more or less on community practice, for one program it is expected that through this learning process students can decide for themselves whether they want to pursue a career in CPP.

“For the students with strong community interest, I think we provide a strong foundation for success in community-based practice. The second course in our two-course community psychology sequence offers students the opportunity to learn about how to negotiate different types of community settings. Also, students work with their community site/partner to identify how they can use their training, skills, and strengths to help advance the site’s mission. This requires students to practice defining their roles as psychologists (in training) and articulating the range of ways community psychology can be applied. Because this course is in the 2nd year, students who want to focus on community-based work have time to focus more specifically on different types of community-based practice later in their training.”

II. Competent Faculty & Community Connections Facilitate Student Competencies

Some programs identified having competent faculty and connections with the community as indicators of effectiveness in training CPPs. It was assumed that faculty who have grants to do work in the community and are working with community organizations will transfer CPP skills to their students.

“We have developed community-based programs and grants.”

“Our faculty members are also very connected to local communities and organizations so this sets up an excellent learning environment for our students.”

For some programs, the mentoring of students by program faculty was thought to support CPP skill development.

“Because of the faculty mentorship…”

One program stated that they know they are effective in training students in CPP not only because they are receiving program training but also because they connect students to local CPPs.

“Our students get a fair amount of experience through practica and through connections with community practitioners in the area.”

III. Students from the Program have a Good Reputation in the Community

Some programs described how they know they are effective in training CPPs because the program maintains a good reputation of having students that do good work in the community, they see students developing successful partnerships, and see students generate knowledge about community-based work. In fact, one program’s students gain acceptance within the community because previous students have left good impressions with community members.

“The community agencies in which our [program’s] students pursue their training largely accept them because their predecessors in those settings were effective in their work.”

Faculty in some programs reported assessing students based on their ability to be successful in developing community partnerships and doing interventions and receive feedback from the community about their students.

“Our students have had great success in a variety of settings doing innovative research and action. They routinely develop community partnerships and community-based interventions. Students integrate their action with research and their research with action.”

“Feedback from agencies where students are based for community practica.”

In one program, another indicator that they are effective in training CPPs is in seeing students generate knowledge not only for scholarship but also for the community:
“They generate knowledge/scholarship and also inform community-based processes. They write papers and conference presentations for scholarly venues and are also committed to quality written and oral feedback to community partners (indeed, feedback that is often co-created with partners).”

**IV. Graduates are employed in Community Practice and Research Positions.**

Some programs indicated that they are effective in training CPPs because their students continue to gain employment in a variety of community positions, such as government, non-profit agencies, and doing CPP research, and continue to do well in those positions.

“Graduates obtain jobs as program evaluators, program directors at not for profit agencies, and at policy levels within state government.”

“Many of our graduates are employed in settings where they are involved in community-based practice carrying out research in community settings, often with community-based coalitions.”

“Also, many of our graduates go into community practice and do quite well.”

**Summary: Effectiveness of CPP Training**

From these findings we can see that there are a number of ways in which programs are currently evaluating their effectiveness in training CPPs. Some conceptions of CPP seem very general, lacking a set of specific skills to be learned. Moreover, comments above from several programs suggest that they do not consider “practice” separate from research, and that effectiveness in training in community research is equivalent to all aspects of training for CPP. While some examples of effectiveness cited by programs are in fact great indicators of the long-term outcomes of training in CPP (e.g., graduates get jobs in community and government organizations), there remains a lack of focus on the skills needed for students who are more interested in CPP. It would benefit those students and the field as a whole to define CPP, its core skills or competencies, and ways to support their development.

**What CPP Skills Are Being Taught in SCRA Graduate Courses?**

The 2008 survey also asked graduate programs about training in 13 specific core competencies or skills for CPP. These were based on, but not identical to, Scott’s (2007) preliminary list of core competencies for CPP (see Table 1).

To assess how these skills were incorporated into curriculum and training, respondents were given five response options and were allowed to pick more than one option for each of the questions. The response options were:

- Not readily available – few if any choices for acquiring this skill are available in the graduate program.
- Available outside of the program – training on this skill set not part of the curriculum but available outside of the program via internship, mentoring, or coursework outside of the department.
- Available in optional coursework – training on this skill set is available through optional program coursework or internship.
- Available in required coursework – training on this skill set is incorporated in required coursework, internship, or mentoring experience.
- Integrated in multiple aspects of the program – training on this skill set is a strong focus of the program, students get a chance to acquire this skill set in multiple ways and most of them usually master it upon completion of the program.

Findings of the availability of training for each CPP skill are presented in Table 2. After examining the data, and due to the complexities of analyzing data involving multiple responses for each competency, we opted for a holistic analysis of the intensity of commitment that graduate programs seem to dedicate to training students in the 13 CPP skills from Table 1. That analysis yielded 3 levels of intensity (High, Intermediate, and Low).

High intensity was assigned to the skills that graduate programs most often reported covering in “required” courses or that were “integrated in multiple aspects of the program.” Intermediate intensity was assigned to the skills that were more likely to be available via “optional coursework” and “outside of the program.” However, some programs reported at least some coverage in required courses for these competencies. Low intensity was assigned to skills that respondents indicated to be “not readily available” or “available outside of the program,” and much less often “required” or “available in optional coursework.” Note that there was considerable diversity in intensity among programs; we are reporting the central or modal tendencies in these data.

**High Intensity:** Skills that graduate programs seemed most committed to training were research, professional judgment, intervention, and community assessment/program evaluation. This indicates an emphasis in training on applied research and intervention programs.

**Intermediate Intensity:** Skills in this category included organizational assessment, capacity building, collaboration/ consultation, and communication. These skills, although related to the ones in the “high intensity” category, were more focused on the dynamics of community organizations and on processes of collaboration.

**Low intensity:** Skills in this category included advocacy, group processes, leadership/supervision, resource development, and service delivery/planning/management. Advocacy included both community organizing and policy advocacy, and about one-third of programs reported training for this in optional courses. Yet a roughly equal proportion reported that this training was not available or available outside the program. The remaining four skills appear to share a focus on specific, practical skills for collaboration and program management.
Table 1. CPP Skills and Definitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CPP Skills</th>
<th>Definitions*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy</td>
<td>Ability to establish personal relationships and communicate with policy makers and community leaders through conversation, consultants, briefs, and lobbying.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Assessment, Program Evaluation</td>
<td>Ability to analyze problems and document strengths in the community as well as conduct program evaluation, analyze, and disseminate the findings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Assessment</td>
<td>Ability to conduct organizational capacity assessment, provide consultation, and assist with development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity Building</td>
<td>Ability to promote community sustainability, self-sufficiency as well as community leadership development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration/Consultation</td>
<td>Ability to develop and maintain a network of constructive work partnerships with clients, communities, and organizations, as well as negotiate and mediate between different stakeholder groups around a particular issue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Ability to communicate effectively with diverse groups through conversation, social marketing, public speaking, and writing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Processes</td>
<td>Ability to ensure that wide range of people is involved in decision making, provide conflict analysis, and facilitate meetings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Ability to develop/conduct surveys, focus groups, interviews, as well as design, and implement participatory action research, and perform other qualitative, and quantitative research in the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interventions</td>
<td>Ability to develop a program theory, design, implement, and evaluate community interventions, as well as facilitate strategic planning, and translate policy into program plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Supervisory and Mentoring Skills</td>
<td>Ability to direct, organize, and manage community-based services, facility organizational decision making, as well as motivate and manage supervisees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Development</td>
<td>Ability to identify and pursue fundraising and grant application opportunities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Judgment</td>
<td>Ability to reflect on what is known, consider its significance, and evaluate alternative strategies, as well as to make decisions in novel and unexpected situations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service, Delivery, Planning, and Management</td>
<td>Ability to assist with risk assessment and management, manage human resources, as well as understand basic financial planning, management, and accounting.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Adopted from 2008 graduate program survey instrument (Hazel, 2008).

2005 Survey Findings vs. 2008 Survey Findings

In order to compare and provide some “convergent validity” we looked at what respondents from the 2005 graduate program survey (Gatlin, Rushenberg, & Hazel, 2009) had to say about their commitment to teaching similar skills. In the 2005 survey, intensity of training was measured on a 6 point Likert scale (0 = not at all or not applicable, 1 = very low, 2 = low, 3 = moderate, 4 = high, 5 = very high). Many CPP skills could have been assigned to the 3 intensity levels created for the 2008 survey.

CPP skills with the highest average intensity scores in 2005 included: community based interventions, working with diverse communities, community-based research, program evaluation,
quantitative methods, ecological/community systems theory, prevention science, oral presentations, and professional writing. Again, there is an emphasis on interventions and applied research. Working with diverse communities may be similar to the collaboration skills that received intermediate emphasis in our 2008 survey findings.

Skills that received “intermediate” training intensity scores in 2005 included: participatory action research, qualitative methods, health promotion, prevention program implementation, community consultation, and social action. These data converge with the 2008 survey findings in the areas of consultation and implementation of programs.

Table 2. CPP Skills and Graduate Training: A Tabular Perspective

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CPP Skills</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
<th>Not readily available</th>
<th>Available outside the program</th>
<th>Available in optional coursework</th>
<th>Available in required coursework</th>
<th>Integrated in multiple aspects of the program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Assessment/ Program Evaluation</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Assessment</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity Building</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration/ Consultation</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Processes</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interventions</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Supervisory and Mentoring Skills</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Development</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Judgment</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service, Delivery, Planning, and Management</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Skills with the lowest intensity scores included: grant-writing, advocacy, policy change/development/implementation, coalition-building, community organizing, and socio-political development. These match well with 2008 survey low-intensity areas such as advocacy, group processes, resource development, leadership/supervision, and program/service management.

Summary: CPP Core Competencies and Graduate Training

In this section we were able to assign a range of skills associated with community psychology graduate training to three intensity levels (high, intermediate, and low). Skills that were
emphasized the most were related to applied research, intervention, professional judgment and community assessment and evaluation. The intermediate intensity level consisted of skills related to organizational assessment and intervention such as capacity building, collaboration/consultation, and communication. The least emphasized skills included: advocacy, service delivery, leadership, and resource development.

Although we were able to classify skills generally into three intensity levels, the differences in intensity between skills are not uniform. For instance differences in emphasis between community/applied research and group processes might be greater than between skills of community and organizational assessment. This made our interpretation less straightforward than one would have liked. Again, please note that we have emphasized modal tendencies in survey responses; there are sometimes marked differences in intensity of training among programs, based on their unique missions and values. There are very few programs that emphasized academic or CPP skills exclusively. Moreover, in this article we have not analyzed the extent of any differences between types of programs, such as doctoral vs. master’s level, or community psychology, community-clinical/counseling psychology, and interdisciplinary programs.

Finally, our findings suggest that it would be beneficial to continue to discuss and possibly revise or elaborate Scott’s (2007) proposed list of core competencies. Scott’s list provides a very good start for programs interested in training CPPs, but it is not very clear if every aspiring practitioner needs to master all of those skills or should just focus on certain skills. Furthermore, it is not clear how to measure the level of proficiency for each competency and which set of competencies should be acquired in the classroom versus in the community, which makes assessing programs based on core competencies very difficult. In addition, adding skills such as resource development, leadership, and service delivery might be needed to account for a larger range of possible career options for community practitioners.

Conclusion

This article presented original qualitative and quantitative data and analysis based on 2008 SCRA survey of graduate programs. Qualitative data analysis indicated that there is a diversity of definitions of Community Psychology Practice (CPP) and training approaches among graduate programs in community research and action, as well as a lack of clear definitions in some cases. Although diversity in definitions and training can be considered a strength, and seen as promoting creativity and program initiative, it might not put students interested in CPP in the best position in a increasingly competitive job market. Moreover, the qualitative data showed that several programs do not have specific criteria in place for evaluating their training of practitioners. The quantitative results suggested that there is a high emphasis on program development and applied/community research, and lower emphasis on training in collaboration, consultation, and advocacy, and related skills. What should be concluded from these results? Does this mean programs should switch their emphasis to a more balanced research/practice curriculum? Will training students according to the same core competencies work for every program? Should all graduate programs in community psychology have the same...
definition of community practice? How should the effectiveness of training in community psychology practice be measured? 
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A Time for Action: How to Move Forward Based on the Survey Results

Written by 
Tom Wolff, Tom Wolff and Associates

Background
At least 50% of graduates from Community Psychology graduate programs (Masters and Doctorate) do not take positions in academia but rather enter the world of practice. The field has little idea about where they go? What is their practice? Did their graduate education help them succeed in their community psychology practice? 
What have we learned from this survey about the practice of community psychology and how well we train students to be professional practitioners? 
First, we learned that only about a third of the graduate programs have a definition of community psychology practice that guides their curriculum. This is troublesome. How do you create a graduate program without a working definition of the field?
The trends from the survey results on the skills and competencies suggest that students are much more likely to get certain skills and competencies in their required courses than others. The more likely skills to be exposed to are: evaluation, ethics, research, applying information, ecological understanding, program planning, professional judgement. The less likely skills to be exposed to are: dissemination, resource development, advocacy, political skills, capacity building, organizational assessment, group process, collaborations, community organizing, leadership, and service delivery. Are these the skills that the students are seeking? Are these the skills that the job market is looking for and that society needs? What does this say about the balance of research and action for the field?

Based on these findings what are our obligations as a field to our students? To the field? To society? What is the potential for the field to do a better job? How do we get there? 
Are basic standards for the training of community psychology practitioners a direction to pursue? If not how do we move the field forward?

To move this discussion forward I propose the following:

Core Requirements for Graduate Programs in Community Psychology that prepare students for the practice of Community Psychology

Premise:
In order to ensure the legitimacy of the field of community psychology practice, SCRA and the Council on Educational Programs need to create some core definitions and expectations regarding the training of community psychology practitioners. These will not be as demanding and restricting as APA requirements of clinical programs but they will move beyond the present stance that every program has carte blanche rights to determine their own definitions and processes. Each graduate program that trains any community psychology practitioners would be required to do the following:

1. Have a program definition of community psychology practice
2. Describe clear pathways for achieving competence as a community psychology practitioner (based on the definition of practice) 
3. Define the specialty areas that are available in their department with a description of the core competencies tied to each specialty area
4. Describe where students can access the educational opportunities that will provide them with the core competencies for their specialty areas: 
   • Inside the department 
   • Outside the department but in the University 
   • External training 
   • Practicum 
   • Supervision/mentoring 
5. Provide exposure/experience with community 
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psychologists, practitioners as role models/mentors, adjunct faculty, etc
6. Track program graduates to be able to assess level of success in practice

To move this proposal along based on the powerful survey results I propose:

1. That students and faculty take these questions back to their programs for discussion, and
2. That the Council on Educational Programs gather feedback from these discussions and pursue consideration of adoption and dissemination of these Core Requirements for graduate programs

This is the perfect time for us to address these issues. Clarity on how we train our graduate students for practice will:

• Help move the field forward,
• Help students emerge with marketable skills,
• Help employers know what community psychology graduate students can do (see the Values Proposition), and
• Help graduate programs be clearer on what they do. The time is ripe for such changes. ☺

Endnote: Member of the Society for Community Research and Action’s Community Practice Group.

Graduate Training: An Action Agenda

Written by
Bill Berkowitz, University of Massachusetts Lowell

Another comprehensive survey. Another detailed and revealing set of data. And now the real work begins.

For with this survey, as with most surveys, the name of the game is implementation. Without implementation, the best of surveys will surely meet the delete key, or the recycling bin, a short while down the road.

So if we value these survey results—as we should—what do we do with them, and how do we do it?

Let’s try this: here are some of the key recommendations emerging from the survey and from commentaries past and present, but this time summarized briefly and recast in the form of training objectives for us to achieve by the time of the 2011 Biennial. Suppose we said that by then we will:

• Agree upon some basic community competencies that ought to be taught
• Implement a process for noting the career pathways of our graduates, as one indicator of training success.
• Share relevant outcomes and materials, as adapted, with prospective new students, other psychology colleagues, and, especially, employers

Does that much seem realistic, and doable? I think so. As with most initiatives, there will need to be some structure to support the effort, plus some leadership to drive it. We’ll also need an easy and multi-directional communication process, linking our different schools (through a separate list-serve, or wiki?). But we have the Council of Education Programs; we have momentum; and it looks like we have the key ingredient of desire. Combined, that’s a winning recipe for successful action.

So here’s a vote and a hope for narrowing the words-to-action ratio, choosing specific objectives for our training agenda, setting not-too-distant timelines for their achievement, and marking each success. That next Biennial should be something to look forward to . . . . ☺

Endnote: Member of the Society for Community Research and Action’s Community Practice Group.

Commentary on Educating Community Psychologists for Community Practice: A Cautionary Note and Some Directions Forward

Written by
Gabriel P. Kuperminc, Georgia State University

The results of the 2008 survey of graduate programs point to some challenges for graduate training programs. Are we preparing our students adequately for the skills most of them will need as practicing community psychologists? As the director of one of the 62% of programs that responded that, yes, we are doing an effective job of training community based practitioners, I must own up also to being among the 64% of programs that have not yet articulated a specific definition of community psychology practice
Caution #1: Assuming that required coursework in practice-oriented skills will solve the problem.

In his comments, Tom Wolff (this issue) outlines the skills that many practicing community psychologists (whose work is primarily done outside the academy) draw upon most often. These, admittedly, are not the skills for which many graduate programs are typically focusing their required coursework. In our program students do get exposed to those practice skills through course electives, field practica, and through their work with faculty. But is that enough to ensure the development of competent community psychology practitioners?

Recognizing a gap between the training we provide and the skills many, if not most, of our students will require in their careers, we began a process about a year ago of soul-searching, revisiting, and revamping the curriculum for our doctoral program in community psychology and our joint program in clinical-community psychology. To make a long story short, our (still evolving) solution did not involve more required coursework, but less of it. We view our challenge not as addressing a dichotomy between academia and practice (more on this later), but preparing students for careers that span community consultation, public health research and practice, community-based clinical work, and academia (to name a few). We reduced the number of required courses, reframed some of our existing courses to lessen redundancy and maximize synergy (e.g., creating a 1-year sequence that covers program evaluation, ecological assessment, and community consultation), and shifted much of the responsibility to students and their advisors for constructing a professional specialization. To assist with the latter, we articulated three broad “tracks” that students can use to identify and make decisions about the career paths they wish to pursue. These include career paths in (1) Applied Research and Practice, (2) Empowerment and Social Justice and (3) General Community Psychology. Finally, our students are required to complete a series of three field practica, at least one of which must emphasize research skills (e.g., program evaluation) and at least one of which must emphasize practice-oriented skills (e.g., advocacy, capacity building). We are currently developing a system for identifying and documenting the professional competencies for which students gain exposure through their practicum experiences. We plan to extend this to coursework as well.

Caution #2: Assuming a clear dichotomy between practice and academic versions of community psychology.

Our task would be much easier if all we had to worry about was preparing students for careers either as practitioners or academics. However, training in community psychology opens doors to many and diverse career trajectories. This state of affairs may be somewhat of a curse, particularly to a maturing field struggling to define the boundaries of its practice, but let’s admit that it is also a blessing for those of us who like a little variety (and maybe some ambiguity) in our lives. Such variety comes to us whether we sit most of the time in the academy or the “real world.” My own practice of community psychology involves activities such as training/capacity building, program and curriculum development, and applied research; I engage in these activities both in my academic and in my part-time independent consultant roles. I am impressed by the ease with which many of my “practitioner” colleagues are able to step into an academic role as a classroom instructor or a researcher. Many of the requisite competencies for research and practice are transferable across roles.

Summary

The 2008 survey of community programs represents an important step forward for our field. One outcome of the survey is that it has catalyzed a hearty debate and the beginnings of a fruitful collaboration between the Council of Education Programs and the practice group within the Society for Community Research and Action. Clearly articulating what it means to practice community psychology, and delineating the specialty areas offered by diverse training programs are movements toward the maturation of our field. The tension between academic and practice-oriented community psychology is real and deserves serious deliberation and action. Whereas I’ve argued that many of the competencies are transferable across roles, the survey results remind us that graduate training continues to emphasize the ones most relevant to an academic career, and de-emphasize the ones most critical to CPP. We owe it to ourselves, our students, and the communities we work in to achieve some clarity in what we are and are not training our students to do, but in doing so we must avoid choosing a narrow path that constrains our field’s capacity for innovation and adapting to a rapidly changing world (Sarason, 1981).
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Commentary on the SCRA-CEP 2008 Survey of Graduate Programs: Is it Realistic to Develop Universal Core Competencies for Training in Community Psychology?

Written by
Gregor V. Sarkisian and Sylvie Taylor, Antioch University

As community psychologists who teach in an Applied Community Psychology (ACP) specialization within a Master’s level clinical psychology program, we view the efforts of SCRA to survey graduate programs as a useful tool to guide reflection on the development of training in community psychology. Below, we provide a brief commentary on the 2008 survey of graduate training programs in the field.

The SCRA lists 82 graduate training programs in or closely related to community psychology in the U.S. and internationally (SCRA, 2009). Given that these training programs are located in a diverse range of geographic, cultural, political, and institutional contexts, we do not find it surprising that results from the 2008 survey indicated there was no widely shared definition of Community Psychology Practice (CPP) or that there was great variability in competencies emphasized by programs. As community psychologists, we shouldn’t be surprised at the influence that local contexts have on the development of training programs, especially in the absence of an agreed upon definition of CPP and core competencies within the field.

Taken as a whole, the results of the 2008 survey suggest that community psychology training programs have two emerging foci — applied/action research and CPP. It is safe to assume that training programs which prioritize applied/action research are primarily located in doctoral level research institutions while CPP-focused programs are typically found at the master’s level. In an effort to honor the need for both research and practice, it is important to recognize that the type (context) of institution in which the training program is housed will dictate the research or practice focus, typically limiting the range of competencies students can develop. Additionally, the curriculum, traditional mentoring opportunities, and intensity of study are significantly different in master’s and doctoral programs. This may indicate a need to address competencies at different levels of depth within each degree (M.A., Ph.D.).

Our experience as a CPP-focused M.A. program in a teaching (non-research) institution is that we are limited in our ability to assist students in developing their applied research skills. These limitations include a unit-limit on our curriculum and the number of faculty available to teach advanced research methods to an adult population of students who may have very limited or no exposure to research methods at the undergraduate level.

While the idea of developing a set of core competencies may be more marketable to potential employers and students interested in the field, it may be unrealistic to assume that all, if any program, has adequate resources to train students in a universally agreed upon core set of competencies. However, a set of competencies that represents the range of skills used in community psychology would be useful for training programs in articulating the core competencies they offer as well as instructive in identifying areas for curricular development.

It is also important to recognize that no matter the focus of a given program, students bring with them their own talents and interests, which despite our best efforts at student selection, often contribute heavily to academic and applied interests that students will develop. Similarly, as students are exposed to new material in their academic program, new interests may emerge that take them far afield from the interests they articulated at the time of admission. In describing the difference between graduate programs of the past and future in one of the first published commentaries on training programs in community psychology, Newbrough (1972) articulated a student-centered approach that is informative to current efforts to better understand core competencies of CPP and graduate training programs:

In a truly transactional educational process, the students and the teachers are both learners in the process, each developing his [or her] own career. The purpose of graduate training becomes the discovery and development of interests that lead one into his [or her] professional life. Graduate school then becomes the initial stage of career development rather than an elongated period of socialization into a social order that requires all to have shared the same experiences and to have learned by imitation (p. 771).

Our programs, at all levels, must possess the flexibility to take advantage of and nurture these emerging interests and passions. It is here, when creativity and curiosity are maximized, that the field has the greatest potential for growth and innovation.
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Commentary on the 2008 Survey of Community Research and Action Graduate Programs: Random Thoughts from a Community Practitioner

Written by
Susan M. Wolfe, Fort Worth Independent School District

As I reviewed the results of the 2008 Survey of Community Research and Action Graduate Programs and read the article by Dziadkowiec and Jimenez (this issue), I had random thoughts that centered on three areas.

The Need for an Articulated Statement

The need for an articulated statement of community-based practice goes hand-in-hand with the field’s larger need for a value proposition. How many times have each of us been asked “What is a community psychologist?” There is probably wide variation in how each of us would answer this question depending on which program we came out of, what we have been doing in the community, and our own sense of what being a community psychologist has meant to us. An articulated statement would help students and practitioners to better define the boundaries of what we do, how we overlap with other disciplines and professions, and how we are distinct. It would allow us to find our common ground for interdisciplinary work with other disciplines while articulating the unique skills and perspectives we bring to the table.

Interdisciplinary Programs

Although not discussed in the article, survey results indicated that fewer than 20 percent of programs were a blend of community psychology with a discipline other than clinical psychology. For community psychologists interested in specializing in specific areas (i.e., programming for children or adolescents, health policy, workplace interventions) having a minor or cognate in a related field can vastly improve subject competency. Having worked in many fields throughout my career, the additional knowledge I acquired through coursework in organizational psychology and business and my developmental psychology degree provided me with useful theoretical frameworks for developing research and evaluation models, an understanding of the mechanisms that underlie the interventions, and additional skills to add to my repertoire.

The flip side of merging community psychology with other disciplines is the opportunity to introduce community skills and theories into training programs for public health officials, developmental psychology practitioners, organizational consultants and other practices. These fields would benefit greatly from a deeper understanding of prevention, empowerment, ecological theories, for instance. I am currently living in a population dense metroplex that is essentially devoid of community psychologists, despite the preponderance of universities and graduate programs. I have seen gaps in expertise in my community that could best be filled by individuals with community psychology training. For example, a recent request for proposals issued by a major medical center for an evaluator for a community based program was unsuccessful in finding someone with the requisite skills and training.

Training for Community Practice Skills

The third, and most compelling, findings that stood out as I reviewed the survey results were the number of skills that are “intermediate” or “low intensity” skills. Having worked as a community practitioner for most of my career, I have gained a good sense of what skills are needed to navigate community based organizations. Skills such as resource development, advocacy skills, organizational assessment, development and consultation, group process skills, building and maintaining collaborations, dissemination and communication skills, community organizing skills and service delivery planning and management are all critical to be effective in community based work.

Let’s begin with resource development. The most obvious resource is money. How many recent graduates really know how to seek out and secure grant funding from multiple sources? Navigating the world of foundations, state and federal government grants, and corporate funding is tricky. Furthermore, understanding how to develop a budget, what format and style are appropriate for each source, how to network with potential funding sources, and how to decide the proper source for your program or research are necessary skills. Having good resource development skills can sometimes be a good entry point for community psychologists who are working to break into a new community or problem area. Most everyone welcomes the individual who knows how to get money.

Resource development can also include understanding what resources are necessary to work on a problem at hand (i.e., people, tools, information), or build an initiative and then understanding the best avenues for obtaining or developing them. Graduate students are all trained to write literature reviews and seek out the most credible research findings. Volumes of money are spent on programs and ideas that are based on nothing (e.g., D.A.R.E.). Being able to provide solid information and identify proven methods and programs can go a long way to prevent money from being spent on ineffective programs.

Dissemination and communication are another core skill set that community practitioners cannot be without. We all have to write papers, master’s theses and/or dissertations. However, the style of writing we are taught in graduate school and to use for publishable journal articles is not very useful when working in community based settings. How many programs include a lesson on how to write up a research report so that someone with a high school education or less can understand it? How many teach students how to condense their research report so that someone with a high school education or less can understand it? How many programs include a lesson on how to write up a research report so that someone with a high school education or less can understand it? How many programs include a lesson on how to write up a research report so that someone with a high school education or less can understand it? How many teach students how to condense their research report so that someone with a high school education or less can understand it? How many programs include a lesson on how to write up a research report so that someone with a high school education or less can understand it? How many teach students how to condense their research report so that someone with a high school education or less can understand it? How many programs include a lesson on how to write up a research report so that someone with a high school education or less can understand it? How many teach students how to condense their research report so that someone with a high school education or less can understand it? How many programs include a lesson on how to write up a research report so that someone with a high school education or less can understand it? How many teach students how to condense their research report so that someone with a high school education or less can understand it? How many programs include a lesson on how to write up a research report so that someone with a high school education or less can understand it? How many teach students how to condense their research report so that someone with a high school education or less can understand it? How many programs include a lesson on how to write up a research report so that someone with a high school education or less can understand it? How many teach students how to condense their research report so that someone with a high school education or less can understand it? How many programs include a lesson on how to write up a research report so that someone with a high school education or less can understand it? How many teach students how to condense their research report so that someone with a high school education or less can understand it?
very hard to determine the point of the presentation, or worked to stay attentive as the presenter droned on? If we are not able to engage our peers, how can we hope to interest members of a community who do not speak “academese.” Another related skill is being able to handle media interviews and writing for popular press. Knowing what to say and how to frame things can go a long way toward avoiding misquotes by eager reporters.

Communities often need individuals who can take on leadership roles, or participate on committees or coalitions. In this capacity, a community psychologist will need advocacy skills, group process skills, skills to build and maintain collaborations, community organizing skills and training in service delivery, planning and management. Being able to conduct an organizational assessment, provide organizational development guidance and consultations, and capacity building are all skills that are needed in many communities and organizations.

Endnote: Member of the Society for Community Research and Action’s Community Practice Group.

Community Psychology Practice Training: Reflections from a Developing Community Psychologist

Written by Tiffeny R. Jimenez, Michigan State University

I became a student in the field of community psychology because I aspire to make contributions to society that will bring about social justice and human welfare. I believe that the underlying values and methods of this discipline can be a fertile training ground for learning the skills necessary to bring about needed social change for and with marginalized communities of people. As a doctoral candidate working as a practitioner while in a community psychology program, I believe that we can do an even better job of training our future undergraduate and graduate student change agents. Although I am a co-author of the article that begins this special section, I asked to write a commentary to address more directly a few questions that have come to mind about community psychology practice (CPP) training.

Question 1: Are we currently providing sufficient training for CPP?

The SCRA Mission Statement asserts that “[SCRA’s] members are committed to promoting health and empowerment and to preventing problems in communities, groups, and individuals” and that a main goal of SCRA is “to promote the development of careers in community research and action in both academic and applied settings” (http://www.scr27.org/about-2). The fact that at least half of recent graduates of SCRA graduate programs are employed in community settings, and students are increasingly interested in finding careers in positions outside of the academy (Hazel, 2007), makes the specific training needs of community psychology practitioners (CPPs) a serious priority for our field. Not only because CPPs desire to find jobs but also to ensure that they are equipped with the skills necessary to be effective community change agents. As a student, I am concerned about finding a job after graduation, but it is even more important to me that I learn how to do that job in a way that will bring us closer to a more socially just world. Given the lack of clarity in defining CPP or how to evaluate effectiveness in training for such a role (as is represented in the survey data), I conclude that we must do better.

Question 2: What does it mean to be an effective community psychologist in applied community settings?

In reviewing whether programs have a definition of CPP, I noted that 3 programs used the definition of community psychology as their definition of CPP. This finding made me consider whether a separate definition of CPP was appropriate. Historically, founders of the field have warned about the need to overcome the dichotomy between the academy and the community (Hazel, 2007), and emphasized the role of participant conceptualizer. Inherent in this role involves an intentional balance between community practice and community conceptualization (or science). I initially felt that the creation of a separate definition of CPP would only further divide the field into scientists and practitioners, but given the lack of credibility and value that practitioners experience within our field (Hazel, Meissen, Snell-Johns, & Wolff, 2006), and the potential for their work to create meaningful social change, I believe a definition of CPP is in order. How will we know if we are effective in training community psychologists that obtain jobs in applied community settings unless we understand the role of community practice in the community and in our discipline?

Question 3: How to move forward in supporting the development of more effective CPPs?

In my 6 years as a graduate student and 3 years of learning to do community psychology practice I have used almost all of the competencies listed by Scott (2007), but I was not trained in all of them. Some of the work I have been asked to do was familiar to me because of my graduate program training and some was quite unfamiliar and unexpected. When I knew something about the role I needed to play (e.g., an evaluator), I was able to turn to existing literature and to my advisors to guide my actions, but for those roles I needed to play that I was not trained in (e.g., community organizing), it was a difficult learning curve that included a lot of trial and error. While we can learn from observing competent advisors and reading relevant literature, those resources are not always helpful.

The issue of how to go about training confident, competent and effective professionals is nothing new. Organizations grapple with this issue continually and turning to the literature on leadership development can provide some direction for how to think about training CPPs. The most effective leadership trainings incorporate experiential or action learning (Olivares, 2008) and reflective
writing (Densten & Gray, 2001). Our field has much to learn about what actually happens within community change processes (both what goes wrong and what goes right) and CPPs could be filling this void with written reflections of their experiences. In supporting the development of more effective CPPs, training programs could find ways of assisting their students with how to balance time needed for research, action, and reflection as well as emphasize the value inherent within each throughout their training and careers. I think that there is something to be gained from personal experience because we know in our individual roles in practice whether we are effective or not. Having CPPs write up those experiences for publication, or present them more often in conferences and graduate courses could be a way to reflect and refine their practice while also providing a unique contribution to the field.
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**Being Intentional about Community Psychology Practice Education**

**Written by**

**Written by Greg Meissen, Wichita State University**

When I read the results of the most recent survey of Graduate Training Programs presented in the lead article “Educating Community Psychologists for Community Psychology Training: A Survey of Graduate Training Programs” the question that kept coming to mind was; “Imagine if we were intentional about the education of community psychology practitioners?”

The results of the survey are marked by a lack of intentionality regarding the education of those who wish to engage in community psychology practice. Most programs do not have a definition of community psychology practice and most of the definitions provided by the minority were vague at best. That the categories were; 1) “community psychology practice is the application of community psychology theory and values”, 2) “community psychology practice is research and social action”, and 3) “community psychology practice is gained in the community” clearly shows this lack of intentionality.

One has to wonder if many graduate programs rather benignly operated under the illusion that few of our graduates are engaged in community psychology practice and that few of our students really want to work predominantly in community settings.

For years I operated under the illusion that most of our graduates from the free standing community psychology doctoral program at Wichita State University were working primarily in research and academic settings. Even though I could have told you where almost every one of our graduates was currently working, it took a survey of our graduates for me to discover that well over half were actually doing great work in community settings and that if we carefully analyzed their jobs close to 75% were engaged much more in community psychology practice than academic based research. About the same time we had a session with all our current students (n=30) regarding jobs and professional development. I was so obliviously thinking that the current group were more academically oriented that I asked our students to move into 3 groups: those who clearly intended to go into academic/research jobs, those who clearly intended to do community psychology practice and those who were not sure. About 75% intended to do community psychology practice, 25% intended to find an academic job, and nobody went to the “unsure” group.

Those in the practice group spoke passionately about their desire to make their communities better places but they just did not want to do that work in an academic setting. “Nothing personal” one said. They fully intended to use their applied research skills which they thought would be frequently but admitted they would likely not publish that work in peer reviewed journals. Those who wanted an academic position spoke with similar passion about their desire to make communities better and that they also intended to engage in practice but wanted to work in an academic setting in order to teach, that they really liked being at a university, and yes, they would be publishing in peer reviewed journals as they also liked the idea of having a tenured position. The difference was more about the setting and the nature of the work product than the actual work.

Community psychology attracts highly competent young people with outstanding values who care deeply about their communities and the populations they serve. The conclusion I draw from the results of this survey is that it is time for community psychology to become intentional and deliberate about providing high quality community practice skills for the great students in our programs regardless of the setting in which they want to work.

**Endnote:** Member of the Society for Community Research and Action’s Community Practice Group.
Strengthening Community Practice in Today’s World

Biennial Address by
Bill Berkowitz, University of Massachusetts Lowell

Editor’s Note: This is a slightly edited version of a talk presented at the 12th Biennial Conference of the Society for Community Research and Action in Montclair, NJ in June 2009, in connection with the Biennial Legacy Program and the receipt of the 2009 John Kalafat Practitioner Award for Applied Community Practice.

Thank you. It’s such an honor, of course, to receive this community practitioner award, in John’s name, and as part of this legacy program. John’s talents, as I’ve come to know them—his commitment to prevention, to collaboration, to empowerment, to outreach, to making our knowledge available to everyone—capture what community psychology is all about. And when we add to that John’s personal traits of kindness, a sense of humor, passion, compassion—each of these so important for doing distinctive community work—it’s clear we are truly fortunate to have all these qualities exemplified in this award.

The very good news is that there are so many people, hundreds of people, like John in this room, who I believe possess many of the same qualities. In fact, we could truthfully say that in this room right now is the greatest concentration of community energy and talent that may ever have been seen in Northern New Jersey, or on this planet at this particular moment. Collectively, we are a major force for positive community good.

So in my remarks for the next few minutes, I’d like to comment on how we might best use that energy, those qualities of skill and will, of mind and heart, to strengthen community practice in our current social and community environment.

To begin, I believe there’s never been a better time to be a community psychologist. There’s never been a better time to practice community psychology, for us, or for anyone. There’s never been a time when our work has been more necessary. There’s never been a better time, not just because we are dealing with social problems unprecedented in most of our lifetimes—that’s a long list; I won’t elaborate here—but rather because of what those problems mean for our community life.

For state and local governments in particular are pulling back; the traditional supports they have provided are becoming harder to fund and sustain. If state and local government can’t or won’t or don’t provide them, then if those supports and our community quality of life are to be maintained, the responsibility for doing so will need to come from somewhere else. And that means from community members themselves. And that means us, as community members ourselves, as well as in our practitioner role.

It’s an axiom by now that we all need social and emotional support to function well in life. The community level is where we can get much of the support we need. Especially for those who have been out of work, and for those whose security is threatened, and for those who are overwhelmed with multiple obligations and pressures, stressed and stretched to the breaking point, much of what they require can come from the community around them.

Or if a playground begins to deteriorate, or if an after-school program is eliminated, or if an arts program is slashed, or if the senior center is overwhelmed with cases because public agencies cannot respond to them—then to maintain community quality of life is up to the community itself. It’s their job.

And it’s our job, too, because maintaining and improving community life is something we know how to do. We know how to bring people together for common good. We know how to persuade. We know how to get people to participate. We know how to help resolve community conflicts. We know how to publicize, how to advocate, how to evaluate. And we have, or certainly should have, the relationship skills that are so necessary for success.

There are principles of behavior that govern these activities, and we know many of them. We know how community life works. There’s a technology for this by now, or perhaps we should call it a community science, following the usage of David Chavis. We have this science in part because of those who have come before us—the Don Kleins, and the Jack Glidewells, and the Joe Zins, and the Sarasons, Kellys, Cowens, Iscoes, Swifts, Dohrenwends, and Rappaports, and the John Kalafats, on whose shoulders we stand, with the responsibility to reach higher.

So there are daily opportunities for community practice, right outside our door, which have become part of our professional and personal responsibility. Then given the needs before us, and given our skills, this should be a breakthrough moment for community psychology. This should be the time for us to emerge from backstage, and into brighter lights. And this should be the time, and it is the time, for community psychology to move front and center out into the national arena.

There’s never been a better time to practice community psychology . . . .
There’s never been a time when our work has been more necessary.

Yet it’s also true that our profession is not front and center; it’s never had that kind of impact. Community psychology is not yet embedded in mainstream thought, nor in the national dialogue. We’ve not yet reached our potential as a discipline. In the last presidential campaign, as in any previous national campaign, the quality of community life has not come up as a campaign issue. No candidate says: “I pledge to you to create a cohesive and vibrant community.” The new Obama administration has not put out a call for community psychologists. [“We want you. . .”] Maybe you’re
different, but my phone hasn’t rung yet. Nor have there been calls from the state house, or city hall.

Nor do we have much of a media presence. Few of us have been in the national media. We’re not on the best-seller list, or YouTube’s most watched, or Twitter’s most followed. We’re not on Oprah. It’s been challenging enough to make ourselves visible within APA, though Carol Goodheart’s [the then-incoming APA President] being here today is a definite first, a significant event, and in my view a major step forward.

If this much is true, what explains our lack of national impact? One reason, not surprisingly, is that we are small. There are more than 300 million Americans, and almost 7 billion people on earth, but only about 1000 of us, give or take. That’s not very many. In addition, while our numbers of graduate programs have grown over the years, our overall membership has not grown commensurately. It’s hard to be effective and to do the practice work that needs to be done if you don’t have the people. And since there are about 20,000 incorporated places just in the U.S., not counting neighborhoods, or blocks, or other small divisions, we certainly can’t do it on a one-to-one basis. If we’ve ever wanted a challenge, here it is.

So how do we proceed, when we are so small? How do we extend the reach of our practice, and optimize our impact? That’s a longer speech, not for this occasion. Rather than a detailed agenda, then, I’ll propose three directions for our consideration. All of them have to do with leveraging, with becoming force multipliers, with maximizing our power through modest effort. We ought to become like first class levers in the physical world, but here generating more impact through the very powerful principle of social leverage, for positive community goals.

There are several ways to do this:

First, we need to exert leverage through the media, and work more diligently to get our message out, through all the media outlets available to us.

A few of us have been burned, but I’m one for working with the media. The media may sometimes misquote and distort, but ultimately the media should be our ally. We need the media to be our ally. The media are the most effective way we have for raising community consciousness and building community skills. They are essential for us to reach and involve the general public.

Closer to home, that includes leveraging our work through the APA Practice Directorate, the APA web page, the APA Media Office, and the APA Monitor. Beyond that, it means leveraging the media through local newspaper columns, in tip sheets, in blogs, in more YouTube videos like Lenny Jason’s, in community makeovers on television (thank you, Rhonda Lewis), in Facebook or your favorite social networking sites, through RSS feeds, through community book groups and film festivals, through any and all formats, using whatever it takes.

As another example, we now have a revived and active Publications Committee, which is excellent. We’re talking about a new publication series, excellent as well. But it would be excellent, too, if some proportion of effort could go into reaching not just us—though that is good—but also the many millions of people who could learn and should learn more about how to do good community work, if we committed ourselves to reach them; and we can. We haven’t tried hard enough to utilize the media and engage the general public. We should make it a priority.

A second avenue for leverage is with our own students, at all stages in the pipeline, but also, and especially, keeping in touch with

**We ought to become like first class levers in the physical world, but here generating more impact through the very powerful principle of social leverage.**

...
members become not just passive recipients, but leading actors, valued collaborators, and full partners in the struggle.

And we can do all of that. Great things, and amazing things, are possible in community life.

As just one example, let me invite you to guess what’s in this bag [shows blown-up photo taken from bag]. This is actually a photograph of a crowd, taken at Boston City Hall several years ago, celebrating the first Super Bowl championship of the New England Patriots, our local pro football team. One and a quarter million people—that’s one-third the population of the entire Boston metropolitan area—came out for this celebration in the middle of the week, on a frigid day in February, including, not surprisingly, some of my own students. Vast numbers of people, a million and more, will, and have, come out under the right circumstances: the largest of public demonstrations, the Million Man March, New Year’s Eve in Times Square. As a different example, we know how to raise a million dollars in single day: the Walk for Hunger, a pledge walk in Boston, makes over $3 million in one day every year.

We may not draw a million, or make a million, but if we can draw even a small fraction of that for a community-building event, we’re doing well. We can do that, under the right conditions. And we know how to create them.

What’s more, we have done it, in our history. For instance, Robert Putnam, in Bowling Alone, writes of civil defense volunteers during World War Two: “In Chicago in April, 1942 sixteen thousand block captains [!] took the oath of allegiance in a mass ceremony in the [Chicago] Coliseum.” During that war, Putnam notes, there were 7.5 million Red Cross volunteers, and “nearly twenty million Victory Gardens in backyards and vacant lots, yielding 40 percent of all vegetables grown in the country.” Those were different times, but people will take part—under the right conditions.

In our everyday world, encouraging and working with others in community practice, of course, doesn’t have to involve massive or large-scale events. The scale can be smaller, and much more part of daily life. This spring in Rockland, Massachusetts, a relatively lower-income community near me, residents voted to raise their own property taxes an average of $427 each year in order to support the local public schools. The leader of the campaign, the mother of a school-age child, said in a news story: “My husband had been laid off, but we were willing to make sacrifices. [Because] our schools and community are one of the most important investments we can make in our lifetime.”

Her words bear repeating: “Our schools and community are one of the most important investments we can make in our lifetime.” This mother is not alone, for we can find many people like her, even at this juncture in our society. These are our practitioners. These are the people we want to work with. They will act without our help, but what we can do in our community practice is to look for the energy that is already there—to nurture it, to cultivate it, stimulate it, catalyze it, coalesce it, leverage it, fan its flame—pick your metaphor, or pick all of them.

This can take place through very traditional community programs such as block watches and park clean-ups, or more recently popular activities such as community gardens or skill exchanges, or more original events, such as neighborhood yoga camp, or street alumni days, or movie night at the park, or the long-awaited community psychology musical. Any of this can occur with or without electronic technology, a topic most deserving of a separate address.

But whatever the form of such activity, wherever the energy lies, we will take it. For we are energy detectives, and our role as practitioners is to find community energy and build upon it: to leverage people’s abilities, and help them leverage the power of others, onto the next level of community success.

That’s the way it’s got to be done. Citizen motivation is there. As one of my mentors taught me: “People want to do meaningful civic work.” Not everyone. Not all the time. But most people, some of the time. Under the right conditions.

These three directions are positive and feasible pathways for us to follow as community psychologists and as community practitioners. Through our community practice, we can both imagine and create communities and neighborhoods that are sustainable and self-sustaining. We can create a community life that is strong, cohesive, and supportive; where isolation is rare; where everyone feels connected to each other; where people cooperate freely; where everyone knows, gives, and receives the resources available in the community, and where those resources are continually being renewed and generated. And through our community practice, we can create a community life that is uplifting and joyful in its own right, one that resonates deep in the soul.

Again the good news: we essentially know how to make all this happen. When we draw upon the legacy of those who’ve come before us, we already have most of the skills to do it. And when we blend those skills with the personal attributes of leaders like John Kalafat, those attributes of spirit and heart, the quality of our work will surely be strengthened. As another of my mentors has written:

The basic social institution is the individual human heart. It is the source of the social energy from which all social action derives its power and purpose.

In other words, the best community work calls upon the best we have to offer as human beings—skill and will, intellect and spirit, head and heart. What a great profession we are in.

In the broader scheme of things, we don’t know how the
national and world situation will play out in the years ahead. Nobody does for sure; assured knowledge of the future eludes us. The economy may turn around, and the economic and social climate may get better; it would certainly be wonderful if that happens. Or things may get worse. Or they may stay roughly the same, or wobble uncertainly for some time. We don’t know.

Under any of these conditions, strong community and neighborhood life will be valuable in and of itself. But if economic and social conditions stay the same, or if they get worse, strong communities and neighborhoods will become that much more important, as a buffer against various types of adversity we may face.

Strong community life is a form of social security; and even better, it’s a renewable resource, infinitely replenishable, and available to all, even if you haven’t paid much into the system. And strong community life is health insurance, a form of universal coverage, free of charge. It is insurance funded neither by government, nor by private insurers, but by our own caring human natures.

That’s our job, to create those kinds of communities—secure and healthy, sustainable and joyful. That’s our community practice. And we are all in fact community practitioners, perhaps in varying degree; but it’s part of our work, for all of us. In this field, we cannot avoid doing practice any more than we can avoid the methods of empirical study or the values of promoting human welfare.

It’s been a privilege to offer these thoughts to you in John’s memory, and as part of this legacy program. There’s much more to come at this conference; I hope some conference ideas will travel home with you, finding a place in your mind, in your heart, and in your own community actions.

Monday morning, or some Monday soon after, we will be back at work. Great opportunities await. Let’s hope that a new chapter of our community practice will then begin.

---

Book Review
Edited by Chris Keys

A Microcosm of Community Psychology: A Review of Workplace Chemistry: Promoting Diversity Through Organizational Change by Meg A. Bond

Written by Chris Keys and Julia DiGangi

Editor’s Note: Chris Keys has collaborated with Meg Bond on other consulting and research projects, and read and commented on a draft of this book.

Microcosm is not a new idea. For example, Hal Borland, the writer and poet, saw many subtleties of autumn in a single leaf. Psychiatrist Irving Yalom among others believed that therapy groups are microcosms of their members’ interpersonal worlds.

What is new is a book that captures so much of community psychology’s core in one intervention research project. Wellness, diversity, ecology, social justice and empowerment, collaboration, systems dynamics, organizational change, and empirical grounding all make important contributions to this case study. Moreover, Meg Bond enhances our understanding of each central construct in this conceptually thick account. Workplace Chemistry focuses on Bond and her colleagues’ consultation to help make the organizational culture of ChemPro, a manufacturing company, more effectively supportive of gender and racial diversity, particularly of women and Blacks (viz., African-Americans raised in the northern United States, African-Americans raised in the southern United States and African-Caribbeans). In so doing, she enacted the concepts that animate our field. She took a stance that enhanced individual and organizational wellness and empowerment by affirming individuals, not blaming them or dwelling on their deficits in order to account for sexist and racist elements in the workplace. She put gender and race at the forefront of the people issues facing Chempro. She built ties with the organization and positively involved its members, effectively bridging differences in gender, race, class, for-profit and not-for-profit, and town and gown. She recognized her own and her intervention’s ecological embeddedness in the ChemPro organization and its historical, systemic and societal contexts. She advocated for social justice and simultaneously valued and respected the people with whom she was working. She developed sound assessment, training, team development and institutional change strategies that complemented one another and enabled ChemPro to address its gender and racial concerns in their complexity. Her sense of the organization and system dynamics is at times almost lyrical, or as lyrical as social science language allows. Bond has a perceptive interventionist’s ear for complexity in language that evokes the multilayered contradictions of systems change. She used data, qualitative and quantitative, behavioral and attitudinal, archival and observational, present and past to help define the issues, develop the interventions and assess their impact.

Consultation is not a new form of action. It has an important place “before the beginning” in the development of community psychology. At the Harvard School of Public Health in the 1940s and 1950s, Erich Lindemann and Gerald Caplan developed community consultation and began to educate consultants. They trained the founders of community psychology including Don Klein, Jim Kelly and Bob Newbrough in the nuance of its early ideas and practice. Seymour Sarason and his staff of budding community psychologists including Murray Levine, Ira Goldenberg and Dick Repucci at the Psycho-Educational Clinic at Yale did consultation in diverse community settings in the 1960s and 1970s. Community consultation traditions continued in the ecological and organizational consultation that Ed Trickett and Cary Cherniss among others practiced and wrote about in the 1970s and 1980s. Bond has made this work contemporary by using consultation to address issues of social justice in the workplace that may affect the viability of organizations in the 1990s to the present. In so doing, she has broadened and deepened the perspective of much diversity training and consulting as well. She has helped expand our vision of sites.
for community psychology consultation, research and action to include the for-profit sector.

**Chempro and the Workplace Chemistry Initiative**

With uncommon access to the staff and management of the Chempro chemical company, Meg Bond set out to explore how diversity can be meaningfully integrated into day-to-day operations. For seven years, Bond and her team undertook a variety of activities to enhance appreciation for workplace diversity under a multifaceted program, named the Workplace Chemistry Initiative.

She begins her book offering a compelling “so what?” Diversity, Bond claims, is essential for equitable and efficient organizations. She explains that diverse workplaces are inevitable as diversity among workers is growing in scope and relevance. She strengthens her argument by providing evidence that suggests companies with greater diversity may outperform less diverse companies when their organizational culture is supportive of differences over time. Finally, she concludes with a moral argument, stating that “paying attention to diversity is often the right thing to do” (p. 9).

Bond presents these goals, as well as the many activities of her program, in a social, participatory ecological framework. Such a framework focuses on understanding the way systems, as well as individual personalities, interact. Using an ecological perspective in a workplace setting, Bond posits, is particularly useful because the workplace diversity is a multifaceted phenomenon that involves interaction from the individual level to the broader levels of society. She clearly and eloquently incorporates social ecology into the theory and practice underpinning her work, emphasizing interactional patterns, group dynamics and organizational inertia more than individual factors.

Bond’s definition of workplace diversity is sufficiently broad, including everything from race to gender to class to sexual orientation. For the Workplace Chemistry Initiative, she and her consulting team focused primarily on issues of gender and race. Thinking ecologically, Bond also challenges often superficial and stereotypic notions of diversity by highlighting how varied individual needs within demographic groups can add to the diversity and complexity of today’s workplaces. For example, she lucidly describes how managers’ temperaments and the frequency with which they praise or criticize their employees can strongly influence organizational culture and workplace morale.

With an ecological, participatory model as a guide, the bulk of the book describes in detail the activities that were undertaken during the seven year initiative. Abetted by the resource of time, Bond and her team gently, persistently and affirmatively aimed to reshape the organizational culture to be more supportive of women and Blacks. They used a wide variety of activities ranging from the creation of mission statements to interviews to surveys to role plays and group discussions. The activities involved innovative ways to help individuals think about themselves and others in the context of a large group with varied needs. The often generative and fun nature of the activities provided an effective and non-threatening medium for workers to reflect. They considered their interdependencies and explored how each shaped and influenced the experiences of another. Building on the ecological theme of interdependence, Bond and her team paid particular attention to the dynamics that arise between people, especially around issues of gender and race rather than the behaviors of any one problematic individual.

Much emphasis, for example, was placed on helping workers develop an awareness of what Bond calls “multiple realities.” Her goal, through a series of team building exercises and activities, was to cultivate awareness of multiple realities by raising the profile of voices of women and Blacks typically missing from teams’ narratives. More collective narratives that contained space for multiple realities, she argued, would ground workers’ self-images in a more ecologically inclusive and accurate narrative that, in turn, would create more effective, resilient and successful work environments.

As her description of these activities unfolds, Bond’s ability to discuss difficult interpersonal issues both directly and gracefully becomes apparent. Although women responded in good numbers to her initial request for interview participation, workers of color did not. She realized that some people of color feared that Keitha, the Director of Human Resources and the highest ranking African-American woman in the company, was planning to leave ChemPro. Others did not want to get involved in addressing race, especially with a consulting team of women with no African-American members. “I’ve been black long enough to know nothing is going to change”, said one Black man.

Bond and the Director of HR effectively addressed these concerns. They discussed people’s issues informally with them. The HR Director issued a memo saying that she was planning to stay and work on issues of race and gender at ChemPro. The consultants then made another request for interview volunteers and received enough responses that people of color were proportionally represented. Bond and her colleagues developed sufficient rapport to obtain high quality information about problems both of gender and of race at the plant. For example, one woman reported that her male manager had said, “women don’t belong in the workplace” and that he liked it “when I wore high heels.” However, at this early stage employees often did not own their critical comments in group discussions of feedback with their peers. Later, as trust built with the consultants and with top management on diversity issues, some Black workers took the bold step of sharing their experiences of being Black with their white team members, openly making it very clear that there are multiple realities. That many male workers of African descent live in a reality that involves regular police stops, snide race-baiting comments and the “soft bigotry of low expectations” was 180 degrees revelatory to their Caucasian counterparts.

Another valuable feature of this book is the multifaceted presentation of an organizational change effort. Bond’s sophisticated approach recognized the importance of understanding the history, local context, organization and system and usefully describes those features for us. She developed the top level organizational support essential to a long-term complex organization-wide effort. Fundamentally, she succeeded in obtaining enduring support for her intervention by helping top management to recognize that a positive workforce is essential to ChemPro’s long term survival and success. This broad vision enabled her to build support for
the intervention over time and to weather intermittent organizational crises and cutbacks that doom many interventions begun in prosperous times and seen as add-ons in hard times when other priorities come to the fore. Her adroit use of multiple methods mentioned above also enabled the Workplace Chemistry Initiative to move forward and sustain momentum even in those difficult times of more limited resources. As an effective consultant, Bond accepted where the organization and its leaders were and helped them move closer to where they wanted to be in terms of diversity issues around race and gender.

One of Bond’s gifts to community psychology is her facility with language and insight. Her rich experience has led her to articulate a number of dynamic ideas that enliven our understanding of how to help an organization more effectively engage and value the diversity of its members. She captures the tension, balance, and fluidity of organizational change and consulting in the terms she creates and uses. The culture of connection, curiously unsettling, recognition of multiple realities, equilibrium in motion, connected disruption, to name some of her terms, all describe complexities in this and many other organizational change efforts. She weaves these constructs into a valuable framework that helps us grasp the dynamic complexities of consulting. She makes supporting diversity an organizational process. She shifts our focus to transforming the soul of an organization rather than modifying more peripheral and easily specified elements.

One of the most valuable contributions of the book was the impact assessment. Frequently, consulting projects offer interesting, innovative ideas without the type of empirical follow-up that enables researchers to determine their long-term utility. In Workplace Chemistry, the length of the program enabled well-spaced data collection, which provided Bond and her colleagues with the opportunity for uncommon longitudinal analysis in a workplace environment. Specifically, in the first and seventh year of the Workplace Chemistry Initiative, surveys were given to all ChemPro employees. On both surveys, Bond and her team received feedback from workers within every unit. With impressive rates of return at both time points, Bond had a rich and representative pool of data to analyze. Data analysis revealed some modest, but important gains in diversity promotion. For example, survey results from Year 7 indicated that worker beliefs about the importance of addressing diversity were less conservative than they were in Year 1. Managers reported more support for diversity over time although workers did not. Of central concern, people of color reported significantly less racial discrimination and women reported significantly less gender discrimination from year 1 to year 7.

Although there were improvements, there was stasis and some downturns as well. People described themselves as moderately empathic at the outset of the Workplace Chemistry Initiative, there was virtually no increase in worker empathy at the program’s conclusions. Additionally, and contrary to Bond’s expectations, workers appeared to have greater concerns about having to adapt to diverse situations and styles of coworkers.

Clearly, the intervention made a number of positive experiences and behaviors possible. Bond’s internal partner was promoted to a corporate human resources position in part based on her efforts with the Workplace Chemistry Initiative. Her successor as HR Director was an Irishman who had had little interest in diversity issues or even constructive behavior as a younger employee. Over time he had come to represent the change in perspective in affirming diversity that occurred for many white men at ChemPro and proved to be a pivotal partner in the change effort. The corporation identified Chempro’s work as the leading edge of diversity work, a system-wide priority. Bond thoughtfully reflects on how this positive yet mixed pattern of findings raises important issues about what is success in a complex initiative such as the Workplace Chemistry Initiative and how can it best be assessed.

In conclusion, the difficulty with which change occurs in sizable organizations is certainly challenging; therefore Bond’s gem of a book shines brightly. She provides insight and analysis of the processes involved in generating individual and organizational change for diversity. The Workplace Chemistry Initiative was very well-designed, creative and strategic, producing clear success with some yardsticks and modest success using others. These findings highlight how difficult change processes can be when multiple, changing and interactive layers are involved. Additionally, assessing changes in moving targets, like a mid-sized industrial plant, is no easy feat. Instead of being discouraged, Bond encourages the reader to come to such tasks with humility, energy, flexibility and commitment.

Bond’s story, history and work also trace the social progress made over the several decades on diversity issues: from the place of her talented, occupationally unfulfilled mother poignantly described in the acknowledgments, to the role of women as targets of discrimination and sexism as they entered the workforce and graduate training in the 1970s, to their leadership in constructively addressing issues of diversity in the workplace in the 1990s and beyond. This era has been an eventful time in history for the inclusion of women and people of color into the workplace. With the insight and sensitivity of talented community psychologists and consultants like Bond, we hope that this progress will broaden and deepen yet further in the years to come.

As a microcosm of community psychology, Bond’s book can reawaken our delight with the insights possible from a thoughtful volume. Workplace Chemistry reminds us that our almost exclusive focus on journal articles as our scholarly medium at times may favor number of publications over nuanced understanding of community phenomena. Her distillation of community psychology principles into this impressive and successful project reinvigorates consultation as a community psychology topic for research and action. We strongly recommend this book as an exemplary case study for community consultation, intervention and fieldwork courses. All community psychologists interested in intervening effectively in the community settings have something to learn from Meg Bond. •
Community Health
Edited and Written by Shannon Gwin Mitchell and David Lounsbury

We are pleased to report that our series of symposia on Social Ecological Approaches to Community Health Research and Action presented at the SCRA Biennial conference last June were nicely attended and well received. The 11 invited presentations were drawn from among those appearing in the special issue of AJCP that, after a year and a half of development, has gone to press.

Both the journal issue and the symposia were organized around three themes: social ecological approaches to violence prevention, social ecological approaches to mental health and substance abuse service delivery, and social ecological approaches to health promotion and behavior change. Our introduction to the special issue provides a brief review of the theoretical foundations of the social ecological approach to community health research and action. In addition, we summarize and discuss common features and innovations found in these works.

In addition, we wish to extend a special note of thanks to those authors who presented alongside us at the Biennial in Montclair, Bruce Rapkin for filling in at the last minute as a discussant for one of the symposia, and to the entire local planning committee for the conference. It was a great pleasure and honor meeting and working with each and every one of you.

For more information about these CHIG activities, please contact either of us by e-mail: David (dlounsbu@aecom.yu.edu); Shannon (sgwinmitchell@gmail.com).

Cultural and Racial Affairs
Edited by Rhonda K. Lewis-Moss

Written by
Rhonda K. Lewis-Moss, Pam Martin, and Kip Thompson

The goals of the Cultural and Racial Affairs Committee are to address issues of cultural diversity and help promote the concerns of people of color. One role the committee has taken leadership on is recognizing community psychologists who mentor ethnic minorities and acquaint them to our field. The professional development of ethnic minorities can take different forms such as developing grant writing skills, presenting at conferences and writing journal articles. The committee feels strongly that individuals that provide the mentorship deserve to be honored and this award is strongly supported by our society. Thus, every year the committee has given the award to a member of the society that has demonstrated such leadership.

At the 12th Biennial Society for Community Research and Action Conference at Montclair State University Dr. Martin, Kip Thompson, and I asked past Ethnic Minority Mentoring Award recipients to participate in a panel and share words of wisdom with the audience. The panel was titled “Effective Strategies for Mentoring People of Color: Promoting Social Justice and Contributing to Community Practice.” The panel included: Drs. Yolanda Suarez-Balcazar, Loyola University, Stephen B. Fawcett, University of Kansas, and William Davidson, Michigan State University.

The panel agreed that there is no magic bullet for effective mentoring. The panelists agreed that it is important for each mentor and mentee to find common ground and learn from each other. It was also mentioned by the panelists the importance of professional development in the mentee/mentor relationship. One panelist noted that there are challenges that ethnic minority students face that students from the dominant culture may not deal with and that it is important for mentors to understand this difference.

In addition to working with ethnic minority students in various graduate programs a question was posed to the panel about how to mentor junior faculty members of color. What strategies are effective with this group? One strategy that was suggested for mentoring junior ethnic minority faculty was to give them advice about not spreading themselves too thin when they work in the community. The committee saw this as a double edged sword that the ethnic minority faculty member would be drawn to the community and the community members would be drawn to the faculty member. This, however, could interfere with research and writing by the faculty member. The panel suggested that the ethnic minority junior faculty member stay true to their commitment to the community by being straightforward on the tasks that are involved in tenure and promotion but also engaging the community in participatory research. The panel was extremely informative and gave a number of important key suggestions.

Because the panel was limited in the number of past awardees that were involved, the Cultural and Racial Affairs committee has been approved by the current American Journal of Community Psychology editor to have a special issue. We would like to invite past Ethnic Minority Mentoring Award winners and other faculty and community practice people to submit articles that focus on:

1) Effective mentoring strategies for ethnic minority students,
2) Ways to find effective mentors that meet ethnic minority student needs, and
3) How to mentor ethnic minority junior members.

Interested parties should write a 300 word abstract and submit to: Dr. Rhonda K. Lewis-Moss, 1845 N. Fairmount, Box 34, Department of Psychology, Wichita State University, Wichita, KS 67260 no later than October 1, 2010. Electronic submissions should be sent to rhonda.lewis@wichita.edu. Once the abstracts are reviewed for issue appropriateness, authors will be asked to submit a complete paper at a later date. Dr. Martin and I will serve as the Guest Editors and we look forward to your submission. Thank you from the Cultural and Racial Affairs Committee.
Dear Colleagues,

I am delighted to be the new editor of the Disabilities Column. My goal is to make this column as diverse as possible, in terms of content, contributors and format. I encourage you to contact me at tritzler@uic.edu if you would like your work to be featured or have ideas to further enrich this forum.

Special education research is an area of scholarship that can be greatly enriched by the work of community psychologists. In this issue our column features a thoughtful examination of special education research for immigrant and racial/ethnic minority students by Traci Weinstein, a student in the doctoral program in Community and Prevention Research at the University of Illinois at Chicago. Enjoy!

---

**Educating Immigrant and Racial/Ethnic Minority Youth in Special Education Programs**

*Written by Traci Weinstein, M.A., University of Illinois at Chicago*

In the United States, our current system of public education is characterized by academic achievement as a function of race, ethnicity, primary language use, and socioeconomic status (Hilliard, 1992). Moreover, in our public school system, 1 in 3 of all students is of an immigrant or racial/ethnic minority background (Agbenyega & Jiggetts, 1999). These students are frequently overrepresented in substantially separate educational settings, especially in special education programs (e.g., Hoover & Patton, 2005). In fact, it has been estimated that up to 40% of all special education students are of a minority background (U.S. Department of Education, 2003). The Office of Civil Rights has found that African American students are overrepresented in services for emotional disturbances, American Indian and immigrant students are overrepresented in services for learning disabilities, and African American, American Indian, and Latino and other immigrant students are all underrepresented in programs for gifted and talented students (Hosp & Reschly, 2004). In addition, students from Spanish-speaking, English Language Learner (ELL) backgrounds tend to be overly referred to specialized programs for students with speech and language learning disabilities (Brantlinger, 2006). The educational discrepancies presented here involving students of immigrant and racial/ethnic minority backgrounds have been of ongoing concern for the past four decades in the U.S.

The education of immigrant and racial/ethnic minority students in special education programs, in particular, has received little attention in research. Therefore, the main purpose of this article is to examine how the education of immigrant and racial/ethnic minority students in special education has been addressed by researchers and to examine how the underlying assumptions of such research have thwarted our research progress.

---

**Special Education Services: The Good, the Bad, and the Ugly**

There is a beneficial purpose of specialized educational services. Those who refer students to such services typically do so in order to allow students access to the advantages of individualized instruction and attention (DeSouza & Sivewright, 1993). Special education services originated from the efforts of parents of children with disabilities to ensure equitable education for all students (Brantlinger, 2006). Thus, these services were designed and intended to have positive effects on children’s academic achievement and to enhance their educational experiences. Typically, special education services provide remedial and/or developmental instruction, while also balancing grade level preparation across multiple curriculum areas. The scope of these services frequently includes vocational coaching, college preparation, and life skills and social development. Allowing students access to general education curricula in substantially separate settings is intended to give students who have been labeled as difficult in some way a “safe haven” in which to learn. In fact, some research has shown that special education programs have benefits for some students, with particular advantages for students with emotional and learning disabilities (DeSouza & Sivewright, 1993). Specifically, students in these settings tend to spend more time on academics than they did while in a mainstream setting; exhibit higher achievement, particularly in mathematics, than their disabled counterparts in mainstream classes; and are less likely to fail classes and drop out of school than they would if they had remained in the mainstream academic environment.

Despite such advantages, however, specialized educational settings also hold negative consequences for children who are labeled as “different” and isolated from their mainstream peers. This disadvantage is of particular concern for students from immigrant and racial/ethnic minority backgrounds, who may already be experiencing the negative effects of such a label due to their minority status. Furthermore, these smaller specialized settings tend to be even more isolating than is generally acknowledged. For example, one study found that students in special education programs for behaviorally disturbed adolescents spent most of their class time on passive educational activities and independent seatwork, rather than engaging in interactive classroom activities (DeSouza & Sivewright, 1993). In general, students in substantially separate educational programs also tend to socially associate more regularly with other disabled peers from these settings than students from the mainstream setting. Additionally, the dropout rate of students in special education programs overall has been found to be quite high (30%) and fewer special education students continue on to college in comparison to students from the mainstream environment (Wagner & Blackorby, 1996). Thus, the paradox between the advantages and disadvantages provided by special education services is one that continues to require more focused attention and research.
An Examination of Special Education across Ecological Levels

By investigating the reasons why students are referred to special education, one study found that only 35% of students were referred for academic-related issues, whereas 33% were referred for primary reasons unrelated to academics (Hosp & Reschly, 2004). Further investigation revealed that teacher referrals to special education are also based on individual teacher’s beliefs about their inability to deliver adequate education to specific students, in addition to various reasons related to student behavior (Gersten & Woodward, 1994). Moreover, over-referrals of linguistically diverse students to special education services appears to be an overall national trend. Given these reasons why students are being referred to and placed in special education services, the examination of special education practices needs to occur at multiple ecological levels (see Trickett, Leone, Fink, & Bratton, 1993), yet this type of ecological assessment is generally disregarded when investigating the education of immigrant and racial/ethnic minority children in specialized educational services (Aghenyea & Jiggitts, 1999).

Simple adjustments to mainstream educational practices that may enhance the learning needs of students from diverse backgrounds are often overlooked prior to referring them to special education services. For example, increased variety in curriculum topics, multisensory classroom activities, and social-emotional supports provided to all students in the mainstream setting are all ways that could engage students who are exhibiting difficult behaviors in mainstream settings. This notion of diversifying curriculum topics in order to make learning more meaningful to students is not a new one, yet it remains underutilized in our public schools:

Our incredibly polyglot and multiracial society is sorely in need of teachers who know how to honor the stories of their students and to join them to wider narratives and larger meanings. We need to learn better how to build on those stories, and, when they clash with mainstream stories, how to explore the discrepancies, rather than to assume pathology. (Featherstone, 1989, as cited in Brantlinger, 2006, p. 148)

When referrals to and placement in special education services typically focus on individual-level student factors, we fail our children by not taking into account important societal, community, and administrative level factors that are also impacting the academic achievement of diverse students.

As another example of a level of need that requires more focused attention in research, consider the issue of teacher training. Approximately 15% of all public school special education students are diagnosed with mild to severe behavior problems (DeSouza & Siewwright, 1993) and 50% are diagnosed with learning disabilities (U.S. Department of Education, 2003). However, despite the reasons for special education referral, students in special education programs are more often exposed to behavioral interventions, rather than academic ones (Del’Homme, Kasari, Forness, & Bagley, 1996). This overemphasis on behavioral interventions, and consequential underemphasis on academic programming, appears to evolve from inadequate teacher training. One of the most frequently cited ideas for reforming our current educational practices of working with immigrant and minority students is teacher training (Hoover & Patton, 2005). In fact, college preparatory programs for mainstream academic teachers rarely require diversity training related to how to work with students of minority and diverse disability backgrounds. Thus, it is common for mainstream teachers to seek out the help and advice of special education and ELL teachers when they are having difficulties with immigrant and minority students, which may be one cause for so many overreferrals of these students to specialized educational programs.

Furthermore, rather than primarily focusing attention on the topic of diversity as it relates to teacher competence, there is a critical need to examine the policies and procedures that dictate which settings are most appropriate to service diverse students. More specifically, there is a dearth of literature that examines the mechanisms currently in place that result in the disproportionate placement of minority students in substantially separate programs.

Is Separate But Equal Even Possible?

With specific regard to the isolation of special education, an issue of new and increasing concern involves a pervasive pressure that is currently on public school staff to quickly refer students with significant academic difficulties to substantially separate educational programs, often without an ecological examination of the causes of such difficulties, as discussed above. This drive has been depicted as emanating from school administrators, who are under constant and renewed pressure to increase their students’ test scores for budgetary compensation (Blanchett, Brantlinger, & Shealey, 2005). For example, by removing students with academic difficulties from mainstream settings, school administrators are able to show statistical improvements in measures of student academic achievement. Such practices point to the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) policies as the source of this problem (e.g., Cochran-Smith, 2005). NCLB policies, and the tactics that schools are forced to undertake in order to be in compliance with such policies, affect teachers and administrators equally, in addition to having significant implications for immigrant and minority children. One consequence of NCLB policies that is frequently cited in the literature is the perpetuation of racial and ethnic educational disparities in our public school system (Blanchett, Brantlinger, & Shealey, 2005). More specifically, the NCLB policies are blamed for emphasizing explicit educational outcomes without directing reform at equalizing the foundations that created the problems the policies are designed to address in the first place. As an example, consider urban schools that have inadequate funding to deal with poverty-related issues arising in the community. Because incidences of poverty-related medical, psychological, and social dysfunction are higher in these schools, which results in more academic difficulties for the students attending these schools, there is a consequential increase in student enrollment in special education services (Aghenyea & Jiggitts, 1999). As an additional consequence, the overrepresentation of immigrant and minority students in poorer urban schools reinforces the overrepresentation of these students in special education programs as well. Thus, in many cases, the disproportionate placement of immigrant
and minority students in specialized educational services originates from the NCLB policies that were developed at the governmental level to address such educational inequalities.

Contextual student factors, apart from academic factors, have a significant impact on issues of academic achievement, with particular implications for student placement in special education programs (Brantlinger, 2006). The importance of contextual factors has been documented throughout the history of special education as well. For example, in the early 20th century, public schools dealt with the socially-derived difficulties of recent immigrant students from Italy and Ireland by placing these students in substantially separate special education programs, for reasons that included physical, intellectual, or “moral” disabilities. Consider the following comments, made in 1926, to explain the contextual factors that were believed to be responsible for the overrepresentation of Italian children in special education services:

> It is unquestionably true that the home surroundings of certain racial groups, notably the Italians and the Negroes, are, as a rule, far less favorable than those of the average American children... It seems probable, upon the whole that the inferior environment is an effect at least as much as it is a cause of inferior ability, as the latter is indicated by intelligence tests. (Goodengough, 1926, as cited in Brantlinger, 2006, p. 82)

A more recent examination of economic, academic, and demographic factors demonstrates how important these factors are to the referral of racial/ethnic minority students to special education services (Hosp & Reschly, 2004). Hosp and Reschly’s study revealed that demographic variables (e.g., race and English proficiency) served as the strongest predictors of student referrals to specialized services for emotionally disabilities (ED), with academic factors also serving as strong predictors for ED for African American students. In contrast, for referrals to specialized services for learning disabilities (LD), academic variables (e.g., mastery in reading and math) served as the strongest predictors, with demographic factors also of strong significance for LD students of American Indian, Latino, and Asian backgrounds. A final, yet important, finding in this study was that academic factors served as the weakest overall predictors for referral to special education services across all racial/ethnic categories and disability groupings. Given the implications of such findings, with contextual factors serving as significant predictors for special education referrals for minority students, is it possible to conclude that specialized educational programs are really separate but equal? Clearly, academic interventions for students of immigrant and minority backgrounds really need to begin to focus on contextual factors at the community, state, and national levels.

**The Final Analysis**

So where do we go from here? The multiple topics that have been examined in the existing literature and reviewed in this article all address some aspect of the problem of overrepresentation of immigrant and minority students in special education programs. For example, at the individual level, they typically examined factors of psychopathology as they relate to student disabilities and fit. The topics that are addressed at the group level relate to cultural incongruence, teacher training in diversity instruction and curriculum development, and the collaboration between mainstream and special education settings. Across the community and societal levels, several factors compete, such as the need to reform special education practices, special education referral procedures, and NCLB policies. In addition, intervention is required at these higher levels to address the economic, academic, demographic inequalities that are impacting the factors reviewed in this article.

However, for every topic that has been examined, there are a number of issues contributing to the problem that remain overlooked. For example, the failure of schools to collect and analyze data on the educational outcomes of their own students, with particular attention to special education practices, is a major issue that requires further exploration in the assessment literature (see Salend, Garrick-Duhaney, & Montgomery, 2002). In addition, an area that has not been addressed in the current literature is how schools are meeting the needs of refugee students, particularly those from war-torn countries. Such students are typically exposed to traumatic events that have the potential to lead to emotional disabilities. In addition, these students are often subject to long stays in refugee camps without regular academic instruction, which has serious and long-term implications for student learning.

In conclusion, there are no easy answers when it comes to addressing the education of immigrant and minority students in special education programs. Furthermore, until we are able to desegregate our public schools entirely, we will not be able to fully desegregate specialized educational programs. Yet there is hope. Immigrant and minority students in special education programs do typically feel that they are supported and cared for in these smaller specialized learning environments. The benefits of special education services that have been reviewed in this article should not be cast aside lightly, because any positive academic outcome for these students is a success.

---
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Education Connection
Edited by Jim Dalton and Maurice Elias

We are happy to present a teaching exercise by Michèle
Schlehofer on Victim Blame. Michèle presents an exercise that she
uses in Social Psychology classes, but that also can be very useful
in Community Psychology or similar classes. Social-psychological
categories such as individual vs. situational attributions and beliefs
in a just world are useful for discussing victim-blaming in
community contexts, alongside classic community psychology thinking
(e.g., William Ryan, Blaming the Victim, 1971, esp. ch. 1).

Michèle’s exercise can be useful in a community psychology
course, especially for undergraduates, and especially early in the
course, where it is important to help students see how an ecological
systems perspective applies to real-life situations.

Longtime readers of this column, and users of the teaching
materials on the SCRA27.org website, may recall that this is actually
the second exercise on this topic that we have featured. Pennie
Foster-Fishman provided an exercise titled ‘The Drawbridge’
which sets a similar dilemma in medieval times, and has been used
by many community psychology instructors. (Jim Dalton has used
the Drawbridge in multiple courses, and both Jim and Maurice
will be using Michèle’s exercise this year as well.)

Both exercises highlight how easy it is to blame a victim, and
lead to discussion of the psychological and social processes that
enable this. “The Drawbridge” is set in medieval times, concerning
a baron and baroness, and my (Jim Dalton) personal experience
with it is that I must remind students to read it in terms of their
own lives today, not as an exercise in how people thought and acted
in the Middle Ages in Europe. An advantage of the exercise that
Michèle describes below is that it is set in today’s world, and discussion
can readily focus on students’ own experiences. On the other
hand, in “The Drawbridge,” the baron/husband actively orders his
wife’s death, after prohibiting her to leave the castle; this readily
opens discussions of victim-blaming and of gender and power and
violence toward women in families.

“The Drawbridge” is available at the Education Connection
page of the SCRA website, www.scra27.org. Michelle’s exercise in
this column will soon be available there, too. Check out the many
other excellent resources for teaching there.

Also in this issue, check out the Special Section, Linking
Competencies for Practice with Graduate Training, a joint project of
the Community Practitioner and Education Connection columns.

Just an Instance of “Wrong Place at the
Wrong Time” But Only for Some: An Exercise in Victim Blame

Written by
Michèle Schlehofer, Salisbury University

I am an Assistant Professor of Psychology at Salisbury
University, a small (7,000 students) state school located in rural
Maryland. One of the courses that I teach is an undergraduate
course in social psychology. The course typically contains a
mixture of sophomores, juniors, and seniors, all of whom have at
least had our introductory level psychology course. Throughout
the duration of the course, I encourage students to avoid making
internal attributions for individuals’ behavior, and instead think
about individual behavior in an ecological framework which includes
social, community, and systems-level influences. I have found that
many students are accustomed to taking an individualistic approach
to explaining social behavior. Unfortunately, this often results in
“victim blame,” where students see individuals as the sole or primary
cause of their own misfortune. Early on in my social psychology
courses, I introduce a short, yet powerful, exercise to demonstrate
victim blame and the just-world hypothesis (Rubin & Peplau,
1975). The exercise is borrowed and adapted from Smith (2002).
To start the exercise off, I distribute a short story for students
to read. There are actually two versions of the story, but students are
unaware of this fact. Both versions entail a description of a woman who
was murdered by a mugger; however, the circumstances surrounding
her being at the “wrong place at the wrong time” differ.

Version 1 reads as follows:
Once upon a time, a husband and a wife, named Sue, lived
The wife soon tired of this arrangement. Restless and lonely, she would take the next ferry into town and develop relationships with a series of lovers. Anxious to preserve her marriage, she always returned home before her husband. In fact, her relationships were always limited. When they threatened to become too intense, she would precipitate a quarrel with her current lover and begin a new relationship.

One night she caused such a quarrel with a man we will call Lover 1. He slammed the door in her face, and she started back to the ferry. Suddenly, she realized that she had forgotten to bring money for her return fare. She swallowed her pride and returned to Lover 1’s apartment. But Lover 1 was vindictive and angry because of the quarrel. He slammed the door on his former lover, leaving her with no money. She remembered that a previous lover, who we shall call Lover 2, lived just a few doors away. Surely he would give her the ferry fare. However, Lover 2 was still so hurt from their old quarrel that he, too, refused her the money.

Now the hour was late and the woman was getting desperate. She rushed down to the ferry and pleaded with the ferryboat captain. He knew her as a regular customer. She asked if he could let her ride free and if she could pay the next night. But the captain insisted that rules were rules and that he could not let her ride without paying the fare.

Dawn would soon be breaking, and her husband would be returning from work. The woman remembered that there was a free bridge about a mile further on. But the road to the bridge was a dangerous one, known to be frequented by highwaymen. Nonetheless, she had to get home, so she took the road. On the way a highwayman stepped out of the bushes and demanded her money. She told him she had none. He seized her. In the ensuing tussle, the highwayman stabbed the woman, and she died. Thus ends our story. There have been six characters: Babysitter, Wife, Co-Worker 1, Co-Worker 2, Ferryboat Captain, and Highwayman.

Following time to read the scenario, I ask students “Please list, in descending order of responsibility for this woman’s death, all the characters. In other words, the one most responsible for her death is listed first; the next most responsible, second; and so forth.” After students are done listing the characters, I ask everyone who read the story about “Sue” who listed the woman as either the most or 2nd most responsible person to raise their hands. I then ask everyone who read the story about “Mary” who listed the woman as either the most or 2nd most responsible person to raise their hands. What generally happens is that those reading about “Sue” (the adulterer) tend to overwhelmingly list her as the most or 2nd most person responsible for her death. However, those reading about “Mary” (the widow) do not often list her as responsible for her own death. Time permitting, I ask individuals to raise their hands if they listed the “highwayman” as most or 2nd most responsible for the woman’s death; again breaking down the results by version of the story (“Sue” or “Mary”). Those reading about “Sue” often do not list the highwayman as a responsible party; those reading about “Mary” generally see the highwayman as the primary person responsible for her death.

At this point, I explain the difference between the two scenarios, and ask students to discuss the reasoning behind their ratings. Students reading about “Sue” often give reasons justifying their belief in her personal responsibility by saying things such as, “she is the one who chose to cheat on her husband,” “she chose to be out late at night,” “she shouldn’t have been cheating on her husband,” and “her ex-lover (or ferry boat captain) has no responsibility to help her out.” Interestingly, some students reading about “Mary” agree that she is the one who chose to be out late at night;
these students argue “she should have gotten a day job.” However, although believing that Mary made a bad decision in taking a night job, in my experience many students often still feel that the highwayman holds primary responsibility for her murder.

After revealing the differences between the scenarios, I introduce the concept of “victim blame” and explain how the “results” of our class demonstration demonstrate victim blame. Students definitely seem to understand the concept after this exercise, and can readily come up with their own examples.

One twist on this exercise that I have tried in the past is to run students through Version 1 of the scenario (describing the adulterer) and then ask them if they think their perceptions of responsibility would change if the woman was instead a widow working the night shift. This approach did not work very well. Most students felt that their perceptions of responsibility would not differ (despite the empirical evidence to the contrary). It might be that students are hesitant to admit (or are just unable to foresee) that their reasoning might be inconsistent across the two scenarios.

In addition to demonstrating victim blame, I use this exercise to springboard into a discussion about defensive attributions. I tell the students that one way to psychologically cope with threatening information, such as reminders that one might be a crime victim if out alone late at night, is to minimize the information’s relevance by convincing ourselves that it could never happen to us. Related, the just world hypothesis predicts that we often assume that bad things happen to bad people, and good things happen to good people. By having this type of beliefs, we can explain away threatening anecdotal experiences with rationalizations that the victims “deserved” it, and since we are “good” (and supposedly do not act in this way), this negative event would not happen to us. Thus, there is a good reason why we rely so heavily on victim blame: it helps us maintain a positive outlook about our own lives and a positive view of the self. In my lecture I mention research that supports this belief empirically. For instance, Summers and Feldman (1984) found that many people see women who have been victims of domestic violence as responsible for their abuse; similarly, Abrams, Viki, Master, and Bohner (2003) found that rape survivors are often viewed as somehow having caused their rape experience. Once I introduce students to the concept, they are often quick to identify other situations in which just-world beliefs are commonly held (e.g., homeless people; the unemployed).

Overall, I have found this to be a fun exercise for students that helps them understand victim blame and our natural tendency to form defensive (and hence self-protective) attributions in order to maintain a positive view of the self.
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These environmental injustices are not a new phenomenon. For example, more than 870,000 of the 1.9 million (46%) housing units for the poor are located within about a mile of factories that reported toxic emissions to the Environmental Protection Agency (Bullard, Mohai, Saha & Wright, 2007). The Environmental Justice movement is a grass roots effort that has identified and resisted such injustices for several decades (Taylor, 2000). This environmental justice perspective provides important insights about how environmental degradation directly intersects with social justice and community well-being and it behooves us to learn from this movement as we get involved in dealing with this crisis.

Community Psychology and the Environmental Crisis

In the APA Task Force Report on the Interface Between Psychology and Global Climate Change, released at the 2009 APA convention in Toronto, community psychology was recognized as one area of psychology that can make significant contributions in addressing issues related to global climate change (Swim, Clayton, Doherty, et al., 2009). We agree. The root causes of this crisis and the needed solutions are complex, multi-layered, and will require the collaboration of many different stakeholders. “Today’s environmental reality is linked powerfully with other realities, including growing social inequality and neglect and the erosion of democratic governance and popular control. … As citizens we must now mobilize our spiritual and political resources for transformative change on all three fronts” (Speth, 2008, p. xi). It seems that community psychology is better positioned to address this crisis appropriately compared to some other, more traditional, fields of psychology. Psychological approaches to pro-environmental behavior change and adaptation to environmental catastrophes have often been focused on individual level factors such as environmental attitudes, pro-environmental values, coping mentally with crises, and psychological barriers to behavior change (Swim et al., 2009). Community psychology, however, has rejected the commonly held notion that social problems should predominantly be approached at the individual level (Nelson & Prillietensky, 2005). We have developed theories, methods, and tools to approach societal problems from a systems-level perspective—addressing multiple levels of the ecological context simultaneously. It is time that we make our knowledge, skills, and tools available to address climate change mitigation and adaptation. With some exceptions, our field has been rather uninvolved in environmental issues in the past (see Riemer, in press, for a review). Still, there is increasing awareness and relevant work is being done by community psychologists. Next, we will feature four examples to illustrate how community psychology can be applied to environmental issues.

Applying the Ecological Model

Livia Dittmer and I (Manuel) worked collaboratively with the environmental organization Reduce the Juice to develop a new training intended to raise consciousness among youths about the systematic barriers to pro-environmental behaviour change. Reduce the Juice trains youths to canvas their local neighbourhoods, applying community-based social marketing principles to influence residents to reduce their carbon footprint. In a series of four workshops students were first introduced to ecological thinking, then learned about urban planning and design, followed by a session about government and policy. The final workshop addressed issues of environmental justice. Each workshop included an action component trying to influence one of the identified systematic barriers affecting residents’ behaviours. For example, the youth this year decided to address the local government, the school board, and the local transportation authority to offer monthly bus passes to all students at a low cost. The training is currently being evaluated using a mixed-method design.

Participation and Power

While citizen participation is increasingly valued in environmental planning and management, the actual implementation is often limited and in many cases represents little more than lip service. Marci Culley and Holly Angelique have studied the nuclear debate in two local communities with respect to issues of social power (Culley & Angelique, forthcoming). What they found is that the nuclear industry and local government exert their power through superior resources and by setting the meeting times and the agenda. The industry representatives used their resources to shape the nuclear debate by promoting nukespeak, portraying nuclear technology as green, as a means of energy independence, and misleadingly embraced by environmentalists and the public. Culley and Angelique suggested that community psychology is well positioned to critically analyze models of participation in environmental planning and management and help ensure that issues of social power are addressed in a meaningful and just way.

Addressing Vulnerability

People experiencing homelessness are among those most vulnerable to the effects of GCC in developed countries (Ramin & Svoboda, 2009). They are exposed to the increasing weather extremes without adequate shelter. As the impacts of GCC become more powerful their situation will worsen. To address this issue, the behavioural geographer Johanna Wandel and I (Manuel) have partnered with the government in the Waterloo Region of Ontario to develop a participatory action research program. Fifty-two interviews with people experiencing absolute homelessness about their experience of extreme weather and how they currently deal with it have been completed. We worked closely with the local service agencies to develop the details of the study and in recruiting our interview partners. Two peer interviewers with experience of homelessness co-facilitated each interview. The results of the interviews will be related to projections from regional climate and air quality models to assess what changes can be expected in conditions to which the urban homeless are particularly exposed and sensitive. Together these findings provide the basis for an extensive knowledge transfer and community engagement plan intended to motivate the development of community-based solutions to reducing the homeless’ vulnerability.
Environmental Justice Work in New Mexico

The Four Corners region of the southwestern United States has been relegated to a wasteland by both government and industry (Kuletz, 1998). Local tribal peoples have had little or no say about uranium mining, waste, and the related dangers and health risks—while often carrying a disproportionately large burden of negative consequences and reaping few benefits (McLeod, Switkes, & Hayes, 1983). As nuclear energy becomes a more attractive option in the face of GCC, past injustices visited upon Southwestern tribes may reaccelerate. In response to the Clinton administration's Environmental Justice Executive Order in 1994, New Mexico became the 6th state to enact a policy based on environmental justice principles (Richardson, 2005). This environmental justice executive order set out guidelines for future environmental regulations to ensure that communities are protected from undue burden of environmental use and abuse.

In response to the opportunity created by this executive order, the Environmental Justice Tribal Liaison for the State of New Mexico and the American Indian Law Center (AILC) at the University of New Mexico have begun creating workshops to disseminate details about changes in permitting regulations. These workshops will encourage tribal leaders and environmental employees to take an active role in permitting processes that will affect their communities—providing a rare opportunity to resist unjust pollution. As a community psychologist, I (Courte) am providing input and assistance in planning, organizing, and implementing the workshops—as well as conducting an evaluation of the workshops to improve their impact.

In an effort to help environmental issues become more visible in community psychology and facilitate engagement in this topic, the idea of the interest group Environment and Justice was first brought up at the 2009 Biennial of the Society for Community Research and Action (SCRA). Our goals are to highlight opportunities for community psychologists to include environmental issues in their work, better help communities we work with cope with environmental degradation, and highlight relevant research and practice in CP. Several of the proposed interest group members will be featured in an upcoming special issue of the American Journal of Community Psychology on Community Psychology and Global Climate Change, edited by Manuel Riemer and Stephanie Reich. This special issue will highlight in more detail how community psychologists have been and can get involved and why it is critically important to do so. The second edition of the textbook by Nelson and Prilleltensky (2005) will also feature a new chapter on this topic (Riemer, in press).

Another goal of this proposed interest group is to support conference hosts to make the SCRA Biennial more environmentally sustainable. We are planning to collaborate with future organizers and sites to decrease our carbon footprint and increase our awareness of how the SCRA community can become more environmentally conscious.

Community psychologists have often bridged disciplines and sectors to better understand and solve social issues. As environmental issues involve many disciplines with expertise in areas we may lack, we will also highlight opportunities for collaborations and examples of successful collaborative work. Through such collaborations, we can use our unique skills and knowledge alongside other interested researchers and practitioners to curb GCC and other environmental issues and help communities to prevent or adapt to negative environmental changes that affect their well-being. We invite our colleagues to include environmental issues into their work.

Concluding Thoughts

As we are faced with probably the biggest crisis in the history of human kind, we are also provided with the opportunity to radically rethink the basic structure of our society. Capitalistic exploitation, consumerism, and extreme individualism are not only among the root causes for this environmental crisis but other societal problems as well (e.g., poverty and increased rates of depression). However, the environmental crisis illuminates with new clarity how interconnected we really are. The desire of Western societies to consume without limit is directly linked to the pollution of our environment in developing countries which are resistant to react to the pledge to conserve by those who exploit them. The emphasis on independence and comfort in Western societies prevents the effective sharing of scarce resources. The list goes on. Thus, to effectively address this crisis we need to do more than just changing light bulbs and driving hybrid cars. Bob Newbrough’s thoughts on the Third Position may be a good beginning to rethink how our society and our communities will be structured in the future (Newbrough, 1995)—to hopefully leave behind the false dichotomies that have created combative environmental debates where cooperation is necessary. With a sense of urgency we are concluding our paper with the words of one of the most important social change agents in North-America’s history:

We are now faced with the fact that tomorrow is today. We are confronted with the fierce urgency of now. In this unfolding conundrum of life and history there is such a thing as being too late. Procrastination is still the thief of time. Life often leaves us standing bare, naked and dejected with a lost opportunity. The ‘tide in the affairs of men’ does not remain at the flood; it ebbs. We may cry out desperately for time to pause in her passage, but time is deaf to every plea and rushes on. Over the bleached bones and jumbled residue of numerous civilizations are written the pathetic words: ‘Too late.’ (Martin Luther King, April 4, 1967, Riverside Church, New York City; quoted in Speth, 2008, p.13) 
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International
Edited and Written by Serdar M. Değirmencioğlu

News from the International Committee

The International Committee was quite busy in Spring 2009 due to the fact that the biennial in New Jersey was approaching and it was time to prepare for the biennial.

Good News

The cost of travel to the United States (U.S.) has increased in recent years. High airfares, conference expenses (registration, lodging, etc.) and local costs (excessive visa fees, etc.) make it very difficult for community psychologists, particularly those from developing countries to travel to and attend the biennial. Therefore, it is very important that SCRA provides travel funding to facilitate the presence of colleagues from outside of North America at the biennial.

The International Committee was initially offered a total of $2000 in financial support for travel costs related to the biennial. Given the high cost of travel, however, it was clear that the this sum was insufficient. The Committee requested registration fee waivers (worth $300 each) to substantially increase the support. The good news was that the SCRA Executive Committee agreed to offer six registration waivers, indicating SCRA’s willingness to invest in international linkages.

The Committee received 10 applications for the travel awards. Former chairs David Fryer (now in Australia) and Toshi Sasao (Japan) joined me in evaluating the applications. The applicants indicated how much they expected to spend item-by-item, what type of a job or income source they had, and whether there was any other form of support. In deciding whom to support, we considered the need (i.e., expected cost of travel, source of income and to some extent the economic situation of the applicant’s country of residence) and whether the applicant had travel support last time in Pasadena.

We decided to support seven applicants from six countries and offer most of them a registration waiver plus a cash award. This combination made the travel award sizable enough to compensate for applicants whose expenses were particularly high. The recipients of the travel awards were from Egypt, India, Japan, Australia, UK, and Turkey.

Bad News

The International Committee circulated “tips” before the biennial. The tips were also published in TCP in Fall 2008 (see pages 14–15). These tips were developed in response to the concerns raised by the participants of the International Committee Business Meeting at the biennial conference in Pasadena in 2007. The bad news had to do with the fact that very few people appeared to take these tips into consideration.

The first set of tips, which had to do with easy ways to accommodate the needs of participants from abroad during the meeting, were ignored during the biennial. It is not clear how many participants travelled from overseas to attend the biennial and how
many participants would have benefitted from a more inclusive conference, but the International Committee believes a more inclusive conference is more in line with the values of community psychology.

The second set of tips had to do with ecologically-sound practices. There was clearly a mismatch between the suggestions and what happened during the biennial. Recycling, for instance, was hardly available. Lunchboxes were made from cardboard and there were plastic containers in the box but most of the boxes ended up in the trash.

I made an effort to find out if recycling was available somewhere, but the people at the information desk next to the main entrance told me there was no recycling in the building. I wanted to confirm and soon found recycling bins located away from the main lobby. I recycled my own lunchbox, those of my colleagues, and some boxes I found lying around. But the vast majority of the boxes used during the biennial were not recycled. The International Committee believes a “greener” conference is more in line with the values of community psychology.

Business Meeting

The International Committee Business Meeting was scheduled at a very early hour to accommodate for the demands of the tight biennial schedule. Just as in Pasadena, the early hour made it very difficult to hold a well-attended meeting. The small group of participants exchanged ideas and shared concerns about the biennial. Some time was devoted to the distinction between the International Committee and the Internationalization Task Force, headed by Rod Watts. Participants appreciated the fact that Rod was available to articulate the goals of the Task Force.

Two participants—both travel award recipients—who travelled from overseas expressed their concern about the difficulties that they experienced at JFK. These were difficulties most travellers experience at busy and very unwelcoming ports of entry, particularly at airports like JFK in NYC. Participants agreed that assistance should be provided to ease such physical and psychological hardships.

The last item for the meeting was the election of a new coordinator. With very few participants in the room, it was unlikely to have many candidates. Indeed, no one volunteered to be a candidate. The final suggestion was for the current coordinator to continue and I accepted to continue for two more years. I certainly hope that the next Business Meeting will not be held at an early hour and the Committee will have sufficient opportunity (and participants) to conduct its business.

Exciting news

The Internationalization Task Force had a brief meeting during the biennial. An important question was whether the Task Force should take on a second term. On behalf of the International Committee, I recommended that the Task Force continue and focus more on concrete issues.

An important concern is the rather obvious lack of attention in the U.S. to the work of community psychologists around the world. Such work hardly gets mentioned in textbooks or cited in journals. In the usual academic conduct, if a piece of work is not published, it does not exist. Unless a typical community psychology student in the U.S. sees such work in print, it is unrealistic to expect this student to believe community psychology exists in other places. Language is still an important barrier for most SCRA non-student members and access to work outside of the English-speaking world appears to be minimal.

It may not be too difficult to make a dent in this obstacle. If SCRA could recognize the work of community psychologists from other parts of the world, with or without an award, and publish the work of award recipients in English, that would certainly be an important contribution of community psychology in the U.S. This suggestion by the International Committee was welcomed by members of the Task Force. The enthusiasm appears to be shared by past and current presidents of the society, and the International Committee certainly hopes to see progress on this front.

Questions?

The International Committee does not have a listserv and meets only at the biennial. If you have any questions or suggestions for the Committee, please feel free to contact me at serdardegirmencigolu@gmail.com. 😊
Living Community Psychology
Edited and 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 column’s purpose is to offer insights into Community Psychology as it is lived by its diverse practitioners. For this installment, we feature Joe Galano, an academically-based community psychologist who has long focused on prevention of mental illness and promotion of health through a dazzlingly broad range of teaching, community partnerships, program evaluation and policy/advocacy initiatives.

Joe Galano, the grandchild of four immigrant grandparents from Italy, was raised in a blue-collar, immigrant community in Brooklyn, NY, where succeeding waves of Greeks, Turks, Irish, and Italians arrived to establish a foothold in America. In his neighborhood, he came to the conviction that all things were possible. “Deep in my psyche is a sense of optimism, generated from multiple American success stories that were earned through hard work and persistence.”

His paternal grandfather traveled to America with his older brother as (human) cargo. Working on the docks as physical labor, he was able to earn enough money to bring over his wife and four more siblings. Joe’s maternal grandfather was a peddler, selling produce with his horse and buggy. His maternal grandmother died when Joe’s mother was 13 years old, when she had to leave school to raise her younger siblings. Joe’s maternal grandfather was a peddler, selling produce with his horse and buggy. His maternal grandmother died when Joe’s mother was 13 years old, when she had to leave school to raise her younger siblings. Joe’s parents were introduced to each other by family friends before World War II, and they moved to Texas, where his father was stationed with the Army and where Joe was born. They returned to Brooklyn after the War, where his brother as (human) cargo. Working on the docks as physical labor, he was able to earn enough money to bring over his wife and four more siblings. Joe’s maternal grandfather was a peddler, selling produce with his horse and buggy. His maternal grandmother died when Joe’s mother was 13 years old, when she had to leave school to raise her younger siblings. Joe’s parents were introduced to each other by family friends before World War II, and they moved to Texas, where his father was stationed with the Army and where Joe was born. They returned to Brooklyn after the War, where his brother as (human) cargo. Working on the docks as physical labor, he was able to earn enough money to bring over his wife and four more siblings. Joe’s maternal grandfather was a peddler, selling produce with his horse and buggy. His maternal grandmother died when Joe’s mother was 13 years old, when she had to leave school to raise her younger siblings. Joe’s parents were introduced to each other by family friends before World War II, and they moved to Texas, where his father was stationed with the Army and where Joe was born. They returned to Brooklyn after the War, where his brother was born. His father, who never graduated high school, worked as a physical laborer for a manufacturing company. His mother worked as a nurse’s aide, at $1 per hour. She strongly believed in education for her children, envisioning that her sons would obtain a college education, whatever they chose to study.

Despite having received little pre-college guidance counseling, Joe entered Manhattan College, a first-rate Jesuit college in New York City. Because he was good at math, he chose to major in physics. He commuted 1.5 hours each way from his family home to college and worked part time at the Gimbel’s Department Store. However, he was “lost” there and soon realized that this college “was not for me,” leaving after his freshman year. He transferred to the more convenient St. Francis College in Brooklyn but again struggled for a few years, unsure of a major or a career path. He worked part-time in a delicatessen.

A friend enlisted him to “get out of the city in the summertime,” by working as summer camp counselors for the Jewish Federation of Camps in the Catskill Mountains in upstate New York. Joe remembers: “The other counselors were different than I was used to—they were wholesome, including former VISTA and Peace Corps Volunteers.” He found great enjoyment and success working with the children so, upon return to college in the Fall, he declared a psychology major. “I fell in love with psychology and blossomed academically in my last two years of college.” (He returned to work at the camp for two more summers, during college.)

Despite being on the Dean’s List at St. Francis, his (11) applications to Ph.D. programs and to 2 master’s programs in clinical psychology were all rejected. Instead, he entered a master’s degree program in general psychology at New Mexico Highlands University (NMHU), “a wonderful place that believes in giving second chances and has a supportive faculty. I was a Brooklyn gringo with mariachi music,” he quips. He supported himself, modestly, through a small stipend, tuition reimbursement and food stamps. Part of a close knit group of ten students at NMHU, he felt he had received strong preparation for moving onto a Ph.D. program – his continuing goal. (Joe was the first recipient, in 1996, of NMHU’s Distinguished Alumni Award.) Having earned a 4.0 GPA, he applied confidently to 13 Ph.D. programs, only to be rejected from all—again.

Still not deterred, he determined to bolster his resume by taking a job at the Ft. Logan Community Mental Health Center (CMHC) in Colorado, working on a treatment evaluation project that used the then-popular method of Goal Attainment Scaling. After a year at Ft. Logan (a well-regarded CMHC), he felt he had matured significantly, had a better sense of his identity and could better articulate his goals, so he re-applied to the same 13 Ph.D. programs. “I wanted to be a psychologist passionately.” THIS time, he was accepted by 7 of the 13 programs and chose Bowling Green (Ohio) State University because it had a strong clinical program, with a community component.

There, he had an NIMH fellowship to conduct research in schools. His career direction was influenced greatly by the arrival at Bowling Green by Dr. Jim Sorensen, an early leader of community psychology. Joe enthuses: “He changed my life. He taught me evaluation and involved me in a number of community-based projects. From him, I learned the value of community partnerships and the concept of giving psychology away to consumers (including measuring the level of consumer satisfaction with mental health services).” Sorensen was his dissertation supervisor, and Joe was far along in his dissertation when he left for his internship year at the College of Medicine and Dentistry of New Jersey (Rutgers...
Medical School). This excellent, community-oriented internship provided many learning opportunities, with field-based experiences via four large community mental health centers (CMHCs) and superb supervision and seminars. His plan was to work for a CMHC—“my clinical work would pay the bills, but my heart was in the community,” he remembers. However, while waiting for the outcome of his applications to CMHC jobs, Joe spotted, in the APA Monitor, a teaching job at the College of William and Mary in Virginia (1977).

Although he had no prior interest in an academic position, the job description was spot-on for his interests—emphasizing innovation that would bring the College into the community and the community into the College and teaching students' skills in emerging mental health trends, following the State’s change in policies for deinstitutionalization. The position called for him to develop, from the ground up, the practicum component for a Psy.D. program sponsored by a statewide consortium of four schools (Norfolk State University, Old Dominion University, Eastern Virginia Medical School, and the College of William and Mary)—then called the Virginia Consortium Program in Professional Psychology. The scale of the practicum program was large, with 90 supervisors, 35 mental health agencies, and 40 students (30 residents, 10 interns). The State legislature loved the program, because it integrated existing resources, at no additional cost; garnered an excellent national reputation; and provided well-trained clinicians in the State. Joe assumed a large responsibility for the community-based practicum part of the curriculum, with significant contributions to the program in developing the practicum training manual and evaluation scheme and integrating community psychology principles into the clinical curriculum. His advocacy helped to insure that the Program has always included courses in community psychology and program evaluation, and many of the graduates are employed in prevention positions. Thirty years later, about a third of his cadre of community-based clinical supervisors for his current students is made up of his former students.

The College of William and Mary has a national reputation for excellence in teaching. Although the original intent was that Joe would devote most of his attention to graduate education, he was pleasantly surprised to find that he loved undergraduate teaching even more, “because it’s a formative time in the students’ development, and I love motivating and mentoring undergraduates.” He views his teaching role as one of preparing generations of prevention advocates. He views his teaching role as one of preparing generations of prevention advocates. He also collaborated with another Virginia community psychologist, John Morgan, in preparing, over the course of a year, a prevention plan for Virginia. They exposed the State’s 40 programs to 40 Community Service Boards that were delivering mental health prevention programs in the State. He made presentations to 40 Community Service Boards that were delivering mental health treatment and rehabilitation services and to free-standing CMHCs in a strategy to increase their awareness of prevention and their appreciation for the value of evaluating prevention programs. Surprisingly, seventeen of the programs requested his services, and the State found sufficient money to award a two-year grant to Joe and his Psychology Department colleague, John Nezlek to assist these programs.

Joe also collaborated with another Virginia community psychologist, John Morgan, in preparing, over the course of a year, a prevention plan for Virginia. They exposed the State’s 40 programs to the 14 prevention programs featured in the seminal work, Fourteen Ounces of Prevention: A Casebook for Practitioners that had been published the prior year. Joe and John assisted participants in the implementation of the communities’ own prevention initiatives. Through a $20,000 grant in 1988, they convened the Prevention Institute, to which they invited George Albee as headliner. Albee had been a role model for Joe since he began attending Albee’s Vermont Conferences on Primary Prevention. (He ultimately attended all ten of the conferences.) There, he experienced camaraderie with like-minded preventionists. He also attended SCRA’s first biennial conference in South Carolina, “falling in love with community psychology.” (Later, also with John Morgan, he co-edited The Community Psychologist for 3 years.)

The major application of Joe’s prevention-related advocacy is to Federal grants and contracts, constitutes the bulk of his scholarship. He has been successful at obtaining outside support, amounting to $2.5 million as Principal Investigator, with more awarded to projects in which he was actively involved, but not as the PI. His work can be seen in the 2007 Special Issue of the Journal of Prevention and Intervention in the Community, Healthy Families America Initiative: Integrating Research, Theory, and Practice that Joe edited.

After six years at the Assistant Professor rank, he was promoted to Associate Professor—a rank he has held for 26 years. He explains that he never applied for promotion to Full Professor because there is no real incentive to be promoted, since salary increases at the College are based on merit, independent of faculty rank. However, he recently decided to apply for promotion to Full Professor. His file is chockfull of commendation letters from students, dating back 30 years.

The College of William and Mary also expects its faculty to perform public service. In this, Joe has more than excelled. (He was twice nominated for the College President’s Award for Service to the Community.) He has followed a careful strategy of progression, from training practitioners to disseminating models to policy formation and advocacy, pertaining to mental health prevention. These activities started a year after Joe’s arrival at William and Mary, when Virginia’s Commissioner of Mental Health (Joe Bevilaqua then) opened an office of prevention in the State’s Department of Mental Health, Mental Retardation and Substance Abuse Services. Joe introduced himself as a prevention advocate to the office’s director, Marsha Penn, who then awarded him a contract to evaluate (mental health) prevention programs in the State. He made presentations to 40 Community Service Boards that were delivering mental health treatment and rehabilitation services and to free-standing CMHCs in a strategy to increase their awareness of prevention and their appreciation for the value of evaluating prevention programs. Surprisingly, seventeen of the programs requested his services, and the State found sufficient money to award a two-year grant to Joe and his Psychology Department colleague, John Nezlek to assist these programs.

Joe’s research productivity has been focused more on community-based applied/action research than on traditional submissions to refereed journals. That is, his lengthy list of program evaluations, manuals and policy analyses, many carried out under State and
child abuse and neglect, where he has worked at the local, state and national levels. He has consulted for more than 15 years with a nearby city, Hampton, in its Healthy Families Partnership and has worked with Prevent Child Abuse Virginia to develop Virginia's statewide child abuse prevention initiative, Healthy Families Virginia. He was a member of the steering committee that developed the Blue Ribbon Plan to Prevent Child Abuse and Neglect in Virginia and currently serves on Healthy Families Virginia's Advisory Council. Since 1992 he has been a member of the Healthy Families America (HFA) Research Practice Network and is a member of the HFA State Leaders Network.

Joe's skills and energy have been deployed in prevention initiatives directed to additional areas of policy development and advocacy. For example, he (again, with John Nezlek) developed a series of Kids Count in Virginia databooks that arm communities with data to effect action on behalf of children's needs. Each member of the Virginia General Assembly was given a copy of the book on Child Advocacy Day. He and colleague Michael Rohrbaugh worked with Project Link, a comprehensive, multi-agency model demonstration program to prevent perinatal substance abuse, among sexually active, substance-abusing women. This resulted in an unprecedented level of interagency collaboration and a reliance on evaluation to guide each step of the process. A third program with which Joe has worked is Square One, a multi-site, public-private collaboration that aims to help all children enter school healthy and ready to learn. He helped in developing the original program and served as the project's evaluator, evaluating the impacts of the program's initiatives in early literacy, parent education, child care, and children's health. A final example of his advocacy is through Al's Pals, a comprehensive approach to working with 3-8 year-old children that promotes social competence and school readiness and reduces early aggression. The program was designated as a model program by several Federal agencies.

One notable feature of Joe's record, in addition to the sheer volume of his activities, is the number of involvements of many years' duration. For example, he has served on Virginia's Prevention and Promotion Advisory Council for 25 years. Joe was a co-author of Virginia's first statewide prevention plan and a major contributor to the subsequent two plans, and he served on the gubernatorial steering committee that developed the Blue Ribbon Plan to Prevent Child Abuse and Neglect in Virginia. As a private citizen, he served as a Williamsburg/James City County Community Action Agency board member, chairing the board for six years.

Joe became a Fellow of SCRA (and of APA) in 1992. The following year, he hosted SCRA's biennial conference, involving his students in the one-year planning process. Although SCRA money was limited and he had no idea how much work would be involved, "it turned out to be a wonderful party with friends. My claim to fame is that the evaluation of our biennial conference earned a 5.1 (out of a possible 5.0) on the quality of the food, especially for our seafood extravaganza dinner." That biennial conference, attended by 500 participants, featured an international poster session. This was an early effort to highlight the work of the field's international members, attracting community psychologists from 13 different countries. In 1996, Joe was honored with SCRA's Distinguished Contribution to Practice in Community Psychology award.

All of which would make any parent proud. Although his father used to tease him, calling him "MISTER Professor," Joe knew his father was proud of his accomplishments. At age 89, Mr. Galano moved to Williamsburg to be near Joe, but lived independently. Planning a trip to Italy for the following year, Joe found members of the Galano family living in Ischia, a beautiful island near Naples, Italy. Although the trip was physically challenging for a 90-year old, the family treated his father with reverence, "like a king." Thirty-four relatives gathered to feast for three straight days and nights. "I saw my father in a different light there. He was easy going, with delightful social skills, among the adoring relatives and friends." Mr. Galano lived to the age of 96. Joe's brother, Richard, recently retired from driving for the Denver Metro bus system, is fixing up his mountain home in Colorado and likes to hunt and fish.

Neither Joe nor Richard had children—a fact which takes on poignancy by the revelation that Joe was, 2 years ago, diagnosed with Huntington's Disease (HD), a degenerative disease of brain neurons passed from parent to child (each child having a 50% chance of inheriting the HD gene). http://www.ninds.nih.gov/disorders/huntington/huntington.htm In retrospect, it appears that his mother (and possibly another relative) had died of (undiagnosed) HD. He was originally alerted by concerned former colleagues, observing him at the 30th reunion of his internship group, as exhibiting an irregular gait and "pill rolling" finger movements. A subsequent blood test confirmed a neurologist's preliminary diagnosis of "the elephant in the room, Huntington's Disease." He has been visiting the holistically-oriented Center for Excellence in HD at the University of Virginia for ongoing assessment and support. He has also served as a "client representative," discussing the disease with 150 medical students. Fortunately, in his life is his fiancé Beverly Peterson, with whom he's had a 20-year relationship, much of it geographically separated. Upon learning of Joe's HD diagnosis, she relocated from her job at a Penn State University campus to be with him in Williamsburg, where she now also teaches at William and Mary and already loves the students as much as Joe does.

Although the disease "puts life into a different perspective," Joe maintains, "I remain as motivated and committed to my work as ever." Nevertheless, he plans to retire from teaching June 2010 so as to slow down and enjoy life with his friends in Williamsburg. Although he expects to continue many of his community involvements and student mentoring in retirement, hopefully he will make time to handicap horse races, an interest and skill he acquired from his father. He can be found three times a week in season at a beautiful little racetrack in Virginia, Colonial Downs, using his own scientifically precise methods of handicapping races. Physical fitness is an important element in keeping HD at bay, so Joe —an accomplished bicyclist who has led bike tours overseas—will concentrate on maintaining an active exercise regimen now and in retirement.

Reflecting back on his career, he sums up: "My teaching, community research, advocacy, and public service have all been in the service of a single mission: health promotion and illness prevention."
Public Policy
Edited by Nicole Porter

Public Policy – A Historic Breakthrough

Written by Olivia Masini and Nicole Porter

After the last Biennial in Montclair NJ, it became clear that much progress has been made in SCRA on public policy issues over the last three years. We now have the first Public Policy Committee in the history of SCRA, we have created a new SCRA entity of a non-working interest group or committee-affiliated “Community” and now have the largest membership of any entity within Division 27. This enthusiasm from within the division and the Executive Committee (E.C.) itself has led the E.C. to develop a three year plan to prioritize public policy as the primary focus within SCRA. Moving forward from 2009 to 2012, public policy is becoming central to our division’s mission and identity. With the commitment of our Chair, Nicole Porter and Co-Chair, Steve Howe, and the dedication of Maurice Elias and president-elect, Mark Aber, our committee is at the forefront of SCRA’s future direction. A SCRA branded approach to public policy is beginning to take shape as we refine our intervention techniques and resources within the community. From one Biennial to the next, students and early career researchers have transformed their feelings of frustration to enthusiasm for our growing community and committee activity. This is an important year and an exciting time for the Public Policy Committee in SCRA, it offers an opportunity to shape public policy intervention and inquiry among community psychologists.

These events raise our Policy Committee activity to the level of high local community importance, but may also lead to more effective and far-reaching national impact. As a small division, SCRA members may often underestimate their influence. However, within the American Psychological Association (APA), Division 27 is seen as a vanguard of public policy research and action. According to Heather Kelly, the APA Government Relations Office Science Directorate, our division is known on Capitol Hill as housing psychology’s most active policy researchers. As an organization on the front lines of public policy research, we now have the opportunity to develop policy techniques that will influence stakeholders and policymakers. There is also a growing interest in public policy as a lever for second-order social change among graduate students and early career researchers. It is important that we infuse these opportunities and techniques with core community psychology values and brand a type of policy intervention that reflects and requires these values.

Since the public policy arena is unfamiliar to a large portion of our members, it comes as no surprise that many of the activities of our committee have focused on the tripartite committee mission (established in 2004, during Steve Howe’s tenure as chair in 2004).

BioFeed

The primary goal of the committee is to create policy training opportunities for division members and encourage the development of their policy skills and their ability to effectively interact with policy-makers. Specifically, we are working to create training resources and templates, as well as a cyber-clearinghouse for policymakers to be able to network with community psychologists. These members will have extensive research experience in areas of interest to policymakers and will also have specific interest, training and experience in public policy at some level. Our policy webpage will feature a keyword search engine to identify division-members with a public policy background in their area of expertise. In this way, interested policymakers, lobbyists, and congressional aides, as well as the staff of the APA Government Relations office and media outlets, can easily identify appropriate SCRA members for data, testimony, and input on related issues. We have begun collecting bios of individuals interested in joining the policy website as “resources”. We would like to hear from folks who have public policy experience in a given topic area, and who would like to be contacted by legislative and judicial policymakers, and media personnel. If you are interested in connecting with policymakers—or their representatives—in your area of expertise and would like to receive more information when it becomes available, please contact Abby Brown at abrown57@depaul.edu or Nicole Porter at nporter@depaul.edu.

Policy Briefs

Another important piece of the training mission of the Public Policy Committee involves collecting templates of policy briefs. Policy briefs are reports often sent to policymakers (i.e., senators, representatives, etc.) in a format that can be easily understood and convey an urgency of the need for intervention. These are essential components in grabbing the policymaker’s attention and developing support for the appropriate and desirable policy. Policy reports, also called whitepapers, discuss the issue in more depth, detailing what needs to be changed, how it will impact social change and the community stakeholders involved. Research conducted in communities provides ample support in justifying the need for these changes and persuasive recommendations for future application from ecological values. The Public Policy Committee is currently working on formulating a SCRA branded template for policy briefs that will encompass core community psychology values. The Committee is interested in getting feedback for this template from the SCRA community, please contact Valerie Anderson at vanders5@depaul.edu or Nicole Porter at nporter@depaul.edu for input and ideas.

Committee Positions and Goals

The committee consists of members with broad skills sets and perspectives who concentrate their efforts on community participation, interdisciplinary perspectives and inclusive input from local, national and international representatives. The committee is structured in a way to obtain diverse input and maintain strong ties across various settings. As outlined below, our new committee appointees are named and their efforts and responsibilities are discussed in relation to the committee’s current direction.

End of Document
Incumbent Chair: The current chair, Nicole Porter, has been recommending and assigning several task-defined positions. These positions were created based on suggestions for projects made during policy meetings at conferences over the last three years. Specific roles and responsibilities were clarified and reaffirmed in policy meetings at the 2008 APA Conference in Boston, the 2009 Biennial in Montclair, several Midwest Psychological Committee meetings from 2006–2008, and correspond to prior directions set at biennial meetings in New Mexico and California.

Committee Co-Chair: A co-chair position has been created that will be filled by past committee chair, Steven Howe. He will provide advice, expertise, and practical direction to various committee endeavors. This will serve to ensure that all past community member voices are heard, and networking activities and historical committee objectives are skillfully addressed.

Former Chair: Steve Pokorny: Chair-ship Advising

Curriculum Coordinator: Over the last three years one consistent public policy complaint has been voiced by graduate students and degreed members. This is the lack of adequate training as a major barrier to member involvement in public policy action. As Steve Howe suggests, students are unaware of how well trained they are to take on policy work and the perception of lack of preparedness is a problem that influences many early practitioner and graduating student career choices. Without explicit training in public policy during their degreed course work, Division 27 members and Community Psychology graduates have felt ill prepared to embark on policy-related research, undertake professional policy consulting or advise in policy implementation and enforcement. When discussing public policy, many graduates and Ph.D. level community psychologists have reported not having access to effective training materials or representative course syllabi. With both community psychology and public policy being nascent disciplines this is not surprising. Consequently, the policy committee has appointed a curriculum coordinator. Nicole Porter and Nancy Bothne, of Adler School of Professional Psychology and previously of Amnesty International, have been working on this task for the past year. Assisted by the committee and committee advisors, Porter and Bothne, will be responsible for compiling: Public Policy syllabi, teaching templates, and other course material to be posted under the Policy link on the SCRA policy webpage. This effort will also create the first Public Policy course unique to community psychology. This course is being developed as an online course and will be made available folks in all geographic areas.

AJCP Policy Special Issue Coordinator: In an effort to achieve member awareness of policy applications and research the committee is seeking to organize a special policy issue of the American Journal of Community Psychology (AJCP). This issue will be edited by Nicole Porter and Steve Howe, and will serve to encourage authors to conceptualize their research in terms of policy impact. It is also hoped that this issue will demonstrate to the readership how many community research programs can function as tools in the policymaking world. The coordinator will work with the AJCP editorial board to collect and edit submissions and bring the issue to fruition. Valerie Anderson has been nominated to assist in this committee position for the current chair’s term.

As recommended by the Policy committee, we have suggested that a change be made to the submission process to AJCP, to include a “Policy Impact” section for various journal submissions. This addition to AJCP journal articles could be a key factor in communicating policy implications to students and long-term practitioners, while acting as training material in real-life research circumstances. This could also help community psychologists realize the importance of the policy and mechanisms for their own research.

Policy Briefs Coordinator: Serving a similar role to the curriculum coordinator, the research coordinators will be responsible for compiling a variety of public policy research samples, to be made available to interest-group members and policy meeting conference attendees. This material will also be posted on the policy webpage. Policy papers will span a variety of the five main types of policy research including:

1. Traditional judicial and legislative policy research (e.g., amicus briefs, whitepapers)
2. Consulting research (e.g., corporate implementation and evaluation reports)
3. Applied regulatory research (e.g., policy targeted academic research)
4. Advocacy and activism (e.g., press releases/press-packs, op-ed pieces)
5. Eco-empowerment (e.g., community fliers, letter writing campaign material)

These member efforts will allow new members that are interested in becoming involved in the policy arena to have access to exemplary professional SCRA policy work. This will not constitute position taking by the SCRA community at-large, but may aide members in developing the ability to speak the appropriate policy language for the given policy task. Case examples are exceptional resources for learning the ropes of public policy. As a result there are several types of documents with which one may want to become familiar (e.g., amicus briefs, whitesheets, policy consulting reports, targeted academic research, etc.). These will not constitute a position endorsement by the EC or SCRA community; rather, they will be sound samples of professional policy products, undertaken by practiced policy workers, that have a community psychology orientation and who are also skilled Division 27 members. These samples may prove helpful to those interested in pursuing a line of policy work grounded in community psychology values and ecological principles. Nominations have been made for the position, and the committee is currently awaiting response.

Bio Feed Assistant Coordinator: John Daviau

Student Policy Representative: In July of 2008, at the recommendation of the chair-elect, Nicole Porter, the committee created a Student Policy Representative position. This position is in its second year and is now held by student representative, Jessica Hunnell. Jessica takes over the work of Aaron Boulton, as a Policy Chair-assistant to organize membership and committee efforts. As a general public policy coordinator and manager, Jessica facilitates...
Policy Committee coordination and communication at all levels of SCRA organization, and facilitates external collaborations. Her work includes organizing at the Policy Committee, assisting Committee activities with SCRA's Executive Committee, coordinating international representation to committee, and managing regional Division 27 policy memberships.

**Policy Community Liaison:** Facilitated by Anne Bogat's herculean efforts to provide information about SCRA members interested in public policy, this position, now held by Abby Brown, has gained tremendous importance. Abby will help direct community building and act as a Policy Committee point-person and will maintain an e-mail list of SCRA members interested in policy. This interest group will become Policy Committee members and will be included in future communications. This email list will allow the committee to pass along policy-specific communications to Policy Committee members (e.g., action alerts, job opportunities, theoretical discussion) without burdening the Division 27 listserv. It will also help in organizing Policy Committee members, providing mechanisms for input to the Policy Committee, and guiding the committee toward the needs voiced by the SCRA Policy Community members with an interest in public policy. Abby Brown will also collaborate with Policy Committee Liaison, Valerie Anderson, and assist in community building activities.

**Policy Committee Liaison:** In addition to the Policy Community Liaison, Nicole has appointed a Policy Committee Liaison. This position, under the direction of Valerie Anderson, will act as a bridge among committee members and work multiple projects. Valerie will collaborate with Abby and the policy community through updating the committee and assist in community building activities. Additionally, Valerie will work the curriculum coordinator in collecting and developing syllabi, as well as the editors of the AJCP special issue on policy through connecting with researchers, policymakers, and recruiting papers.

**Governmental Relations Liaison:** Following the advice of Heather Kelly, the APA Government Relations Office Science Directorate, Nicole has appointed a Governmental Relations Liaison. This position is also in its second term, under the direction of Blair Coleman. Blair will continue her efforts in networking, and serving as the committee's primary APA contact and committee representative. Blair facilitates community building among like-minded APA members, helps to provide collaborative training opportunities, and communicates with the science relations office and other APA representatives to coordinate networking events. Blair will also help in organizing interested Policy Community members, providing mechanisms for input to the policy committee, and acting in guiding the committee toward the needs voiced by those SCRA members with an interest in public policy.

**Webpage Coordinator:** The SCRA webpage is a crucial element in the Policy committee’s current efforts and long-term goals. The Policy link, initiated by Nicole Porter and facilitated by the efforts of Scot Evans, was formalized by Anne Bogat’s extensive labors in updating the SCRA website in 2008. Our newly clean and efficient web presence has been developed to include a prominent Public Policy presence. This affords us the inclusion of depth and breadth of various types of SCRA related policy information. This page will act as a resource for training materials and other policy resources to which Division 27 members will have direct access.

The three main pages will include: 1) training material (including multiple CP and policy related syllabi and teaching materials), 2) collaboration or “BioFeed” (links to Congressional Fellowships and Policy Experts), and 3) resources (e.g., policy papers including template Whitepapers, Amicus brief, and other policy reports).

**Executive Committee Liaison:** The final committee member will serve as the executive committee liaison. Many current committee members have expressed the opinion that yearly turnover for committee chairs contributes to the lack of progress for the Policy committees. The EC Liaison will be in charge of reviewing tenure issues as well as attending EC meetings to advocate for policy related solutions. Nominations have been made for the position, and the committee is currently awaiting response.

**Public Policy Award Representative:** The first Public Policy Award was presented at the 2007 biennial in Pasadena to Dr. Leonard Jason for his contributions to changing health policy for individuals with ME/CFS. This biennial award is recognition by the Policy Committee of a SCRA member for their significant and current contributions to public policy. Facilitating the submission, evaluation, and award process will be the Award Representative’s main responsibilities. They will work in conjunction with the current SCRA Student Policy Representative, Jessica Hunnell. Jessica will also act as the award process coordinator. The Policy Award Rep will solicit, accept, and collate nominations. This Committee representative will also organize materials for award judges, coordinate nomination materials and voting among Policy Committee members, and facilitate awarding the commemorative plaque at presentation time during the next biennial. This representative will also help nominate and facilitate the transition to the next Public Policy Award Representative.

It is important to note that these positions may not recur as tasks are completed (the special issue, for example) and new objectives may develop that require additional committee members. In addition to these task-focused committee positions, several SCRA members with an expert knowledge of policy work will serve as advisors to the committee. We are very grateful for the limited time commitment and extensive roles played by our already over-burdened member and non-member advisors:

- Anne Bogat: Committee Building and EC communication
- Maurice Elias: Committee Advising
- Lenny Jason: Effective Goal Implementation
- Tom Wolff: Interest Group Development and Practice Group Collaboration
- Heather Kelly: APA Resource Advising

This solidifying format will take a sustained and diligent effort by all parties involved and require critical attention as SCRA becomes increasingly self-aware of its ability (and duty) to shape policy that reflects our values as community psychologists.
Regional Update
Edited by Bernadette Sánchez

A number of changes have taken place among regional coordinators. The first important change is that we changed the title of International Regional Coordinators to International Regional Liaisons (IRLs). This change was made in SCRA’s effort to work more collaboratively with community psychologists across the world rather than SCRA attempting to coordinate activities internationally. Our International Regional Liaisons play an important role in serving as links between SCRA and international community psychology organizations. Further, these folks are important leaders in their regions in promoting community psychology, so SCRA’s relationship with them is integral in learning about community psychology events taking place globally. SCRA is grateful for the participation of the International Regional Liaisons.

The second important change is that now that summer has ended, a number of Regional Coordinators have completed their 3-year terms in August 2009: Chiara Sabina and LaKeasha Garner in the Northeast Region, Elaine Clanton Harpine in the Southeast Region, and Joanne Sobeck in the Midwest Region. Nicole Roesner and Aaron Boulton completed their terms as a Student Regional Coordinator in the Midwest. I would like to thank all of these individuals for their dedication and hard work in promoting SCRA and organizing activities and events in their regions.

In the mean time, we have new Regional Coordinators, International Regional Liaisons and Student Regional Coordinators who will begin their term in September 2009! The Northeast region has 3 new regional coordinators: Anne E. Brodsky, Lauren Bennett Cattaneo, and Michele Schlehofer. Amy Edwards joined the Northeast as a student coordinator. Other new regional coordinators are Lisa Walt in the Midwest and Maria Felix-Ortiz in the Rocky Mountain/Southwest Region. Finally, the Australia/New Zealand/South Pacific region has new International Regional Liaisons as well: Diane Costello and Kamal Kishore. Karen Johnson joined the team as an undergraduate student international liaison. To learn more about all of these individuals, please read the regional updates below!

Multiple regions have vacancies so if you are interested in being a Regional Coordinator, International Regional Liaison or Student Coordinator, please contact me at bsanchez@depaul.edu. This is a great way to get involved with SCRA, network with community psychologists, and access resources! The regions that have vacancies are Southeast, U.S., Midwest, U.S., Rocky Mountain/Southwest, U.S., West, U.S., Latin America, and Europe/Middle East/Africa.

Australia · New Zealand · South Pacific

International Regional Liaisons
Katie Thomas: Katie.thomas@curtin.edu.au
Diane Costello: d.costello@curtin.edu.au
Kamal Kishore: k.kishore@fsm.ac.fj

International Regional Student Liaison
Karen Johnson: Karen.Johnson3@det.wa.edu.au

Western Australian SCRA members were fortunate enough to have the 11th Trans-Tasman conference, convened by the Australian College of Community Psychology in Fremantle, hosted in Western Australia, from July 15th to the 17th. Local SCRA members, Lauren Breen and Anne Sibbel were convenors of the event which aimed to foster links across Australia and New Zealand and had the theme of “Exploring Boundaries, Expanding Frontiers.” Lauren and Anne did a superb job of organization and are to be congratulated on the quality of this event. Participants expressed particular appreciation for the critical discussion, clear conference organization and provocative conversations conducted about the role and future of Community Psychology within Australia. We particularly thank Lauren and Anne for their commitment and their personal labour which ensured such a quality regional event.

SCRA Indigenous Interest Group

One of the outcomes of the recent Biennial is that the Australian, New Zealand and Pacific branch of SCRA has proposed a new SCRA interest group. The aims of this group are interrelated. Firstly, it wants to support SCRA members who are conducting Indigenous research by providing a forum for the exchange of ideas, literature and experience. This will assist the Group’s more specific focus which is to utilize our combined resources more effectively to conduct strengths-based praxis towards raising public awareness of the plight of Indigenous people and addressing the social justice issues they face in oppressive dominant societies. Those people who are interested in this domain and would like to be added to a listserve for this purpose please send your name, contact details and brief background statement of your interest to Lizzie Finn. Please ensure that you include a statement of permission to be added to the email listing. Thank you. Email to: l.finn@curtin.edu.au

Australian Discussion Site

For all those who have expressed interest in being linked to the Australasian region and fostering International collaboration please feel free to visit our new website at: www.scra27.org/community/groups/smart. Our name listing reflects our values: South Pacific Mutual Support, Action, Reciprocity and Trust Network (SMART) and in the future we will be posting research/visiting and collaborative opportunities.

We welcome your contributions and comments and hope this will provide a space to link you to the South Pacific and to foster ongoing collaboration and communication.

SCRA Website development for the site for the Australia,
New Zealand and Pacific regions is continuing with the able assistance of Mr. Scot Evans. We would like to invite all of our Northern hemisphere colleagues to visit the site, as Australia, New Zealand and the Pacific would like to foster greater international collaboration.

Welcome to first-year International Regional Liaisons

We are pleased to introduce and welcome two new SCRA international regional liaisons for our region: Dr. Kamal Kishore for the Pacific and Dr. Diane Costello for Australia. Diane and Kamal are both strongly committed to the social justice aims of SCRA and are looking forward to increasing the SCRA profile and membership in the region and to fostering greater collaborative links with other SCRA members around the globe. Brief biographies are provided below:

Pacific Regional Director
Dr. Kamal Kishore
Head of Department of Health Sciences (DHS) and Associate Professor of Medical Microbiology at the Fiji School of Medicine (FSMed)

E-mail:
fijikamal@yahoo.com.au

Dr. Kishore has a history of successful international collaborative research projects. He is the project director (Fiji) for USAID funded project titled “Support for the Fiji School of Medicine to Strengthen Health Care Worker Education in HIV and Sexual Health, Fiji/Pacific”. Kamal has conducted numerous health and HIV/AIDS prevention/prevalence studies in the Pacific. He was a member of the Regional Strategic Reference Group (RSRG) and Country coordinating Mechanism (CCM) for regional Global Funds for HIV, AIDS, TB, and Malaria (GFATM) applications for round seven of multi country application, and round nine of Fiji country application; Founder President of the Fiji chapter of the Alliance for Prudent Use of Antibiotics (APUA); Member of the Fiji Government’s committee for the Development of National Biosafety Frameworks Project; Editor-in-Chief of the Fiji Medical Journal, a publication of the Fiji Medical Association; and Founder president of the Fiji Society for Microbiology, a non-profit organization for the betterment of microbiology in the Pacific region.

Dr. Diane Costello
Research Fellow, Research Centre for Stronger Communities, Curtin University, Perth, Western Australia

Email:
D.Costello@curtin.edu.au

Diane’s current research focus examines the social impacts of climate change within the energy sector, particularly rural communities who may be disadvantaged. Understanding the synergy between community mobilization and public policy action is a key focus. Using community psychology approaches Diane has conducted extensive research with Indigenous and rural communities since 1995. As a consultant, Diane undertook research in remote Indigenous communities examining the underlying causes of crime, evaluating the cultural appropriateness of non-Indigenous public participation models and local community health services. Diane also lectured at Notre Dame University of Western Australia teaching psychology from a critical community approach. This involved exploring the socio-political and historical antecedents related to Indigenous health and welfare including Australia’s diverse multi-cultural population as a major focus for professional practice. She has supervised many Honours and Master students applying a variety of theoretical lenses including sense of community, social capital, civil society, procedural and distributive justice, racism, discrimination and moral community.

Northeast Region, U.S.

Regional Coordinators
Seema Shah: s_shah@brown.edu
Sudha Wadhwani: wadhwani@mail.montclair.edu
Anne Brodsky: brodsky@umbc.edu
Lauren Bennett Cattaneo: lcattaneo@gmu.edu
Michèle Schlehofer: mmschlehofer@salisbury.edu
Student Coordinator
Amy Edwards: am-edwards@hotmail.com

The Northeast Region Coordinators are looking forward to an exciting year ahead, with many new changes to report. We have been fortunate to fill our open coordinator positions since our last update, with two additional coordinators to the Northeast Region’s team: Anne Brodsky, Associate Professor and Associate Chair of Psychology at University of Maryland Baltimore County, and Lauren Bennett Cattaneo, Assistant Professor of Psychology at George Mason University. Anne and Lauren join Michele Schlehofer, Assistant Professor of Psychology at Salisbury University, bringing our total to three First-year Coordinators. We also have our new Student Regional Coordinator, Amy Edwards, who is a first year graduate student studying Public and International Affairs at the University of Pittsburgh, and Sudha Wadhwani,
who will be continuing as a Third-year Coordinator. NE Region Coordinators enjoyed meeting at the SCRA Biennial in June 2009 at Montclair State University, where Sudha served on the Local Planning Committee. It was a nice opportunity to connect with colleagues and obtain global perspectives on community research and interventions around the world.

Please mark your calendars for the next SCRA Northeast Regional conference, which will be held at the Annual Meeting of the Eastern Psychological Association (EPA)—Friday, March 5, 2010 at the Marriott New York at the Brooklyn Bridge, in New York City, New York. The Northeast Region Coordinators will be working together to develop the NE SCRA program, which will provide an opportunity for community psychologists, professionals, researchers, and students in the Northeast Region to connect and discuss prevention/intervention efforts, build coalitions, disseminate research, and engage in community advocacy within the context of impacting social change.

Now is the time to start planning your proposal submission, as we’d love to have an even larger turnout for Community Psychologists at this year’s EPA. To be part of the NE SCRA Program at EPA, please submit abstracts in Word format to NESCRA@gmail.com by Friday, October 30, 2009. Information about the EPA Meeting and the NE SCRA Program are available on the SCRA website at www.scola.org and the EPA website at http://epa27.org. For further instructions on submissions and/or more information about the NE SCRA program at EPA, please contact Sudha Wadhwani, Psy.D. at wadhwani@email.montclair.edu.

Rocky Mountain/Southwest Region, U.S.

Regional Coordinators
Jessica Goodkind: JGoodkind@salud.unm.edu
Maria Felix-Ortiz: felixort@uiwtx.edu

This is our first update as co-regional coordinators of the Southwest region. We would like to first thank Mariolga Reyes for re-invigorating and connecting our region. Below we introduce ourselves and provide an update on what is happening in community psychology in our region.

Update

Our most recent activity in the Southwest has focused on planning efforts to develop community psychology graduate programs in our region. At the 2009 Biennial in Montclair, New Jersey, Michelle Bloodworth and Jessica co-facilitated a roundtable on starting community psychology graduate programs. We began the session by studying and discussing a poster presented by Gitika Talwar and Anne Brodsky that utilized GIS to depict the current geographic distribution of community psychology programs in the United States and around the world. The poster clearly demonstrated that some areas of the country have no programs, although the need for trained community psychologists in these regions is great. Our roundtable had attendees at well-established programs, attendees who have recently successfully started community psychology graduate programs, attendees who are in the process of developing community psychology graduate programs, attendees who are hoping to start community psychology graduate programs in the future, and long-standing members from the Southwest Region. During the roundtable, we discussed preconditions necessary for starting community psychology graduate programs, potential “home” departments, naming/marketing new programs, advantages and disadvantages of Master’s and Doctoral programs, and other related topics. Our hope is to build upon the experience and wisdom shared at the roundtable to begin programs in New Mexico and possibly other locations in our region. Thanks to the many people who attended the roundtable! We are also hoping to plan a Southwest Regional meeting/conference in 2010.

Introduction to the new Rocky Mountain/Southwest Regional Coordinators

Maria: Dr. María Félix-Ortiz, PhD obtained her doctorate in clinical psychology from UCLA, and her AB from Bryn Mawr College. She is a professor at the University of the Incarnate Word in San Antonio and an independent research consultant. She has held faculty positions at Florida International University, University of Southern California and University of California, Los Angeles, and was a research associate for the Hispanic Research Center at University of Texas, San Antonio. Her research interests are in drug use and abuse, where she conducted pioneering work in resiliency among Latino and other youth and in the use of assisted mutual support groups. Her research has been supported with grants from the National Institutes of Health, the John Randolph Haynes and Dora Haynes Foundation, and the Ford Foundation. During her fellowship at UC San Francisco, her clinical work reached “hard-to-serve” populations including individuals who were HIV-infected, mentally ill, and abusing drugs, and Latino gang affiliated youth. She worked recently as a weekly mental health columnist for the San Antonio Express-News. She has earned awards for her research, teaching, and her journalism. She donates her time to several South Texas organizations offering both direct service and administrative leadership. She is a member of the American Psychological Association, a charter member of NIH’s Hispanic Science Network on Drug Abuse, and Society for Prevention Research. She has published over a dozen peer-reviewed articles across various journals including the Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences, Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, and Journal of Community Psychology, and has made dozens of national presentations on drug use.

Jessica: In 2004, I moved back to my home state of New Mexico to join the faculty of the University of New Mexico Department of Pediatrics, Division of Prevention and Population Sciences. I completed my PhD in ecological-community psychology at Michigan State University in 2002, and was on the faculty at California State University East Bay Department of Human Development for two years before returning to New Mexico. My primary interests are community-based participatory research and community-based interventions to promote the mental health and
well-being of marginalized populations. Specifically, my research focuses on collaboratively-developed community-based interventions to promote the well-being of Native American families and communities, and community-based advocacy and learning interventions with refugees and immigrants who resettle in the United States. I have also been involved in research to improve the community’s responsiveness to women who experience intimate partner violence and their children, and my interests include mixed-methods research and a wide variety of community-based participatory research projects and service learning opportunities that work towards social justice. I am looking forward to developing stronger connections with other community psychologists in the Southwest.

Southeast Region, U.S.
Regional Coordinator
Elaine Clanton Harpine: elaineh@usca.edu
Student Coordinators
Lindsey McGowan: lindseycm@hotmail.com
Angela Cooke: cookeangela@hotmail.com

As a follow-up to our October conference on School-Based Mental Health Group Interventions in the Southeastern Region, we are organizing research teams. We are trying to bring researchers together across the region—any topic. Let us hear from you. We have one research team working on prevention programs for early elementary children, and we are seeking topics and teams. We would like to hear from groups around the southeastern region. Would you like to organize a research team? Contact Elaine Clanton Harpine at clantonharpine@hotmail.com or elaineh@usca.edu

West Region, U.S.
Regional Coordinators
Maria Chun: mariachu@hawaii.edu
Regina Langhout: langhout@ucsc.edu
Student Coordinator
Marieka Schotland: mss286@nyu.edu

School Intervention
Edited by Paul Flaspohler and Melissa Maras

Greetings from the School Intervention Interest Group! I am pleased to announce that Melissa Maras has assumed the role of co-chair of the School Intervention Interest Group (SIIG). Melissa was approved by attendees at the SIIG business meeting during the Biennial. Melissa is an assistant professor in the College of Education at the University of Missouri teaching in Mizzou’s Department of Educational, School, and Counseling Psychology. Melissa’s research and practice focuses on helping schools develop and evaluate coordinated, comprehensive systems to support student learning and healthy development. She collaborates with diverse stakeholders in schools at the local, state, and national level to align initiatives that span the continuum of health and mental health care with a focus on positive outcomes for all youth. She has strong interests in competency development among the interdisciplinary school mental health workforce, and is currently working on a number of collaborative research and evaluation projects with school counselors, school psychologists, school social workers, and school nurses in Missouri. Melissa was trained as a clinical psychologist at Miami University (Ohio) and completed her internship in Clinical-Community Psychology at The Consultation Center at Yale University.

Melissa and I are both members of the Mental Health-Education Integration Consortium (MHEDIC), an interdisciplinary community of practice dedicated to professional workforce preparation for the many disciplines involved in supporting student learning and mental health. MHEDIC membership includes individuals from various disciplines (e.g., social work; education and education leadership; clinical, counseling, school and educational psychology; psychiatry; nursing; public health) and institutions (e.g., university, state and local governments, school systems, mental health systems). For this issue of the SIIG Column, we asked a colleague from MHEDIC, James Frabutt from the University of Notre Dame (along with his colleague, Anthony Holter), to describe his innovative work developing action research skills and appreciation through an educational leadership program preparing future principals for service in Catholic schools. The article provides a compelling example of alternative means to promoting the methods and values of community psychology among school leaders, a pivotal group of stakeholders who must be positioned at the forefront of quality school reform and change. It also supports our mission to engage the diverse disciplines engaged in school mental health in our broader community of action and research.
Ensuring Vital Schools through Action Research

Written by
James M. Frabutt and Anthony C. Holter,
Mary Ann Remick Leadership Program in the Alliance for Catholic Education, University of Notre Dame

This article describes the process of developing an action research orientation among school leaders and administrators and reflects on how instilling such an orientation among our educational leaders might ensure the vitality of schools. Training and empowering leaders in the educational workforce through action research, we believe, will have a transformative impact on schools across the United States.

Perhaps one of the most debilitating threats that educational systems face is inertia. Inertia in schools commonly manifests as passively accepting the status quo, not questioning current power dynamics, failing to demand high academic achievement, and neglecting to develop youth to their full human potential. Equally debilitating is the paralysis that can occur when school leaders are aware of growth potential and need areas in their schools, but lack the requisite skills or systematic approach to adequately address them. Both passive acceptance of the status quo and ineffectual awareness of pressing education issues in the school can arrest innovation and threaten the effectiveness and vitality of our educational institutions.

So what is the answer to the threat of inertia in schools? We do not offer a panacea that will banish inertia from the educational landscape forever, but we are strong proponents of an approach that makes inertia—in classrooms, schools, districts and dioceses—most unwelcome: action research. While we are certainly not the first to recognize the value of action research (Corey, 1953; McNiff & Whitehead, 2006; Somekh, 2006; Stringer, 2007) or teacher research (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 1999; Pine, 2009; Zeichner, 2001), there is a less pronounced tradition of administrator-led action research in schools.

The term ‘action research’ originated with the work of social psychologists at the turn of the century, and has been implemented increasingly in educational contexts since the 1950s (see Noffke, 1997, for a comprehensive review of the history of action research). Action research has also gone by many monikers: practitioner research, participatory action research, teacher research, and so on. We define action research as a three-part approach to inquiry that is: a) systematic, b) oriented to positive change, and c) practitioner driven (Frabutt, Holter, & Nuzzi, 2008; Holter & Frabutt, 2009). Our approach to the study and implementation of action research in Catholic education is broadly divided into two primary components: training school leaders to be a) critical consumers and b) systematic producers of educational research. As you will see in the following sections, the three components of action research are manifest in this larger framework.

Professional Preparation of Academic Leaders

The Mary Ann Remick Leadership Program at the University of Notre Dame is a relatively new graduate program leading to a Master of Arts in Educational Administration degree. Similar to other preparation programs in educational leadership, candidates complete coursework in the principles of educational administration, instructional supervision, curriculum leadership, education law, human resources management, and financial management. However, as the Remick program expanded from a certificate to a three-year masters degree, we sought to add a unique dimension to the usual course of study. We designed and implemented a four-course, 10-credit hour action research sequence. While several pre-service teacher training programs include requirements in teacher research or action research, it is more unusual for principal preparation programs to do so.

The sequence challenges candidates to become both critical consumers and skilled producers of relevant and well-designed educational research. This intentional pairing of consumption and production of educational research bridges the traditional chasm between practice and research (Johnson, 2008) and places educational leaders at the nexus of cutting edge research and real, positive change in their schools. Rather than waiting for or blindly accepting answers from outside experts, school leaders are empowered to address head-on the most pressing issues in their schools.

To that end, each candidate completes coursework in educational research methodology and proposes, executes, and disseminates a site-based action research project within the span of one year (Frabutt et al., 2008). Like the task of learning a new language, the prospect of learning and applying the “language” of educational research can be daunting at first and frustrating at times. Candidates therefore study, design, and implement the components of educational research in a highly structured, collaborative, module-based system with multiple rounds of feedback and edits from professors and peers alike (Holter & Frabutt, 2009). This approach to action research is based on the major components of an educational research report and mirrors the collaborative and iterative process of designing, implementing, analyzing and disseminating educational research.

Action research, as an approach, is clearly geared toward data-informed, transformative social change—an orientation that befits all educational leaders and in all contexts. However, given our Catholic context, we are able to draw specific and explicit linkages between core beliefs of our faith, scripture, Catholic Church teaching, Church documents, and the tenets of action research (see Frabutt, Holter, & Nuzzi, 2008 for a detailed review). Thus, situated at a Catholic university and enrolling candidates in service to Catholic schools, our brand of action research draws intentionally on spirituality, noting that strong social science can indeed further social justice. In addition, action research is presented as systematic, rigorous inquiry conducted in a participatory, collegial manner—often with fellow teachers, administrators, or learning communities of professionals (Frabutt et al., 2008). In line with much educational action research, and deeply resonant with community psychology’s core beliefs, we stress an approach to
Critical Consumers of Educational Research

Leaders in all schools are often saturated with the newest, greatest, and most effective teaching and learning tools peddled by publishers, academics, and practitioners. By virtue of their position as educational leader of the school, these dedicated women and men are already consuming vast amounts of information—some of which are research based. However, they may not be adequately prepared with the knowledge, tools, and “research language” to fully understand or adequately critique the information and research that inundates their inbox.

**Becoming research savvy.** In the marketplace, consumers must be savvy and knowledgeable in order to obtain high quality products and services. Similarly, in order for principals to distill the best and highest quality information from a vast and variable educational research literature, they must be properly prepared. Understanding research jargon; assessing the connectivity among research questions, data collection, and findings; deciding whether the overall claims outstrip the actual data—mastery of each of these skills makes for a research savvy principal. Once principals are conversant in the language of educational research, they are able to freely navigate the world of educational research. Like the shopper who consults Consumer Reports before making a significant purchase, these leaders can assess the strengths, weaknesses, claims, and conclusions of most educational research and then assess its applicability or relevance to their own context.

**Assessing the evidence base.** Today’s principals lead in an educational environment that is steeped in an evidence-based approach to management and practice. Scientifically based research should guide decision making. Thus, leaders are often awash in claims touting “what works,” “best practices,” “highly effective strategies,” and “empirically supported programs.” Wading into that morass is infinitely easier when a principal possesses the professional autonomy and competence to objectively assess those claims on his or her own. Leaders that are familiar with the required components of effective research and whether they are present in the sources they do locate bring a powerful lens for assessing and validating any educational claims that they encounter. Moreover, schools leaders can employ a common and standard metric to evaluate programs and pedagogy in their school—new and old alike.

**Learning from previous work.** Embracing the skill set of a critical consumer of educational research has yet another upside for practicing principals: a firmer understanding that their endeavors are not entirely unique. That is, they come to realize, for example, when they want to address new teacher induction, that there is already a rich and varied literature on the topic. They can peruse that literature, ascertain the dominant trends and issues, and perhaps even identify already existing programs that are topically or contextually relevant to the needs and issues in their own school. Principals begin to realize that each new educational initiative, whatever it is—bullying prevention, technology integration, afterschool programming—need not be developed from scratch. Through critical consultation of the educational research literature, principals can glean the best of what is already known and perhaps push a new initiative forward in a novel way or in a heretofore unexamined context. Furthermore, a growing awareness of foundational and cutting edge educational research makes these leaders a valuable asset in their school, district, or diocese. They become knowledgeable of trends and broad movements in the field of education, conversant in the language that governs educational evaluation and research, and cognizant of effective and ineffective educational interventions.

The cumulative impact of these “critical consumer” skills is best summed up in the words of a recent graduate reflecting on the overall impact of action research on his leadership responsibilities:

> The biggest upside of action research seems to be that no longer must I feel imprisoned by anecdotal evidence, which is far too often used to make important decisions regarding fundamental aspects of the life of the school. Now if there is a problem, I have a systematic approach to examining existing research on a topic, collecting data, and analyzing results that will allow me to be data-informed.

Systematic Producers of Educational Research

**Conducting useful, relevant action research.** It is not enough, however, to know what constitutes good research. Through their own site-based action research project, our candidates are challenged to implement it in their schools in a meaningful way. In so doing, principals experience—perhaps for this first time—that practitioners can indeed conduct rigorous, well-designed educational research. Research is encountered in a way that is context-bound, relevant, applicable, and engaging. Rather than maintaining the distinct hard line between research and practice, wherein pure research occurs in the academy and true practice unfolds on the front lines of classrooms and schools, the distinction is intentionally blurred. Thus, the research-practice gap is bridged when the roles of researcher, practitioner, and leader merge and overlap (Frabutt et al., 2008; Robinson & Lai, 2006). Our cadre of action research graduates has addressed issues as diverse as student bullying and block scheduling, English language acquisition and engineering programs. In every instance, these
practitioner-researchers employ rigorous educational research methods to locally relevant issues.

Cultivating empowerment and voice. Embracing action research is a concrete means to build empowerment and voice among principals. Too often school leaders are made to feel that outside “experts,” a distant review team, or the central office must be tapped in order to solve a specific school problem. While there are certainly cases when such outside involvement or support is warranted, action research provides a structure to handle more issues internally. Principals—and their own faculty—become an expert resource for issues in the school not because they have all the answers, but because they are equipped with the tools and research skills that will lead them to sound, reliable answers. As succinctly noted by Pine, “action research assumes that teachers are the agents and source of educational reform and not the objects of reform” (2009, p. 30).

Contributing to a broader network. Continued engagement of principals in relevant, solutions-focused scholarship via action research has great potential to make a contribution to the enterprise of education more broadly. Indeed, action research is an instantiation of what some have termed the “engineering approach” to educational research, which centers on understanding phenomena in order to develop solutions to practical problems (Burkhardt & Schoenfeld, 2003). Having graduated two cohorts from our program, we are starting to build and connect a network of action researchers. We have created an on-line resource (researchandac- tion.wordpress.com) that serves as a repository for completed action research projects, provides advice for novice action researchers, allows action researchers to post comments or reflections on their individual action research experience, and alerts principals to publication and presentation opportunities. Our hope is to develop a critical mass of action researchers in Catholic schools that contributes to a mutually informative national dialogue based on their own research-based practice. Administrator-led action research will continue to grow in scope and influence as the work these individuals do is shared, replicated, and modeled for others.

An Action Research Orientation to Leadership

As we are fond of saying, research is not the answer, but a process, orientation, and set of tools that help us discover meaningful answers to our questions. For Catholic school administrators, critical consumption and production of educational research does not fully satisfy the conditions for effective leadership. These school leaders must also be models of this action research orientation for their faculty and staff thereby cultivating a culture of inquiry and evaluation that extends beyond any single research question or isolated evaluation. Conceived of in this way, action research is indeed resonant with and a tangible expression of the core tenets of community psychology: local empowerment, democratization of knowledge, and appreciation for the interrelation of ecological systems.

One can see then how action research is decidedly inhospitable to inertia in the education arena. Embraced fully, the action research sequence leads not just to a requirement-fulfilling paper or even one fully answered research question, but a long-term leadership stance. That is, principals master a specific skill set that is important for educational leadership, but also a disposition or orientation to educational leadership that prizes systematic, data-driven evaluation of programs and policies. With this disposition and specific set of tools, inertia is supplanted by informed action that improves, strengthens, and indeed transforms our schools. This transformation does not happen all at once or overnight. Rather, sustained integration of the skills and dispositions of action research works gradually to change the momentum of the educational institutions in which these leaders work, teach, and serve. As one recent graduate remarked, “Your action research project can truly be a catalyst that will change the culture of the school.”

References


Certified Peer Specialists: Transplanting a Program to the Heartland

Written by
Nathan Swink and Emily A. Grant, Wichita State University Center for Community Support and Research

Abstract
This article explores the formation and growth of the Certified Peer Specialist (CPS) Program in Georgia, and how seeds from this program were then sown in Kansas. By telling the story of how a CPS program emerged in Georgia and how it was then "transplanted" to Kansas, this article aims to elucidate the journey those concerned with implementing a CPS Program might travel. This article begins by explaining the term "Certified Peer Specialist," then traces the steps taken to bring about a CPS Program in Georgia then Kansas. In general, the combination of federal-level pressure, organized consumer-level pressure, and a plan to alleviate this pressure by training and hiring Certified Peer Specialists has been successful in securing state-level Medicaid funding in these two states.

What is a CPS?
Certified Peer Specialists (CPSs) are mental health service consumers who have reached a point in their recovery journey where they have re-established a measure of control over their life and the direction it should go, and have become certified at the state level to use their "recovery story" to aid other mental health service consumers in negotiating the mental health system and in regaining control over their lives and their recovery (Chinman, Young, Hassel & Davidson, 2006; Sabin and Daniels, 2003; Orwin, Briscoe, Ashton & Burdett, 2003). Certified Peer Specialists work in mental health centers in Kansas, Georgia, and at least 11 other states under a CPS Specific Medicaid billing-code (Davidson & Rowe, 2008), which means that CPS services are distinctly different from but in the same vein as Case Managers, Attendant Care Workers, Crisis Intervention Workers, Drivers, etc. Certified Peer Specialists are set apart from these other Consumer Support Services (CSS) in that CPSs use human-experience language and their own recovery story to aid fellow-consumers in navigating the system and moving toward a recovery-orientation and the achievement of recovery-based goals. By sharing their story of recovery, a CPS can demonstrate that recovery is possible, restoring hope and acting as a role model (Mead & MacNeil, 2006). Research has shown that among those with mental illness, an important part of coping and recovery is the unique understanding and support provided by peers. (Deegan, 2006; Mead, Hilton, & Curtis, 2001; Mead & MacNeil, 2006).

Roots of CPS Training
In 2001 Larry Fricks was the mental health Consumer Affairs Officer for the State of Georgia where a CPS Program was about to emerge. In this capacity he represented the consumer voice at a table with representatives of the national organizations Substance Abuse and Mental Health System Administration (SAMHSA), and Center for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS) as well as Georgia State Medicaid. He also held a position as director of a successful consulting firm called Appalachian Consulting Group. Fricks saw a problem in the current mental health system in his state, and found himself uniquely positioned to do something about it. While the state had developed a consumer-based lobbying entity called Georgia Mental Health Center Network (GMHCN) which had seated him as Consumer Affairs Officer, he was still hearing that the consumer-voice was substantially missing from the mental health centers themselves. Appalachian Consulting Group began working to develop a CPS program in Georgia to address this absence of voice.

The idea to hire those who have experienced the mental health system first-hand is not a new one. Many mental health centers nationwide have learned the value of hiring mental health service consumers in various supporting roles. Larry Fricks and the GMHCN moved this idea of hiring consumers a step further in Georgia. Their idea was that those who have navigated the mental health system and found control over their lives and the direction they want it to go have knowledge that can be considered an education, and, combined with a little bit of guidance, as grounds for hire as a Certified Peer Specialist. It was a nice idea, but without dollars backing it up, an idea is just what it would stay.

A collaboration between Appalachian Consulting Group and GMHCN provided a strong "consumer voice" to the idea that peer support should be available in all mental health centers, and that the service should be billable to Medicaid. Legitimizing the cause at the federal level was the 1999 Surgeon General’s report which stated that the fastest growing form of support for anyone who was trying to heal (in any capacity) was self-help/mutual support (Center for Mental Health Services, 1999). The report provided enough direction from the federal level, which combined with the pressure from Fricks and GMHCN (which had just been awarded a State Networking Grant by SAMHSA) at the consumer advocate level, yielded an allocation of funds from Georgia State Medicaid. Funding paid for training and wages of Certified Peer Specialists in the mental health arena, and for the acquisition of an external review organization to ensure the implementation of promised policy changes. This was a big victory for folks seeking aid at Georgia mental health centers, but it didn’t stop there. Since the GMHCN had been awarded grant money, this consumer run organization was also able to supplement the federal dollars with less restricted funds which can be used for such things as providing CPS training to those who want it but have not been hired by a mental health center in that role.

Larry Fricks then asked Ike Powell, who was known for his work with Mental Health Empowerment Partners in New York, to develop the curriculum used in the pilot training of the Georgia
CPS Program. A team of specialists and consumers, including consumers who were trained in the pilot worked together to decide which skills need to be taught and how to most effectively teach each. In other words, they further developed the “core curriculum,” a two-page sheet tracking the outline and rationale of training. The original curriculum came out of these meetings in the form of two manuals, one for participants and one for facilitators. The training was two weeks long, and based on a Community Based Recovery model which one team member described as holding that, “(i)f people are not recovering, there are problems not necessarily in the person, but in the community, and how we are thinking about how we utilize resources in the community,” (B. Filson, personal communication, July 29, 2009). The training initially aimed at instilling the possibility of recovery and providing the skills needed to achieve such a goal.

Summary of CPS in Georgia
What worked in Georgia, then, began with a campaign launched collaboratively by Appalachian Consulting Group and mental health service consumers in the state who organized into GMHCN, the lobbying entity that seated Larry Fricks as Consumer Affairs officer for the state. From this position Fricks was able to point out to state-level Medicaid representatives that there existed both pressure from below, at the grass roots level and guidance from above, at the federal level, to further Peer Support Services within the state. This movement was successful in large part because the need was stated in terms of obligations to constituents and superiors, but also because the person pointing to the need presented a well constructed plan to address that need.

Transplanted in Kansas
Three years ago Kansas did not have a CPS Program, but there was fertile ground. Kevin Bomhoff, representing Center for Community Support and Research at Wichita State University (CCSR-WSU), attended a national workshop that ignited in him, and then in the CCSR as an organization, a desire for such a program to emerge in Kansas. The Heartland seemed like fertile ground because two state-wide consumer-led organizations had already cropped up, so consumers had an official forum for the consumer voice. Also, the 1999 Surgeon Generals Report still offered legitimacy to peer support services and recovery. All that was lacking then was the well-constructed plan and someone to present it to state Medicaid representatives.

In 2007, a member of the CPS Curriculum team in Georgia moved to Kansas to help transplant the program. Beth Filson took employment at CCSR-WSU as a curriculum consultant and was one of the founding members of the CPS Training Team, which formed to provide training to CPSs in the state. While Filson represented the team who initially built the training, other members represented other organizations and perspectives. Kevin Bomhoff is a former CSS Director and current manager at CCSR-WSU. Randy Johnson is the director of Mental Health of America in the Heartland, and former Consumer Affairs Officer in the state. Also, the consumer perspective was sought out, so two founding members were mental health service consumers who later trained and became certified CPSs. The team collaborated to adapt the training to Kansas. All that was missing then was the pressure from above.

On August 15, 2007, CMS released a letter that provided “policy guidance” for states wishing to include more peer-support in mental health and substance abuse arenas, including, “requirements for supervision, care-coordination, and minimum training criteria for peer support services” (US Department of Health and Human Services, 2007). The memo reinforced the position that mental health centers should adopt a “recovery orientation” [insert footnote 3] and firmly supported peer support services as a part of this movement. This reinforcement of peer support at the federal level, combined with the well organized voice of consumers and the presentation of a plan that not only worked in Georgia but had been carefully adapted to Kansas did win buy-in from state-level Medicaid representatives. As in Georgia, they required that every mental health center hire at least one CPS, that a billing code be assigned to the service, and that training for all hired CPSs be paid for by Medicaid. Additionally, Kansas Health Services (KHS) was named as an External Review Organization to ensure policy changes took place.

Criteria to determine whether the mental health center needs more than one CPS was left open to the interpretation that, so long as the person asking for the service is a verified mental health service consumer, asking for the service demonstrates a “medical need” for the service. If those asking for the service cannot be accommodated by one CPS, more need to be hired. Repercussions for mental health centers in the state still not complying by providing at least one CPS have been set.

Summary of CPS in Kansas
What worked in Kansas, then, began with the groundwork laid through collaboration with consumer run organizations and the curriculum originators to produce a well-constructed plan for offering services and training. Once these pieces were in place, the
Final Thoughts

Among some of those hired into CPS positions, there now exists a sentiment that mirrors what Larry Fricks felt after he had been appointed as Consumer Affairs Officer in Georgia; they feel like they are in the position to help more than they were, but that the consumer voice is still missing from the mental health system in important ways. So this new growth in Kansas does not indicate an end to the movement in the state. The consumer voice still needs to inform systematic changes in the jobs of mental health professionals. Furthermore, the practices and language used by mental health professionals must be better adapted to a recovery orientation. Mental health centers in Kansas with successful CPS programs emphasize the need for CPSs to have a “direct line” to Consumer Support Service directors.

The point here is that there is always room for growth. If no CPS program exists in your state, we hope this work can help to clear away the fog from a portion of the path consumers can take toward CPS implementation. Once a CPS Program is instated though, the work is not done. Much still needs to happen before the mental health system can fully integrate the consumer voice.

If a CPS program is desired, a step in the right direction is to hire consumers as employees. This feature of the CPS program stands out to trainers and CPS supervisors alike. CPS trainer Beth Filson (personal communication, July 29, 2009) spoke of the differences noted in Georgia consumers who were hired in peer support roles, “The reason I’m hooked into this, that I believe so strongly in this, is because I saw what it did to the individuals who became CPSs, took on leadership roles, got a paid job, moved from being the least-heard to their experience being vital to recovery, because that is the transformation that took place.” Filson went on to explain that being employed and considered important had a ripple effect on the way community members accepted long-time consumers. A Kansas CPS Supervisor echoed this, “renewed hope, that our peer support specialist brings to the table because of his own mental health recovery, I think it just sparks a renewed energy for (staff and administrators) toward recovery. We have seen clients who have been in services with us for many many years, now ‘talking recovery’ and thinking about advocating for themselves, it has just been an exciting process to witness,” (S. Lopez, personal communication, February 03, 2009).

In conclusion, what has been successful in two states whose mental health service consumers have achieved Medicaid-billable CPS Programs has been the collaboration of research professionals and consumer run organizations to present a logical plan for implementing the program while pointing out how pressure also comes from the federal level to do just that. It is noteworthy also that the “logical plan” was acquired through a personal connection to the consulting team who designed the curriculum. One need not re-invent the wheel. Wherever your state is on the path toward greater integration of peer support, the hiring of qualified mental health service consumers into roles they can competently fill seems to be helpful. ☞
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Hello to the student membership of SCRA! Thank you for showing your confidence in my ability to advance the mission of SCRA by electing me as the new National Student Representative. I have been a member of SCRA since 2004 and I consider it my professional home. As an undergraduate student in San Francisco, I came to believe that although helping those who are suffering may be noble, it is more effective, efficient, and humane to prevent suffering in the first place. However, since moving across the country to begin doctoral training in the clinical and community psychology programs at Georgia State University, I have often wondered how the values and vision of community psychologists can be advanced in varying settings. Those who attended the student meeting at the 2007 Southeast Ecological Conference may remember our in-depth discussion of whether the values of community psychology can exist within an academic setting. The Community Psychologist has explored similar questions that are critical for students of community psychology, such as whether opportunities for graduate training in psychology are diminishing (fall 2006; pp. 19–25) and how to infuse practice into community psychology graduate education (spring 2007; p. 81–105).

Given the continuing association of community psychology with academic training and employment, in my new role as a representative of students I plan to initiate a structure for an ongoing program evaluation of graduate training programs in community psychology. I propose the creation of a student working group to develop assessment criteria and gather existing data. Initial launch points for selecting evaluation criteria might be to assess how well program curricula, opportunities, climate, and actions live up to Kelly's (1971) "Qualities of the Community Psychologist," Prilleltensky's definition of psychopolitical validity (2003), the new SCRA vision statement (2007), and the efforts of outgoing SCRA President Maurice Elias to better define core competencies for practicing community psychology.

A second initiative I plan to develop is to extend the reach of existent community psychology knowledge in and from communities apart from academic expertise. Specifically, I am impressed with the comprehensive aspect of the Community Toolbox (http://ctb.ku.edu/en/), which includes Web 2.0 functions such as RSS feeds, twittering, and online workstations in addition to thousands of pages of how-to information for communities to address local problems. Given the use of the Toolbox from users around the globe, I believe it may be helpful to develop a standard way to link videos from community members to the Toolbox using YouTube as a host. Change strategies that are detailed in the text could be hyperlinked to videos posted by community members showing how they applied the material in their own communities and in their own languages. This technology is becoming more and more affordable and may be a highly accessible medium to drive “non-member” traffic to the SCRA website and the Community Toolbox in our increasingly interactive age.

I proposed these two primary initiatives for my two-year term in my candidate statement and both will require extensive input from students. Please feel free to contact me directly with your perspectives on the status of students in your training program, suggestions for the evaluation of community psychology education programs, as well as your ideas for the best uses of the Internet to better connect those doing community psychology around the globe. I can be reached via email at lindseyzimmerman@gmail.com or via my website www.lindseyzimmerman.com. My first step will be to compile a list of students who are interested in working on these two initiatives. My own professional research is focused on improving scientific knowledge and application of new interactive Internet media such as YouTube for the prevention of social problems. I will bring my knowledge of emerging Internet media to bear as a student representative of SCRA and I will continue in service of the vision of our division toward social justice through collaboration with our national and international partners in community psychology. I look forward to working with you!

Call for Papers: Winter 2010 Issue of The Community Student

Please consider writing an article for The Community Student (TCS)! TCS features articles written by students about their experiences, ongoing research and insights in relation to psychology as a whole, and community psychology in particular. We encourage you to email us articles for the Winter 2010 edition of The Community Student.

Paper submissions should follow one of the two possible themes described below (both formats should include references):

1. A critical reflection on a previously published TCP article (preferably within the past 3–4 editions). We encourage personal reflections that employ a critical analysis aimed to elicit insight on the field of community psychology. Double spaced and no longer than 6 pages.*

2. A scientifically oriented article that informs the field of...
community psychology. Submissions should speak to one or all of the four principles of Division 27 (www.scra27.org). Written work must include a methodology, results section, and discussion. Double spaced and no longer than 10 pages.*

*Please adhere to APA guidelines

The deadline for paper submissions is November 10th, 2009. The Community Student is a great way to share your insights and experiences with other SCRA members. It's also a great way to add a publication to your curriculum vitae! Articles should be submitted electronically to Fernando Estrada at fernando.estrada@asu.edu and Lindsey Zimmerman at lindsdeyzimmerman@gmail.com.

**Women’s Issues**
**Edited by Susan M. Wolfe (Current Chair) and Michèle Schlehofer (Outgoing Chair)**

---

**What’s New with the Women’s Committee**

The Women’s Committee is continually evolving! At this time the committee has several initiatives underway. The first and biggest is a potential restructuring. We are currently working on a plan that would result in a more participative committee and more opportunities for SCRA members to become actively involved in Women’s Committee initiatives and activities. Stay tuned! We will be providing details as soon as they are finalized! We plan to announce the changes via e-mail and the TCP Women’s Column, and will be seeking volunteers.

Second, our presence at the Biennial was a success. The committee sponsored two sessions and Women’s Night Out at the Biennial, and they all went very well. The first session was focused on transgenerational themes of women’s careers in community psychology across decades, beginning in the 1960’s. Panelists were Holly Angelique, Gloria Levin, Anne Mulvey and Judy Primavera, and each had a riveting story to tell. Further, Holly Angelique and Anne Mulvey will be co-editing a special issue of the Journal of Community Psychology based on themes arising from this panel. For the second session, Michèle Schlehofer led a town hall-style meeting on work/family/life balance. Becki Campbell, Zermarie Deacon, Jessica Goodkind, Julie Pellman, MaryBeth Shinn and Shari Walling all facilitated group discussions that provided useful information for planning future Women’s Committee initiatives concerning mentorship and institutional support within and outside SCRA for work/life balance issues. Women’s Night Out was held at the Six Brother’s Diner and approximately 60 women attended! There was a lot of great conversation and informal mentoring going on over meals.

Third, the committee has undergone its annual leadership turnover. Michèle is now the “outgoing” chair, after serving for a very productive year. Susan is the current chair, and will be working very hard to continue building on the great foundation that has been laid.

Finally, we are still taking nominations for the incoming Chair for the Women’s Committee. This is a three year commitment, with most activity taking place during the second year, when the individual serves as chair of the committee. The first and third years are spent assisting the chair with the various activities. As current and outgoing chair, we can attest to the great opportunity this has been. It’s a wonderful chance to become more involved in SCRA and contribute in a meaningful way, to meet and network with more of the marvelous women who are SCRA members, and to have some great experiences. You are also very welcome to nominate yourself. Just send an e-mail to Susan (Susan.Wolfe@fwisd.org) and/or Michele (mmschlehofer@salisbury.edu) and give us a brief description of why you are interested and any other information you think would be important for us to make the decision. Alternatively, if you’d like to get involved in Women’s Committee activities but are hesitant to assume the position of incoming chair, please contact either of us, as we could use your assistance on several projects arising out of Biennial. We welcome any and all contributions to the committee.

These are just a sample of the exciting happenings with the Women’s Committee. Other projects are in the works, so watch your inbox for SCRA-W e-mail with announcements of opportunities and other news. If you are not signed up on SCRA-W, here are the instructions:

1. Send e-mail to LISTSERV@LISTS.APA.ORG
2. Leave the subject area blank
3. In your message area type: SUBSCRIBE SCRA-W

To post a message to the list send e-mail to SCRA-W@LISTS.APA.ORG. (Also, be sure that you are sending the message from the e-mail account you used to subscribe).

NOTE FROM SUSAN: Kudos and many thanks to Michèle Schlehofer for her hard work and the significant contributions she has made to this committee during her year as Chair. I look forward to working with her during the next year!

---

**Becoming an Advocate in Rural Communities: A Review of Research and Policy Implications Related to Children of Lesbian Families**

**Written by Megan E. Bradley, PhD**

**Abstract**

The purpose of this paper was to review the literature on children of lesbian families as it applies to rural community psychologists. Major research projects in this area were explored on aspects of research design, and findings were summarized from several articles
and meta-analytic studies. The majority of articles comparing children of lesbian parents with children of heterosexual parents reported no major differences in child outcomes. Characteristics unique to families headed by lesbians also were described including the scant information from rural populations. The paper concluded with recommendations from researchers, policy makers, and social justice advocates that rural community psychologists may implement to promote acceptance of family diversity.

Introduction

In 2004, the American Psychological Association (APA) issued a policy statement related to sexual orientation, parents, and children (Paige, 2005) that summarized the current research on lesbian and gay-parented families and called upon psychologists to become advocates on behalf of these families. Pertinent aspects of this policy statement include:

WHEREAS research has shown that the adjustment, development, and psychological well-being of children is unrelated to parental sexual orientation and that the children of lesbian and gay parents are as likely as those of heterosexual parents to flourish; THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the APA opposes any discrimination based on sexual orientation in matters of adoption, child custody and visitation, foster care, and reproductive health services; THEREFORE BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that APA encourages psychologists to act to eliminate all discrimination based on sexual orientation in matters of adoption, child custody and visitation, foster care, and reproductive health services in their practice, research, education and training.

Other organizations, such as the Child Welfare League of America, American Bar Association, American Academy of Pediatrics, and the American Psychiatric Association, issued similar statements (Joos, 2003).

To assist psychologists, the APA published the “Guidelines for Psychotherapy with Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Clients” (Division 44 / Committee on Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Concerns Joint Task Force, 2000) detailing 16 guidelines across four areas: attitudes toward homosexuality and bisexuality, relationships and families, issues of diversity, and education. The guidelines encourage psychologists to become familiar with the research and with community resources for lesbian, gay, and bisexual individuals and families.

In this paper, the focus will be on lesbian-parented or gay-parented families. Most of the research on these family types focus on lesbian parents (single or with partners) and their children, due to the greater number of families headed by lesbians. In accordance with the APA’s policy statement, the major research findings for lesbian-parented families will be reviewed first followed by a summary of recommendations for psychologists to become community advocates.

Is there a need for rural community psychologists to be more informed about these issues? Eliason and Hughes (2004) researched treatment counselor’s attitudes about lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgendered (LGBT) clients in an urban Chicago sample and a rural Iowa sample. Results indicated counselors in both settings reported little formal education on LGBT issues, lacked awareness of legal issues facing LGBT families, and often (nearly half) reported harboring negative or ambivalent attitudes towards these clients.

More recently, Green, Murphy, Blumer, and Palmanteer (2009) studied marriage and family therapists’ comfort level while working with lesbian and gay individuals and families. Participants were recruited from nine states but specific rural versus urban demographics were omitted. Sixty-five percent of therapists reported learning about sexual orientation issues during graduate school while 46% learned through clinical supervision. Most therapists (89%) learned about sexual orientation issues through personal experience and most (73.5%) were supportive of recognizing legal same sex unions. Since the age range for therapists was 45–64, it is possible that their graduate and internship training was several years ago when sexual orientation issues were not as integrated. Current research on a variety of therapeutic graduate programs and internships, in both rural and urban settings, is needed to fully evaluate if therapists are receiving proper education and training.

Summary of Research Designs on Lesbian-Parented Families

Opponents of gay-family rights have criticized the quality of research on lesbian-headed families (for a review, see Stacey & Biblarz, 2001). Yet, the field has progressed from the early days of small convenience samples to include current longitudinal data with matched heterosexual comparison groups (Patterson, 2006). Table 1 summarizes the research designs of some major projects by leading principle investigators.

In addition, three major review or meta-analytic studies have been published examining outcomes for children of same-sex parents. Allen and Burrell (1996) conducted a meta-analysis across 18 research studies on the effects of parental sexual orientation on parenting practices, emotional well-being of the child, and the sexual orientation of the child. Stacey and Biblarz (2001) reviewed 21 studies, including 11 from the Allen and Burrell (1996) meta-analysis, to determine if there were any differences among children raised by “lesbigay families” versus heterosexual families on the following variables: gender behavior/preferences, sexual behavior/preferences, self-esteem and psychological well-being (of parents and children), parental behavior toward children’s gender and sexual development, parenting practices, residential parent/child relationships, and nonresidential parent/child relationships. Most recently, Crowl, Ahn, and Baker (2008) conducted a meta-analysis across 19 studies on one family outcome (parent and child relationship quality) and five child outcomes: cognitive development, gender-role behavior, gender identity, sexual preference, social and emotional development. Thus, this body of research is extensive enough for meta-analysis and the findings are strikingly consistent. Below is a summary, including findings of no differences based on parental sexual orientation, differences unique to families headed by lesbians, and information from rural-only studies.
Summary of Findings

No significant differences—The majority of published articles comparing children of same-sex parents with children of heterosexual parents reported no major differences in child outcomes. Indeed, parent sexual orientation has not been found to be related to negative child outcomes (Crowl et al., 2008). The specific child and adolescent outcomes showing no differences include:

- Children’s self-concepts, preference for same-gender playmates, or measures of social competence and behavior problems (Chan, et al., 1998; Fulcher, et al., 2005; Patterson, 1996)
- Gender-typed behavior, gender role behavior, or gender identity (Crowl, et al., 2008; Golombok, et al., 2003)
- Cognitive development or sexual preferences (Crowl et al., 2008)
- Children’s play narratives on indices of mother-child relationships, aggression, negative emotion, story narrative coherence, or favorable endings (Perry, et al., 2004)
- Maternal reported strengths or difficulties for children (Golombok, et al., 2003) or adolescents (MacCallum & Golombok, 2004)
- Teacher-reported adjustment, strengths or difficulties for children (Chan, et al., 1998; Fulcher, et al., 2005; Golombok, et al., 2003) or adolescents (MacCallum & Golombok, 2004)
- Psychiatric evaluation by child psychologist unaware of family structure (Golombok, et al., 2003; MacCallum & Golombok, 2004)
- Physical environment of children’s bedrooms (Sutfin, Fulcher, Bowles & Patterson, 2008)
- Parent-adolescent expressive warmth/closeness, instrumental warmth, expression of affection, or conflict tactics (MacCallum & Golombok, 2004)
- Adolescent school adjustment or peer relationships (MacCallum & Golombok, 2004)
- Adolescent self-esteem in families where divorce was a factor (Huggins, 1989)
- Adolescents’ psychosocial adjustment (depressive symptoms, anxiety, self-esteem), school functioning (including GPAs), engagement in sexual intercourse, involvement in romantic relationships, parental warmth, or integration into the neighborhood (Crowl et al., 2008; Patterson & Wainright, in press)
- Adolescent self-reported frequency of delinquent behavior, victimization, or substance abuse (Patterson & Wainright, in press)

Differences/Unique Family Characteristics

Differences have been found that uniquely describe lesbian-parented families. As Stacey and Biblarz (2001) concluded, “(m) ost of the differences in the findings…cannot be considered deficits from any legitimate public policy perspective. They either favor the children with lesbigay parents, are secondary effects of social prejudice, or represent ‘just a difference’ of the sort democratic societies should respect and protect” (p. 177). The following are differences in results from specific studies:

- Lesbian mothers held less traditional views about gender-related issues than heterosexual parents and were less likely to create gender-stereotyped physical environments for children (Sutfin, et al., 2008)
- Adolescents headed by same-sex parents reported greater school connectedness than adolescents headed by opposite-sex parents (Patterson & Wainright, in press). Specifically, adolescents’ perception of adult and peer care had a stronger influence on school connectedness for those living with same-sex parents than those living with opposite-sex parents.
- Lesbian mothers reported using smacking as a discipline tool less frequently and reported engaging in more play (imaginative and domestic) than heterosexual mothers (Golombok, et al., 2003).
- Co-mothers (non birth mothers) were less likely to smack children, had fewer disputes, and were less likely to show increase levels of emotional involvement compared to fathers (Golombok, et al., 2003).
- In families without fathers, mothers reported more aggression towards children during disagreements than mothers in father-present families. Specifically, single heterosexual mothers showed more disciplinary aggression than lesbian mothers compared to mothers in families with fathers (MacCallum & Golombok, 2004).
- Twelve-year-old boys in father-absent families scored higher on femininity measures than boys in father-present families. There were no differences between single heterosexual-headed or lesbian-headed father-absent families. In addition, there were no differences in boys’ scores on masculinity measures based on presence or absence of father (MacCallum & Golombok, 2004).
- Same sex parents self-reported better parent-child relationships than heterosexual parents; however, children’s perception of the relationship did not differ based on family type (Crowl et al., 2008).
- Lesbian couples of young children (4–6 years old) were more likely to evenly distribute paid and unpaid labor while matched heterosexual couples tended to have fathers focus on paid labor while mothers focused on unpaid labor (Patterson, Sutfin, & Fulcher, 2004).
- Children of lesbian-parented families experience stigmatization and experiences with homophobia to varying degrees (Bos, et al., 2008; Bos & van Balen, 2008; Gershon, Tschann, & Jemerin, 1999). This within-group difference shows that some children experience very little stigmatization while others experience greater degrees that can negatively impact self-concept.
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Same sex parents face more legal difficulties related to child custody, visitation rights, and basic parenting rights than heterosexual parents (Joos, 2003).

### Rural Findings

To date, there is no published study examining unique characteristics of rural children of same-sex parents. Rural children have been included in some of the reviewed articles (see Table 1) but there were no separate statistical analyses. There are, however, some studies on rural aspects of lesbian parents or lesbian singles. McNair,
Brown, Perlesz, Lindsay, de Vaus, and Pitts (2008) examined 20 lesbian parented families as they negotiated the health care system in rural and urban Australia. Vignettes indicated two rural couples become less open about their relationship after having children and moving from an urban area to a rural one. Parents did not want to expose children to homophobic attitudes and felt the need to avoid disclosure to increase child safety. This decrease in openness led to the parents experiencing stress over not being honest or authentic.

Similar findings emerged in another sociological study on same-sex attracted women living in rural Australia (Edwards & Cheers, 2007). These women tended not to seek help from local practitioners or members of their social support network despite having many close community ties. Their decision was based on fear of exposure in facing the negative consequences of rural homophobia. In addition, younger lesbians from rural communities reported more pressure to conform and higher level of threats (particularly in schools) than older rural lesbians. Thus, younger rural lesbians were less able to use social networks for support of their feelings related to same-sex attraction.

Taken together, these findings from rural studies highlight the need for community psychologists to proactively assist same-sex families. Differences in cultural norms, beliefs, and policies exist in the United States between urban and rural areas (Weber, 2008). Urban areas appear more successful in supporting same-sex unions and other legal rights of same-sex families than rural areas. Therapeutic outreach programs to potential clients that reinforce existing confidentiality procedures may help with immediate issues of families receiving local assistance; however, the overarching cultural/community issues of homophobia and stigmatization remain. Consequently, the community psychologist is challenged to become an educated advocate to improve the lives of same-sex families as a means of fulfilling the APA's Policy Statement.

**Recommendations for Rural Community Psychologists**

Patterson (2007) recommended professionals learn about local laws related to domestic partnerships, legal rights of both partners in same-sex families (including the right to adopt), employment discrimination, and protection against harassment of lesbian- or gay-headed families. If legal rights are lacking, these families may face additional financial and mental health burdens as they seek safety and security already guaranteed to other families. It may be necessary to adjust client fees if not all family members are recognized for coverage under health insurances. Where laws need to be implemented, become a vocal advocate on behalf of these families. In addition, it may be necessary to educate same-sex parents on the existing status of their rights.

Ryan and Martin (2000) listed several recommendations related to perception of families. First, they recommend abandoning traditional ideals of optimal family structures and, instead, define a child’s “parent” as any adult with the intention of being a parent and who assumes responsibilities of a parent. Next, they indicate that clinical practices and other organizations can assist in welcoming possibly hesitant same-sex parents by changing all forms to eliminate heterosexist language such as “mother’s name” or “husband.” The authors recommend including more than two spaces on forms for any section about parents and provide the opportunity to write-in alternate parental titles. Furthermore, they recommend all publications, orientation programs for open houses, and fact sheets specifically recognize and welcome family diversity to avoid the appearance that some families may not be welcomed.

Once a child or parent is a client, psychologists should obtain a detailed family history and proper identification of all family members (Ryan & Martin, 2000; Tellingator & Patterson, 2008). Be open to a wide variety of family constellations for families headed by same-sex parents, such as children conceived by donor insemination (anonymous or known) or full functioning adult parents with no biological or legal ties to the children. Also assess the degree of support from extended family members and surrounding community (Tellingator & Patterson, 2008). Clients may hold secrets about their family constellation due to actual external threats or internalized homophobia. Issues of disclosure to extended family members and the community may need to be explored by psychologists within a supportive therapeutic environment.

Reaching out to local schools can assist in fostering growing acceptance of lesbian- or gay-headed families. Crowl et al. (2008) recommended schools implement professional in-service training and to counter anti-gay sentiment through gay-straight alliances or other school-based programs. Bos et al. (2008) found that children of lesbian parents who experienced homophobia and attended schools with LGBT curricula experienced fewer social problems or aggression compared to those children who did not attend schools with LGBT curricula. The authors suggested LGBT curricula served as a protective factor against the negative influence of homophobia. National organizations have established programs in place; however, the involvement of local community psychologists likely will improve implementation success. In addition, professional in-service training or LGBT-type programs could be implemented in other community areas such as local physician offices and libraries.

Weber (2008) recommended community professionals should expedite the process of creating legislation/programs emphasizing equal rights instead of waiting for public opinion to become more favorable. Arguments should be made on the basis of scientific evidence and should not hinge on a basic human rights framework that is more influential in countries like Canada. On a more personal level, Goodman (2000) reviewed three different types of motivation that may be used to help members of privileged groups, such as heterosexuals, support social justice for others (e.g., same-sex parented families): Empathy, moral and spiritual values, and self-interest. Each type of motivation has strengths and limitations depending on the person and the context. Assessing why a person is resistant to accepting same-sex parented families will assist community psychologists in selecting the right motivation to promote change on a small or large scale.

In conclusion, rural psychologists have a unique opportunity to create positive changes in their communities. The scientific evidence on children of same-sex parents is clear and consistent in its findings that parental sexual orientation is not associated with any negative child outcomes (see Paige, 2005). Yet, same-sex parents and
their children continue to experience unjustified homophobia and stigmatization. Rural communities are known for close ties among its inhabitants. Community psychologists can use their intimate knowledge of their towns to implement a variety of changes towards the goal of accepting greater family diversity.
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Submit Your Dissertation for a SCRA Dissertation Award

Is it possible that you just happened to write one of the most relevant dissertations in the field of community psychology and/or wellness in the last 2 years???

Well.....YES! It is possible! But—you will never know if you don’t try. We are currently accepting nominations for two dissertation awards.

DEADLINE FOR NOMINATIONS: December 1, 2009

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, 2007 and August 31, 2009 —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 designated 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, 2007 and August 31, 2009—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 meeting in 2008.

Materials required: 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 Chair of the Dissertation Awards Committee. The nomination cover letter should include the name, graduate school affiliation and thesis advisor, current address, phone number, and (if available) email address and fax number of the nominee. The abstract should present a statement of the problem, methods, findings, and conclusions. Abstracts typically range from 4–8 pages and may not exceed ten 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 asked to submit their full dissertation electronically (finalists whose dissertations exceed 150 pages may be asked to send selected chapters). The committee will then review the full dissertations and select the winners.

Nomination Process and Deadline for Submission: Submit an electronic copy of the cover letter and dissertation abstract to the Chair of the Dissertation Awards Committee, Darcy Freedman, by December 1, 2009 at darcy.freedman@sc.edu.

SCRA Award Nominations 2009–2010

DEADLINE FOR ALL AWARD NOMINATIONS: December 1, 2009

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 be sent to Mark Aber at maber@uiuc.edu by December 1, 2009 and 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.

Past recipients are:
2008 Christopher Keys
2007 William Davidson
2006 Kenneth Maton
2005 Abe Wandersman
2004 Roger Weissberg
2003 Lonnie Snowden
2002 Ana Marie Cauce
2001 Rhona Weinstein
2000 Stephanie Riger
1999 Irwin Sandler
1998 Dickon Reppucci
1997 Leonard Jason
1996 Marybeth Shinn
1995 Ed Trickett
1994 John Newbrough
1993 William Ryan
1992 Irwin Altman
1991 Kenneth Heller
1990 Edward Seidman
1989 Edward Zigler
1988 Richard Price
1987 Murray Levine
1986 Julian Rappaport
1985 George Fairweather
1984 George Spivack & Myrna Shure
1983 Rudolf Moos
1982 Charles Spielberger
1981 George Albee
1980 Barbara & Bruce Dohrenwend
1979 Emory Cowen
1978 James Kelly
1977 Bernard Bloom
1976 Ira Iscoe
1975 John Glidewell
1974 Seymour Sarason

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, implementer, and/or evaluator of ongoing preventive/service programs in community settings; or other innovative roles.

Criteria for the award include the following. The first criterion applies in all cases; one or more of the remaining criteria must be present:

1. 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;
2. Demonstrated positive impact on the natural ecology of community life resulting from the application of psychological principles;
3. Challenged the status quo or prevailing conceptual models and applied methods; and
4. Demonstrated personal success in exercising leadership based on applied practice.

Initial nominations should be sent to Mark Aber at maber@uiuc.edu by December 1, 2009 and include:

1. The name and contact information of the nominee;
2. A 250–500 word summary of the rationale for nomination;
3. A statement, which can be from the nominee, that
documents clearly and specifically his or her eligibility for
this award by describing how he or she “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.” 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.

Finalists for the award will be contacted by the committee and
asked to provide more information.

Past recipients are:
2008 Richard Jenkins
2007 Jerry Shultz
2006 Adrienne Paine Andrews
2005 Peter Dowrick
2004 David Julian
2003 Jose Toro-Alfonso
2002 Debi Starnes
2001 Ed Madara
2000 Will Edgerton
1999 Thomas Gullotta
1998 Vivian Barnett-Brown
1997 Steve Fawcett
1996 Joe Galano
1995 Bill Berkowitz
1994 Gloria Levin
1993 Maurice Elias
1992 David Chavis
1991 Beverly Long
1990 John Morgan
1989 Frank Reissman
1988 Betty Tableman
1987 Donald Klein
1986 Anthony Broskowski
1985 Thomas Wolff
1984 Carolyn Swift
1983 Saul Cooper

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 research and action;

2. Contribution to fostering a climate in their setting that is
supportive of issues relevant to racial/ethnic diversity and
conducive to the growth of ethnic minority students and/
or beginning level graduates;

3. A history of involvement in efforts to increase the
representation of ethnic minority persons either in their
own institutions, research programs, or within SCRA; and

4. Consistent contributions to the structure and process
of training in psychology related to cultural diversity,
particularly in community programs.

Nomination Process: Both self-nominations and nominations
by students or colleagues will be accepted. Those submitting
nominations should send: 1) A nomination letter (no more than
3 pages long) summarizing the contributions of the nominee
to the mentorship of ethnic minority persons; 2) Name and
contact information (address, telephone, email) of at least one
additional reference (two if a self-nomination) who can speak
to the contributions the nominee has made to the mentorship
of ethnic minority persons (see above criteria)—at least one
reference must be from an ethnic minority person who was
mentored; and 3) A curriculum vita of the nominee. Collaborative
work with ethnic minority mentees, as well as other activities or
publications relevant to the criteria indicated above, should be
highlighted.

Please submit nominations by December 1, 2009 to Rhonda
Lewis-Moss at Rhonda.lewis@wichita.edu, or to Department
of Psychology, 1845 N. Fairmont, Wichita, KS 67260-0034.
Submissions by email would be especially appreciated.

Past recipients are:
2009 Meg Bond
2008 Stephen Fawcett
2007 Craig Brookins, Hirokazu Yoshikawa
2006 Robert Sellers
2005 Yolanda Balcazar
2004 Mark Roosa
2003 William Davidson II
2002 Shelley Harrell
2001 Ed Seidman
2000 Gary Harper
1999 Isaiah Crawford
1998 Maurice Elias; Ricardo Munoz
Award for Special Contributions to Public Policy

The purpose of SCRA’s Award for Special Contributions to Public Policy is to recognize individuals or organizations that have made exemplary contributions in the public policy arena. Those whose work contributes to public policy, whether from community agencies, academia, or non-government agencies, both national and international, are eligible for consideration. Priority will be given to a living member of SCRA, an allied discipline, or an organization involving individuals who have made important contributions to public policy, broadly defined.

Nomination Process: Both self-nominations and nominations by students or colleagues will be accepted. Those submitting nominations should send:

- For an individual: CV or resume (full or abbreviated), statement (maximum of four pages) regarding major social policy contributions of the individual, and up to three letters of support.
- For an organization: CV or resume for organization head or key individual, organization description/mission statement, statement (maximum of four pages) regarding major social policy contributions of the organization, and up to three letters of support.

Please send nominations by December 1, 2009 to Chair of the Social Policy Committee: Nicole Porter, nporter@depaul.edu, or to Center for Community Research, 990 W. Fullerton, Suite 3100, Chicago, IL 60614. Submissions by email would be especially appreciated.

Past Recipients:
2009 Steven Howe
2008 Marek Wosinski
2007 Patricia O’Connor

Outstanding Educator Award and the Excellence in Education Programs Award

These two awards are sponsored by the SCRA Council of Education Programs (CEP).

Criteria for these awards include two or more of the following:

1. Significant contributions to the structure and process of education in community psychology, research, and action;
2. Consistent, high quality teaching and mentorship contributing to the professional development of students and/or recent graduates involved in community research and action; and
3. Contribution to fostering a positive climate that supports undergraduate and graduate students in their setting.

Collaborative work with students, activities, publications, and curricula relevant to the criteria indicated above, should be highlighted.

Outstanding Educator Award: The purpose of this annual Award is to recognize a SCRA member who has made exemplary and innovative contributions to the education of students about community psychology and community research and action.

Nomination Process: Both self-nominations and nominations by students or colleagues will be accepted. Those submitting nominations should send:

1. A nomination letter (no more than 3 pages long) summarizing the innovative educational strategies promoted by the nominee, and how they contribute to the education of community psychologists and the development of the field of community research and action (and speak to the criteria listed above);
2. One letter of reference (2 letters if the nomination is a self-nomination);
3. Course evaluations and other types of evaluations from students/recent grads; and
4. A curriculum vita of the nominee.

Past Recipients:
2009 Sylvie Taylor
2008 Marek Wosinski
2007 Patricia O’Connor

Excellence in Education Programs Award: The purpose of this biannual Award is to recognize an exemplary undergraduate and/or graduate program that has innovative structures, strategies, and curricula that promote development of the field of community psychology and community research and action.

Nomination Process: Both self-nominations and nominations by individuals or organizations outside the program will be accepted. Those submitting nominations should send:

1. A nomination letter (no more than 4 pages long) should describe the basis of the recommendation and summarize the features of the program that would qualify it for the award (in relation to criteria specified above). The nomination letter should also include a listing of the
program faculty and other resources (e.g., community-based organizations, community expertise), relevant publications, and the ways in which they contribute to the education of undergraduate and/or graduate students; and

2. One letter of reference (2 letters if the nomination is a self-nomination). Reference letters should come from individuals outside the program, and may include representatives of community agencies/organizations with whom the program is associated, graduates of the program (out for at least 3 years), or colleagues in other programs in the college/university or outside the college/university.

Past Recipient:
2007  DePaul University

Please send nominations for both awards by December 1, 2009 to: Steven M. Davis, Ph.D, Associate Professor, Aurora University, Arts and Sciences, Institute for Collaboration 302, 347 South Gladstone Avenue, Aurora, IL 60506-4892 or email: smdavis@aurora.edu.

**John Kalafat Award**

John Kalafat’s life work integrated the principles and research of community psychology with their practical applications. John left a rich legacy in the published literature and in the many communities he helped strengthen. To continue his vision, two annual awards have been created in his honor.

**The Community Program Award:** This award will honor programs or initiatives that demonstrate a positive impact on groups or communities as validated by program evaluation; build foundational bridges between theory, research, and improving the world, and/or demonstrate excellence in integrating training and program development in crisis intervention.

2009  Screening for Mental Health, Inc
SOS Signs of Suicide Prevention Program

**The Practitioner Award:** This award will be a monetary stipend to an individual who exemplifies John’s unique characteristics as mentor, teacher, and advocate, and especially his passion in making the benefits of community psychology accessible to all.

2009  Bill Berkowitz

To make a nomination, e-mail kalafataward@scra27.org by December 1, 2009.

More at www.johnkalafat.com

---

**Now is the Time to Nominate SCRA Fellows!!**

**DEADLINE FOR NOMINATIONS:**
December 1, 2009

**What is a SCRA Fellow?** SCRA seeks to recognize a variety of exceptional contributions that significantly advance the field of community research and action including, but not limited to, theory development, research, evaluation, teaching, intervention, policy development and implementation, advocacy, consultation, program development, administration and service. A SCRA Fellow is someone who provides evidence of “unusual and outstanding contributions or performance in community research and action.” Fellows show evidence of (a) sustained productivity in community research and action over a period of a minimum of five years; (b) distinctive contributions to knowledge and/or practice in community psychology that are recognized by others as excellent; and (c) impact beyond the immediate setting in which the Fellow works.

**Applications for Initial Fellow status must include the following materials:**

1. A 2-page Uniform Fellow Application (available from Anne Bogat—see email and address at end of section) completed by the nominee;
2. 3 to 6 endorsement letters written by current Fellows,
3. Supporting materials, including a vita with refereed publications marked with an “R,” and
4. A nominee’s self-statement setting forth her/his accomplishments that warrant nomination to Fellow Status.

**SCRA members who are Fellows of other APA divisions** should also apply for SCRA Fellow status if they have made outstanding contributions to community research and action. Fellows of other APA divisions should send to the Chair of the Fellows Committee a statement detailing their contributions to community research and action, 3–6 letters of support, and a vita.

**Nomination Process:** Complete nominations should be submitted by December 1, 2009 to Maurice Elias email: rutgersmje@aol.com or to U.S. mailing address: Rutgers University, Tillet Hall, Room 405, 53 Avenue, Livingston Campus, Piscataway, NJ 08854-8040.
The Division of Community Psychology (27) of the American Psychological Association:

The Society for Community Research and Action (SCRA), Division 27 of the American Psychological Association, is an international organization devoted to advancing theory, research, and social action. Its members are committed to promoting health and empowerment and to preventing problems in communities, groups, and individuals.

Four broad principles guide SCRA:

1. Community research and action requires explicit attention to and respect for diversity among peoples and settings.
2. Human competencies and problems are best understood by viewing people within their social, cultural, economic, geographic, and historical contexts.
3. Community research and action is an active collaboration among researchers, practitioners, and community members that uses multiple methodologies.
4. Change strategies are needed at multiple levels in order to foster settings that promote competence and well-being.

The SCRA serves many different disciplines that focus on community research and action. Our members have found that, regardless of the professional work they do, the knowledge and professional relationships they gain in SCRA are invaluable and invigorating. Membership provides new ideas and strategies for research and action that benefit people and improve institutions and communities.

Who Should Join:

- Applied & Action Researchers
- Social & Community Activists
- Program Developers & Evaluators
- Psychologists
- Public Health Professionals
- Public Policy Makers
- Consultants
- Students from a variety of disciplines

Interests of SCRA Members Include:

- Community Mental Health
- Consultation & Evaluation
- Culture, Race & Gender
- Empowerment & Community Development
- Human Diversity
- Prevention & Health Promotion
- Public Policy
- Self-Help & Mutual Support
- Training & Competency Building

SCRA Goals:

- To promote the use of social and behavioral science to enhance the well-being of people and their communities and to prevent harmful outcomes
- To promote theory development and research that increase our understanding of human behavior in context
- To encourage the exchange of knowledge and skills in community research and action among those in academic and applied settings
- To engage in action, research, and practice committed to liberating oppressed peoples and respecting all cultures
- To promote the development of careers in community research and action in both academic and applied settings

SCRA Membership Benefits & Opportunities:

- A subscription to the American Journal of Community Psychology (a $105 value)
- A subscription to The Community Psychologist, our outstanding newsletter
- 25% discount on books from Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers
- Special subscription rates for the Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation
- Involvement in formal and informal meetings at regional and national conferences
- Participation in Interest Groups, Task Forces, and Committees
- The SCRA electronic mailing list for more active and continuous interaction about resources and issues in community research and action
- Numerous activities to support members in their work, including student mentoring initiatives and advice for new authors writing on race or culture
SOCIETY FOR COMMUNITY RESEARCH & ACTION
Membership Application

Name:__________________________________________
Title/Institution:____________________________________
Mailing Address:____________________________________
____________________________________________________
____________________________________________________
Day phone:_____________________________________
Evening phone:____________________________________
Fax:____________________________________________
Email:___________________________________________

May we include your name in the SCRA membership directory?
☐ Yes  ☐ No

Are you a member of APA?
☐ No  ☐ Yes  APA membership # ________________

If yes, please indicate your membership status:
☐ Fellow  ☐ Associate  ☐ Member  ☐ Student Affiliate

Please indicate any interest groups or committees you would like to join:
☐ Aging Interest Group
☐ Children & Youth Interest Group
☐ Community Action Interest Group
☐ Community Health Interest Group
☐ Cultural & Racial Affairs Committee
☐ Disabilities Interest Group
☐ Interdisciplinary Linkages Committee
☐ International Community Psychology Committee
☐ Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual & Transgender Concerns Interest Group
☐ Organization Studies Interest Group
☐ Prevention & Promotion Interest Group
☐ Public Policy Committee
☐ Rural Interest Group
☐ School Intervention Interest Group
☐ Self-Help/Mutual Support Interest Group
☐ Stress & Coping Interest Group
☐ Students of Color Interest Group
☐ Undergraduate Awareness
☐ Women’s Issues Committee

The following questions are optional, but they do help us to better serve our members:
What is your gender?______________________________
Your race/ethnicity?______________________________
Do you identify as a sexual minority? ________________
Do you identify as disabled?________________________
How did you hear about SCRA membership?
________________________________________________

Membership Dues:
☐ SCRA Member $60.
☐ Student Member $30.
☐ International Member $50.
☐ Senior Member $15.

You must be 65 or older, retired, and a member of SCRA Division 27 for 25 years to qualify for this rate.
Senior members will receive The Community Psychologist but not American Journal of Community Psychology.

Payment:
☐ Check enclosed (payable to SCRA)
☐ Charge to credit card:  ☐ Visa  ☐ MasterCard
Account #:_____________________________________
Expiration date:_____________________________ 
Authorized signature:___________________________
Signature of applicant:_________________________
Date:___________________________

Please mail this form along with payment for your membership dues to:

SCRA
16 Sconset Neck Rd. #290
Fairhaven, MA 02719
ABOUT THE Community Psychologist:
The Community Psychologist is published four times a year to provide information to members of the SOCIETY FOR COMMUNITY RESEARCH AND ACTION. A fifth Membership Directory issue is published approximately every three years. Opinions expressed in The Community Psychologist are those of individual authors and do not necessarily reflect official positions taken by SCRA. Materials that appear in The Community Psychologist may be reproduced for educational and training purposes. Citation of source is appreciated.

TO SUBMIT COPY TO THE Community Psychologist:
Articles, columns, features, Letters to the Editor, and announcements should be submitted as Word attachments in an e-mail message to the Associate Editor at: dj5775@yahoo.com. You may also reach the Editor by e-mail at mariachu@hawaii.edu or by postal mail at Maria B. J. Chun, UH Department of Surgery, 1356 Lusitana Street, 6th Floor, Honolulu, HI 96813. Authors should adhere to the following guidelines when submitting materials:

- **Length:** Five pages, double-spaced
- **Images:** Images are highly recommended, but please limit to two images per article. Images should be higher than 300 dpi. Photo image files straight from the camera are acceptable. If images need to be scanned, please scan them at 300 dpi and save them as JPEGs. Submit the image(s) as a separate file. Please note that images will be in black and white when published.
- **Margins:** 1” margins on all four sides
- **Text:** Times New Roman, 12-point font
- **Alignment:** All text should be aligned to the left (including titles).
- **Color:** Make sure that all text (including links, e-mails, etc.) are set in standard black.
- **Punctuation Spacing:** Per APA guidelines, make sure that there is only one space after periods, question marks, etc.
- **Graphs & Tables:** These should be in separate Word documents (one for each table/graphs if multiple). Convert all text in the graph into the consistent font and font size.
- **Footnotes:** Footnotes should be placed at the end of the article as regular text (do not use Word footnote function).
- **References:** Follow APA guidelines. These should also be justified to the left with a hanging indent of .25”.
- **Headers/Footer:** Do not use headers and footers.
- **Long quotes:** Follow APA guidelines for quoted materials.

UPCOMING DEADLINES:

SUBSCRIPTION INFORMATION:
The Community Psychologist and the American Journal of Community Psychology are mailed to all SCRA members. To join SCRA and receive these publications, send membership dues to SCRA, 16 Sconticut Neck Rd., #290, Fairhaven, MA, 02719. Membership dues are $30 for student members, $60 for United States members, $50 for international members, and $15 for senior members (must be 65 or over, retired, and a member of SCRA/Division 27 for 25 years; senior members will receive TCP but not AJCP). The membership application is on the inside back cover.

CHANGE OF ADDRESS:
Address changes may be made online through the SCRA website <www.scra27.org>. Address changes may also be sent to SCRA, 16 Sconticut Neck Rd., #290, Fairhaven, MA, 02719. Email: <office@scra27.org>. APA members should also send changes to the APA Central Office, Data Processing Manager for revision of the APA mailing lists, 750 First St., NE, Washington, DC 20002-4422.
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