What's in This Issue

MEG GERRARD, Editor

The main focus of this issue of the Division 27 Newsletter is the APA meetings in Washington D.C. Current rosters of active committees, lists of new members, names of Regional representatives and student representatives, and the 1976-77 Executive Committee members are included. This issue also highlights the other Division 27 publications, the American Journal of Community Psychology and the Community Psychology Series. We have a new editor of AJCP who informs us of several changes in the journal. Barbara Dohrenwend has written a very thoughtful piece for her first President’s Message.

Of special interest is a new column entitled Program Evaluation in Community Psychology. The first article in the column is submitted by Brenna Bry of Rutgers University. The column is designed to stimulate dialogue and we are printing a response to the Bry piece written by Anthony Broskowski of Harvard Medical School. We hope that you will also respond to the column and let us know your reactions.

President’s Message

BARBARA S. DOHRENWEND, CUNY Graduate Center

PRIMARY PREVENTION OF WHAT?

I would like to pick up two challenges issued by my predecessors, Emory Cowen and Charlie Spellberger. In his third presidential column in this Newsletter Emory wondered and worried about what Division 27, or, for that matter, Community Psychology, would do with power if it had it. In his presidential address Charlie urged us on to the task of creating a knowledge base for Community Psychology. I will not argue that “Knowledge is power.” As psychologists we know that such an argument would overstate the role of rationality in human affairs. But I would argue that knowledge provides both a motive for acquiring power and direction for exercising it. So let me try to advance both Charlie’s and Emory’s cases with a question.

Before we come to the question, let’s look at some assumptions that precede it. Assumption: Community Psychology grew out of dissatisfaction with, as Emory put it, “the failure of past mental health ways to deliver.” Put in terms of individuals, the typical member of Division 27 would probably argue that neither tertiary prevention nor secondary prevention will solve existing problems of mental health in our society.

Assumption: If secondary and tertiary prevention are not going to solve mental health problems we must develop methods of primary prevention. Not only would primary prevention be more efficient but, probably at least as important to many members of this Division, it would be more humane.

So far we are, I hope, together, but now what? At this point we could, I fear, begin wandering around in circles asking each other “How can we improve mental health?” The problem is that mental health is a term that is strongly connotative but has almost no denotative meaning except in the negative sense of excluding mental illness. And “mental illness” with no further qualification is also pretty hard to get hold of. Yet it is my impression that almost all of our discussion of primary prevention starts with these amorphous terms and, because they place almost no constraint on us, soon evolves into an exciting but unproductive debate about how to improve the world and the people in it. I suggest that we could avoid this impasse by leaving the question of how aside for the time being and asking first, “Primary prevention of what?”

This question seems to me to have the advantage of directing us toward both knowledge and power. First, if we think in terms of specific outcomes we are directed to the extensive and growing literature on the epidemiology of various types of psychological disorder. This literature, among other things, relates the position of an individual in his community as well as various community processes that impinge on him, such as discrimination, to the likelihood of his becoming schizophrenic, neurotic, or whatever. It provides, I suggest, an important knowledge base for Community Psychology.

With respect to power, it seems to me that we are much more likely to gain popular attention and support with proposals for reducing the incidence of particular psychological disorders than with proposals for making the world, or even a particular part of it, a better place to live in. The latter goal is no more our business than it is the business of politics and politicians, and we are not likely to be very successful in competing for power directly with professional politicians. In contrast, the goal of reducing the incidence of particular types of mental illness can reasonably be defined as the business of Community Psychology. It is, moreover, an attractive goal that can be described fairly clearly. Thus, the coincidence of our special competence with an explicit and socially valued good provides, I suggest, a means for Community Psychology to secure socially useful power.

I have used this refereed column to have my say on a subject that is, I think, of some importance to Community Psychologists. I doubt that all of you will agree entirely, and some perhaps not even partly, with what I have said. My question to you, members of the Division of Community Psychology, is, therefore, “What do you think?” I would be interested in hearing either directly or through letters to the Editor of the Newsletter. I have hopes that discussion of this subject will tell us something about who we are and where we are going as Community Psychologists.
Murray Levine

Division 27 is proud to announce the election of Murray Levine as President Elect for 1976-77. Dr. Levine received a B.S. degree in Social Science from the College of the City of New York in 1949, and a Ph.D. in Psychology from the University of Pennsylvania in 1954. He is currently a professor at the State University of New York at Buffalo where he has been a member of the faculty since 1968. Prior to 1968 he was an Associate Professor and Director of the Clinical Training Program at Yale University.

Levine’s numerous publications reflect a variety of interests including program evaluation, mental health consultation, and clinical psychology. He has recently developed a legal model of fact finding and decision making for program evaluation. Levine is a Diplomate in Clinical Psychology, ABEP, and is on the editorial boards of the American Journal of Community Psychology, the Journal of Community Psychology, and the Journal of Law and Human Behavior.

Ira Iscoe Presented with Distinguished Contribution Award

A standing room only audience was on hand at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association in Washington, D.C. to see Ira Iscoe receive the 1976 Division of Community Psychology Award for Distinguished Contribution to Community Psychology and Community Mental Health. The award, presented by the Division for the third year, identifies persons who have made significant contributions to conceptualization and theory building, research, and program development in the fields of community psychology and community mental health.

Ira Iscoe has been a member of the faculty in the Department of Psychology at the University of Texas at Austin for 25 years, and is also the director of the University of Texas Counseling and Psychological Services Center. A Diplomate of the American Board of Examiners in Professional Psychology, he is a past president of Division 27. In a tribute delivered by James Kelly of the University of Oregon, a former student of Iscoe, he was cited for his energy, creativity, effectiveness as a spokesman for community psychology, and for his continuing work toward building a community of community psychologists both young and old. Iscoe received additional national recognition as host for the National Training Conference in Community Psychology in the spring of 1975.

At the ceremony itself, Iscoe presented an acceptance speech entitled “Realities and Trade-offs in a Viable Community Psychology”. This talk and James Kelly’s introductions will be published in a forthcoming issue of the American Journal of Community Psychology.

A Note of Thanks From Ira Iscoe

The receipt of the Distinguished Service Award of our Division is an honor I will always cherish. The way the presentation was done, it’s content, sincerity and affection, has given me an appreciation for what a peak experience really is. To all who took time from their busy schedules to honor me with their attendance and for all who arranged for the occasion, my deepest appreciation.

To James Kelly, a good and true friend and a respected colleague, my love and thanks for putting together in a bound volume the series of comments in my honor which I will always treasure along with the beautiful plaque presented by the Division.

Division 27 Business Meeting

September 5, 1976, Washington, D.C.

The meeting was called to order by President Emory Cowen.

Standing Committee Reports

a. Awards Committee: Will Edgerton, Chairperson. Congratulations to this year’s unanimous, and unquestionably deserving recipient: Ira Iscoe. Introduction to be made by Jim Kelly. The Awards Committee prepared a commemorative plaque to be given at the ceremony.

b. Fellowship Committee: Mel Zax, Chairperson. The Fellowship Committee received and processed seven (7) completed applications for Fellow status in the Division. Two persons already maintain APA Fellow status, Len Goodstein and Lester Leboe. Four additional names were submitted to the APA Review Committee, and two were eventually elected. The new Fellows to Division 27 were Frank Baker and Murray Levine. Congratulations to Frank and Murray.

It was recommended that alternative procedures be explored to increase the Division 27 response to the call for nominees in the future. Active Executive Committee participation and support, as well as vigorous Newsletter coverage was suggested.

c. Membership Committee: Deac Dorr, Chairperson. The membership committee reported a very active recruitment program which has been aimed specifically at minority psychologists in the last year. The 1975-76 census includes 1368 old members and 1328 new applications have been recorded for 1976-77 (including fellows, full members, students, associates, and affiliates). Goals for 1976-77 include continued enrollment from Community Mental Health Centers, Asian American and Women Psychologists, and a study of division membership attrition since 1970.

d. Nominations and Election Committee: Charlie Spielberger, Chairperson.

(1) Nominations were solicited from members of the Executive Committee and from the Division 27 membership through Newsletter announcement.

(2) Division elections for officers were very close this year, with 364 members voting for President, 314 for Secretary-Treasurer, and 330 for Member-at-Large. Congratulations to: President-Elect: Murray Levine (1977-78); President (1977-78); Secretary-Treasurer: David Stenmark (3 year term); Members-at-Large to the Executive Committee: Julian Rappaport (3 year term), Edwin Trickett (2 year term). As a matter of information, it was noted that Bob Newbrough was the third Member-at-Large on the Executive Committee and has one year remaining in his three year term.

e. Program Committee: Barbara Dohrenwend, Chairperson. This year, 57 symposia were submitted for presentation for APA, and 20 symposia were accepted. Seventy-two research and topical papers were submitted, and 16 papers were accepted. Numerous problems emerged as a result of the re-arrangements and shuffling by APA. A notable example resulted in Will Edgerton being scheduled as a paper session chairperson at the same time period when the Division 27 awards were being presented, Will served also as the Awards Chairperson.

A protest letter will be written by the President, Barbara, to APA regarding this, and other programmatic problems.

Thanks were extended to the members of the Program Committee, and in particular to Mort Bard and Steve Danish.

f. Regional Activities: Edison Trickett, Chairperson. Report on activities of Regional Coordinators, 1975-76. This was a year of mixed success for regional coordinators. In several regions—the West, the Northeast, the Southwest, and the Midwest—
programs were organized by the regional coordinators with the help of the student regional coordinators. These programs were not unified by a common theme, but were, on a general level, designed to increase the visibility of community psychology activities in the varied regions. In meetings of the Executive Committee at this APA and in discussions with several of the regional coordinators, the need for a more active structuring and clearer definition of the role of regional coordinators became clear. Ed Trickett will continue to serve as the “coordinator of the coordinators” for the coming year.

Publications Committee
David Hoffman, Chairperson. The Publications Committee, per se, has not been active since the Mid-Winter Executive Committee Meetings, and operative guidelines remain to be developed. David Hoffman, being out of the country, was unable to attend the APA meeting.

a. AJCP:
(1) As announced at the Mid-Winter Executive Committee Meeting, Charlie Spielberger, founder and editor of AJCP, has resigned as the journal editor. Jack Glidewell will serve as the new Editor of AJCP, and the transition will begin September 1st with projected completion in 30 to 60 days. All manuscripts and reviews are to be sent to Jack Glidewell at the University of Chicago.
(2) Charlie Spielberger reported data for the current year. AJCP has received a 20 percent increase in submitted articles, exercised a 65 percent rejection rate, and currently has an 18-21 month publication lag. Alternatives were discussed regarding expanding AJCP format in an effort to reduce the publication lag. Jack Glidewell will pursue these alternatives, contractually, with Plenum Press.
(3) AJCP cost increase. Plenum has proposed a substantial increase in subscription costs, for next year. The major increases in cost would be assessed to institutional subscriptions. Details remain to be negotiated by the Editor.
(4) AJCP announcement in the last Division 27 Newsletter led to 30-35 new individual subscribers.

b. Austin Conference Book-NIMH Report: Iscoe, Bloom, and Spielberger - Co-editors. Iscoe, Bloom, and Spielberger reported the completion of a satisfactory manuscript, the submission of the manuscript to the publisher, and an expected publication date of February or March 1977.

Minority Task Force
Thom Moore and Stanley Sue, Co-Chairpersons. The Minority Task Force was formally established by the Executive Committee at the Mid-Winter Meeting in New York, at the request and recommendation of Emory Cowen, President. The Task Force is administratively linked to the Executive Committee by the Division President. This Task Force has been operational only six months, and gets the Division 27 “most significant progress award” for 1978. The report of the Task Force and proposed budget are presented in these minutes, however, the budget will be considered formally at the Mid-Winter Meetings.

NOTE: The Minorities Task Force is working on a final draft of their Task Force Report which will be available to the membership this winter.

Student Representatives
Meg Meyer and Bonnie Burstein, Co-Chairpersons.

a. Election Results: Election of student representatives were held in three regions. Mike Zevon (University of Minnesota) will represent the Midwest; Brian Wilcox (University of Texas) the Southwest; Anne Mulvey (CUNY), Kevine Conter (Penn State), and Mark Ginsberg (Penn State) will collectively represent the Northeast. Elections will be held in the Southeast and the Rocky Mountain area during the fall. Bonnie Burstein continues as Western area representative. Ann Mulvey has been elected for a two-year term as student member of the Executive Committee.

b. Activities: Regional student activities have been integrated into overall division 27 regional activities during 1978. A major concern continues to be membership; recruitment has been less intense than anticipated and problems of attrition and renewal are in the process of clarification.

Education and Training
Task Force Report—Robert Newbrough and Margie Rust, Co-Chairpersons. The E&T Committee was concerned that all persons who have expressed interest in working on a TF be provided a way to participate. It was agreed at the mid-winter Executive Committee Meeting that two membership statuses should be established for each TF: (1) central members; and, (2) readers and reactors. Persons who do not connect on either of these two are encouraged to contact the chairpeople of the Committee in order that other alternatives can be explored (Margaret Rust, TRIMS, J. R. Newbrough, Box 319, Peabody College, Nashville, TN 37203).

Secretary-Treasurer’s Report
David Stenmark. The Secretary-Treasurer reported that as of August 31, 1976, the treasury had a balance of $5,938.13 which will be reduced to about $4,700.00 when currently outstanding bills are paid.

Commendations
The meeting unanimously approved resolutions to write letters of appreciation to: (a) Dee Fruchter for her creative and diligent work for the division as newsletter editor for the past one and one-half years; and, (b) Charlie Spielberger for his outstanding contribution to the division as founder and guiding spirit of the American Journal of Community Psychology. Barbara Dohrenwend took the chair as incoming President and adjourned the meeting.

Respectfully submitted,
David Stenmark
Secretary-Treasurer
Division 27 Executive Committee 1976-77

President
Barbara Dohenwend
CUNY Graduate Center
33 West 42nd Street
New York, New York 10036

President-Elect
Murray Levine
SUNY Buffalo
Department of Psychology
Buffalo, New York 14213

Past President
Emory Cowen
Department of Psychology
University of Rochester
Rochester, New York 14627
(716) 275-2547

Secretary-Treasurer
David E. Stemmark
Department of Psychology
University of South Carolina
Columbia, S. C. 29208
(803) 777-2558
(Home) 772-4313

Rep. to APA Council
Charles Spielberger
Department of Psychology
University of South Florida
Tampa, Florida 33618
(813) 974-2755 or 2795
(Home) 932-3593

Student Representatives
Bonnie Burstein
11874 Beatrice St.
Culver City, Cal. 90230

M. Anne Mulvey
32 Montgomery Place
Brooklyn, New York 11215

Members-At-Large
J. R. Newbrough (1977)
2426 Abbott Martin Road
Nashville, Tennessee 37203
(615) 327-8273
(Home) 292-6101

Julian Rappaport (1979)
Children’s Resident Center
University of Illinois
51 Gerty Drive
Champaign, Illinois 61820

Edison Trickett (1978)
Department of Psychology
Yale University
333 Cedar Street
New Haven, Connecticut 06511

Call For Nominations

Distinguished Contribution Award

Nominations, along with supporting documentation, are now in order for recipients of the 1977 Division 27 Award for distinguished contributions to community psychology and community mental health. Awards are made in the areas of conceptualization and theory development, empirical research, and program development. Please send your nominations to:

J. Wilbert Edgerton, Ph.D.
Chairman, Award Committee, Division 27
South Central District Office
Division of Mental Health Services
Suite 504, 225 Green Street
Fayetteville, N.C. 28301

Final determination of the award will be made by the Award Committee, which is made up of all past-Presidents of Division 27.

Division 27 Committee Chairpersons 1976-77

Awards Committee
Will Edgerton
UNC School of Medicine
Chapel Hill, N. C. 27514
(919) 966-4539
(Home) 942-5837

Fellowship Committee
Julian Rappaport
Children’s Resident Center
University of Illinois
51 Gerty Drive
Champaign, Illinois 61820

Membership Committee
Darwin A. Dorr
Chief Psychologist
Highland Hospital
Duke University Medical School
Asheville, North Carolina

James Kelly
2332 McMillan Street
Eugene, Oregon 97405

Program Committee
Murray Levine
SUNY Buffalo
Department of Psychology
Buffalo, New York 14213

Publications Committee
David Hoffman
School of Public Health
UCLA
Los Angeles, California 90024

Nominations and Elections Committee
Emory Cowen
Department of Psychology
University of Rochester
Rochester, New York 14627
(716) 275-2547

Minority Group Task Force
Stanley Sue
Department of Psychology
University of Washington
Seattle, Washington 98105

Thom Moore
1103e Willard Street
Urbana, Illinois 61801

Regional Coordinator Liaison
Edison Trickett
Department of Psychology
Yale University
333 Cedar Street
New Haven, Connecticut 06511

AAP Liaison
Tom Glynn
149 Westway Road
Greenbelt, Maryland 20770

Education and Training Comm.
J. R. Newbrough
2426 Abbott Martin Road
Nashville, Tennessee 37203
(615) 327-8273
(Home) 292-6101

Margie Rust
1270 Emerson Street
Denver, Colorado 80213
(Home) 303-831-8939

Training Sub-Committee Task Force 1: University Training
Meg Gerrard, Coordinator
Center for Social Work Research
School of Social Work
University of Texas
Austin, Texas 78712

Task Force 2: Manpower
Suzanne Bachman, Coordinator
Department of Psychology
University of South Carolina
Columbia, S. C. 29208

Task Force 3: Continuing Education
F. T. Miller, Coordinator
Div. of Community Psychiatry
Medical Center
University of North Carolina
Chapel Hill, North Carolina

Task Force 4: Entry Levels
Steve Danish, Coordinator
College of Human Development
Pennsylvania State University
University Park, Pennsylvania

Task Force 5: Field Training
Edison Trickett
Department of Psychology
Yale University
333 Cedar Street
New Haven, Connecticut 06511

Judy Kramer
CPC-CMHC
27 West Street
Red Bank, New Jersey 07701
Membership Committee
DARWIN DORB, Duke University Medical Center

A major problem facing the Membership Committee this year was the establishment of clear rules and regulations regarding the conditions of membership. Many persons participated in this project and after several months of work, we blocked out a clear statement regarding the conditions and duration of membership for all classes of members. This statement of policy was published in the Spring 1976 edition of the Newsletter.

The second major goal of the Membership Committee, of course, was the expansion of the membership base including not only numbers but representativeness of our population. Assisting in these efforts were the official Membership Committee consisting of Jose Bauernmeister, Edward Heck, Meg Meyer, Annette Rickel, Stanley Sue and Dave Terrell who are assisting in recruitment of Spanish-speaking, community mental health center workers, students, women, Asian Americans and blacks, respectively. A very large number of individuals expressed interest in joining the Division. Ultimately, we accepted 326 new members of whom 163 are full members, 31 are associate members, 29 are affiliates and 103 hold student membership. We have been particularly fortunate in attracting full members and student members. The figure of 163 for full members represents a 31% increase over the number of full members recruited last year. Most striking is the 51% increase in the number of students recruited this year over last year. We continue to be especially fortunate in attracting students to the Division.

Attrition of members continues to be a subject of concern. According to figures reported from 1973 to 1975, we lost about three-quarters of such members as we added to the rolls. In 1975 the number of full members was 901 and 130 new full members were voted in at the 1975 APA Convention. This should have netted us a total of 1,031 full members, but our census according to APA Central in early 1976 was 940, 91 persons apparently having dropped out as full members. We have not yet compared these rates to those reported by other Divisions. Hence, we do not know whether these figures are bad, good or indifferent. However, we are continuing in our attrition study to identify the attrition patterns in our Division as well as others and hopefully we will be able to report this in the Spring Newsletter.

The following persons were approved for membership at the annual business meeting in Washington:

Members

Patricia Anderson
William Douglas Anton
James Archer, Jr.
James Barbour Ashbrook
Albert Allen Attenborough
Suzanne Bachman
James Moses Ballard, Jr.
Bernard M. Bandman
Oscar A. Barbain
Carol Jeanne Barrett
Paul E. Beckman
Edward R. Beebe, Jr.
Kathleen Stassen Berger
Michael I. Berger
William R. Berkowitz

Mark W. Cohen
Matthew N. Cooper
James E. Crowfoot
William Buchanan Dalton
William B. Davidson
David Dean
Edmund Frank Dejowski
Ursla Marie Delworth
Raymond A. DiGiuseppe
Gerard Egan
Louis A. Ensenat
Jeff Alan Epstein
Garry Louis Feldman
Ronald Eugene Feldman
Alan R. Fiester
Robin C. Ford
Raymond D. Fowler
Olin Kenneth France, Jr.
Donata Melsane Francescato
Ellis L. Gesten
Joel Gilbert
Don Glad
Leo Goldman
George S. Goldstein
Sandra Courtlandt Goff
Ruth H. Gordon
Howard S. Gotsky
Barbara Wilton Guggenheim
Gary Ross Hackney
Esther Halpern
Raymond Reed Hardy
Dominie S. Harstone
Mary R. Harvey
Robert C. Hayden
Charles Howard Haywood
Kenneth Heller
Robert William Hoffman
Lois Ann Huenber
Barbara Carol Jessen
Helen Bernice Jones
Dorotha Adele Lewis
Kanalpauni
Ellyn Kaschak
Dean G. Kilpatrick
TeVonne Kimmitt
Michael D. Knox
Anthony A. Kopera
Kenneth Calvert Kramer
D. Bruce Krug
Clayton E. Laid
Robert E. Lamp
Gregory Blaise Laskow
John Joseph Lavelle
Carolyn U. Lindquist
Glenn E. Littlidge
David Anthony Lombard
John William Lounsbury
Rosemary H. Lowe
Joseph C. Lowman
Gordon Donald MacLean
James C. Maloni
Fortune Vincent Mannino
James LeRoy May
John Milton McCauley
Douglas O. McKewon, Jr.
Christine McLean
Spencer A. McWilliams
James J. Messina

Roger Arnold Meyer
Andrew William Meyers
Joel Meyers
Michael John Mischley
Max James Mobley
Rebecca S. Morgan
Subhash Chandra Mukherjee
J. Dennis Murray
Margery A. Neely
Gerald Theodore Olson
Amado M. Padilla
Eligio Roberto Padilla
Frank Joseph Prerost
Ann Pye
Edward Rappaport
James John Reisinger
Paul Joseph Rethinger
Thomas Allen Rich
Kernit J. Rehde
Charles Pierce Ruch
Brian P. V. Sarata
Walter Cruce Saunders
Thomas E. Schneider
Allan H. Scholom
Andrew Lee Selig
Lon Dale Shackelford
Deane H. Shapiro, Jr.
Richard J. Shea
Edward P. Sheridan
Diana Shelitz
Joyce L. Shichel
Lawrence Jeffrey Siegel
Robert J. Silver
Romney Earl Smallwood
Joel A. Smith
Robert Leslie Sokolove
Susan Spilman
James David Spivack
Robert Emanuel Steele
Marvin A. Steinberg
Frederick LeCompte Stevens, Jr.
Daniel Alexander Stone
Anthony Taylor
Janet Tanay
Arnold Thaw
William Thomas Thompson
Gilbert M. Trachtman
Eric W. Trupin
Theodore R. Valance
John Lester VanHagen
Andrew R. Vogelson
David Neil Walker
Gretchen Z. Warwick
Robert J. Warwick
Robert Curt Weigl
Malcolm Samuel Weinstein
David Weisfeld
Geoffrey D. White
Jeffrey O. Whitley
Erika Wick
Maurice Thomas Wilson
Norman Edward Wilson
Sondoa Mae Wilson
Richard Allen Winett
Jeanne H. Wurmsner
Gail Elizabeth Wyatt
Joan Wagner Zinober

Martha E. Bernal
V. Edwin Bixenstine
Sheldon Blackman
Marlyn Sue Bogner
Frank G. Bolton, Jr.
James A. Boone
Barry R. Burkhart
Lester Butt
H. Stephen Caldwell
William H. Calhoun
Fanny Mui-Ching Cheung
Ronald James Clack
Helen A. Cohen
Lester Cohen
Notice for Student and Affiliate Members:

Now that we have a firm policy regarding the conditions and duration of membership, individuals who have held either student or affiliate membership for a lengthy period of time and who have not renewed this membership may be up for termination December 31, 1976. If you were accepted for student or affiliate membership prior to March 1, 1976, your membership will most likely be terminated at the end of December this year unless you renew your membership by submitting a renewal form and a check to the Membership Chairperson.

Student/Affiliate Membership Renewal

If you would like to request or renew Student or Affiliate Membership in Division 27 for 1977, please fill in the information below and send this article with your check for $3.00 to:
Darwin Dorr, Ph.D.
Division 27 Membership Chairman
Highland Hospital
Division of Duke University Medical Center
Box 1101
Asheville, NC 28802

Name ____________________________
Address ____________________________________________________________
City ____________________________ Zip Code __________
State ____________________________ University Affiliation_____________

Expected Date of Graduation ________________

Check those that apply:

New Member ____________ Student Renewal ____________ Affiliate ____________

Paul Alan Marcus
Jane D. Martin
Steve B. McElfresh
Marcia Sue McPherson
Ophelia Corrine McShan
Jim Merrill
David William Merz
Anne Morgan Metzger
Roger Emmit Mitchell
Carole Whitfield Morgan
Donald Scott Morton
Ricardo Felipe Munoz
Michelle Lynn Munson
Irene Marie Newport
Manfred Nute
Sister Virginia O'Reilly
Christine Anne Padesky
Kenneth Paul Parker, Jr.
Dennis Neville Thomas Perkins
Susan Helen Potts
Joetta Mae Prost
Brian Robert Rasmussen
Donna Louise Renelli
Lynda Carleton Roach
Janet Rodeghiero

Mary P. Rodgers
Irma S. Rodriguez
Gregory Duane Roeder
William M. Rooney
Robert Gerald Rosofsky
Paul Carl Schoenfeld
Beryl A. Schulman
Albert W. Scovorn
Steve L. Shearer
Stana Carter Snodgrass
Andrea Gail Sodano
Lona Davis Spencer
Richard A. Stamm, Jr.
Mark Alan Stein
Clen Francis Strobel
Ira Strumwasser
Ella Taylor
Renate Treiber
Thomas Arnold VanHoose
Stuart A. Vexler
Michael Foster Whitdon
Linda Audrey Whitlock
Tina Tong Yee
David Leon Zahm
Susan Frances Zlotlow
DIVISION OF COMMUNITY PSYCHOLOGY
of the
AMERICAN PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION

Application for Membership

Name: __________________________________________________________________________________________
   (Last)   (First)   (Middle)

Preferred mailing address: ___________________________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________________________________________
   (City)   (State)   (Zip)

APA Membership Status: Fellow Member Associate Student None

Division 27 Application as: Member Affiliate Student

Education:
   (Highest Degree)   (Date)   (Institution)
   __________________________________________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________________________________________
   (Major Field of Study)   (Minor Field of Study)

Present Position: ________________________________________________________________________________
   (Title)   Employer   (Date)

Briefly describe your interests and activities relevant to community psychology.

This is/is not a renewal application.

Date: __________________________________________________________________________________________
   Applicant Signature.

Please return two copies of completed form to: Darwin Dorr, Ph.D.
   Membership Committee Chairperson
   Highland Hospital
   Division of Duke University Medical Center
   Box 1101
   Asheville, NC 28802

Please do not write below this line

Report of Division 27
Minorities Task Force

THOM MOORE, University of Illinois

Origin

The Minorities Task Force grew out of the interest and independent efforts of several people. As best I can tell, the initial stimulus was the National Training Conference in Community Psychology at Austin, Texas. While the Conference's original focus was training issues relevant to Community Psychology, there was an uneasy feeling among several minority conference that the specific issues of minority people were being ignored. The alarm of the minority people was not limited to their wanting a fair share of advance degree community psychologists; a much broader concern was at stake. The tenor of the conference indicated that the laboratory of community psychology was to be the communities of minority people, who would have little to say about the general plan of interventions and representatives to direct subsequent interventions. Consequently, they perceived themselves as police who had a responsibility to prevent a violation from occurring. A Black caucus was hastily formed to discuss the Austin situation and request time to make a position statement on the last day of the conference. Also, during the conference, there were numerous contracts among members of the various minority groups, with some discussion regarding the formulation of a coalition to address the status of minority people in Division 27 and APA. Unfortunately, this was never accomplished. Nonetheless, it indicated that many of us were aware that we were going to have to get involved. In addition to the Black caucus and the inter-minority communications, many of the minority people personally communicated to the conference organizers and members of the Division 27 Executive Committee their concerns over the manner in which the whole issue of minority involvement, on the conceptual and action level, was to be handled. Austin then provided an opportunity for a number of minority people in community psychology to come together and for the first time hear, interact and react to the directional plans proposed for community psychology. Like any conference, however, Austin was also an inspiration. Many plans, promises, and pledges, all but signed in blood, were made to continue the struggle of minority people in psychology (not just community psychology).

Follow-through

The opportunity for follow-up came in several different forms. The first real opportunity, with the division, came at MPA in May 1975. Dr. Newbrough announced that he would be meeting the Task Forces on Education and Training and he invited participation from interested persons. At that time, the concerns and issues important to minority people (especially Black) were presented. The committee felt that while the concerns of minority people were related to the Education and Training Task Forces, it was a broad topic deserving more attention that it would be given through the existing task forces.

Around the same time, Dr. Cowen was engaged with several self-appointed representatives of minority psychologists. Basically there was an exchange of ideas regarding minorities in community psychology as professionals and as service recipients. In addition to such dialogue, there was some agreement that the problems were complex, but a starting point needed to be selected. Thus strategies and techniques were discussed. One goal which was continually expressed was an action orientation resulting in tangible change as opposed to engaging in meaningless rhetoric. This form of communication tended to generate ideas and identify the sincerity of those expressing themselves.

A substantial accomplishment in terms of follow-through was the inclusion of a chapter on “Minority Groups, Women and Students” in the Proceedings of the National Conference on Training in Community Psychology. And finally, there were a number of supportive replies to Dr. Cowen’s column in the Newsletter regarding Division 27 power. These events subsequently influenced the decision of the Executive Committee to establish the Minorities Affairs Task Force.

Task Force on Minority Issues

The Minorities Task Force was proposed and officially approved at the 1976 Mid-winter executive meeting of Division 27. Dr. Stanley Sue of the University of Washington and Dr. Thom Moore of the University of Illinois were asked to serve as co-chairpeople. They accepted and this represented the first step in actually realizing the task force. Additional members included three other minority group psychologists. The third member was appointed as a representative of the Executive Committee. As of March 22, 1976, the Task Force was at full strength, with the addition of Dr. Carolyn Atteanue, Professor of Psychology and Director of the Native American Program, University of Washington; Dr. Eligio Padilla, Assistant Professor, Department of Psychiatry, School of Medicine, University of California, Los Angeles; and Dr. Sherman James, Assistant Professor, School of Public Health, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill. Dr. James served as the member from the Division’s Executive Committee. Still further, the Task Force was instructed to report directly to the president’s office. In the letter received from the president, announcing the Task Force and the chairpeople, it was specifically stated that, “This special arrangement is to provide maximal latitude for the TF to deal with other educational and training issues, should it desire.” (Quoted from letter received January 13, 1976 from President of APA, Division 27.) Consequently the physical structure of the Task Force was completed.

The Charge Given the Task Force on Minority Issues

An overall statement of direction was presented to the chairpersons, along with the specific charge given to the Task Force. The president’s statement was, “We hope that the TF can be formed and can prepare a more detailed, operational statement of focus and turmoil for presentation at the outgoing EC meeting in Washington (APA) in early September. Approval of such a plan would allow for an accompanying indication of needed resources and a longer-term proposed timetable to be presented at the incoming EC meeting several days later (also at APA in Washington).” The charge itself, however, was conceived to be somewhat loose and unstructured but not too vague as to be without focus. As stated by the president, “in the end, we agreed that the TF should have both substantive and structural foci, much as we have used these terms in our prior rounds of correspondence.” The announcement of the Task Force which appeared in the newsletter identified these distinctions as: structural matter—recruitment and training of minority group people in community psychology and in the division, and substantive matter—the needs and concerns of minority communities, minority communities and intervention strategies.

Due to the time element the co-chairpeople agreed that there was definitely a need for the Task Force to consider the two issues. To be more specific, we agreed that one of the issues facing minorities to Division 27, APA, and the larger society as a whole, is the problem of representation. That is, there are too few entry points for minorities and this is the beginning of the circle which ends with the comment that, “There just isn’t anyone available.” Thus, Dr. Sue and I felt it imperative at this point to break into that circle and begin to foster the growth of a pool of minority psychologists. Consequently, emphasis on recruitment and training seemed to be logical and would meet the Task Force charge of dealing with structural matters.
The substantive matters, although somewhat related to the structural, were independent. These concerns grew out of a need to be more aware of the particular activities involving the minority community. We were quite aware that programs identifying themselves as community were serving minority people. Our interest is to know more specifically what alternatives are available for student training and what services minority people are receiving. The former need is motivated by the desire to supply students who want to work with minority people with detailed information about program orientation, service recipients, service outcome, etc. In addition, we are acutely concerned about the type of services offered to minority people. We would like to guard against the exploitation of minority people under the guise of service. Such concerns and awareness of programs will also assist in developing programs which are more suited to delivering needed services. Personally, I find this aspect of the Task Force potentially enlightening for all of psychology. As we discover new and innovative concepts about minority people, we can begin to broaden the existing notions of human behavior. Such information can only strengthen our present understanding of psychology.

We have begun a more systematic assessment by collecting recommendations from minority people regarding the two structural and substantive areas of interest. These are included in the full report to the executive committee and will be available from the Division by November 1, 1976. For further information on the Task Force, please contact either Thom Moore, Department of Psychology, University of Illinois, Champaign, Illinois 61820 or Stanley Sue, Department of Psychology, Psychology Clinic, Tolman Hall, University of California, Berkeley, California 94720.

Names and appropriate information which will guide the Committee on Scientific Awards in conducting an intensive career review and evaluation should be forwarded to the Office of Scientific Affairs, American Psychological Association, 1200 Seventeenth Street, N. W., Washington, D.C. 20036. The deadline for nominations is January 14, 1977.

Student Notes

BONNIE BURSTEIN, UCLA

Election Results

Anne Mulvey has recently been elected as student member of the Division 27 Executive Committee, and will serve in this capacity until August of 1978. She is a student in the Social Psychology program at C.U.N.Y. and is one of the three student representatives elect from the Northeastern region. She has previously participated in the Austin Training Conference and was one of the organizers of the 1974 Community Psychology Student Training Conference.

Regional Activities

Student Representatives from the Northeastern and Western regions were able to meet during the Washington APA meetings and discuss plans for the coming year. Initial plans for these regions include membership drives and local student gatherings.

STUDENT REPRESENTATIVES

Southwest: 
Brian Wilcox
Department of Psychology
University of Texas
Austin, Texas 78712

West: 
Bonnie Burstein
11874 Beatrix Street
Culver City, California 90230

Midwest: 
Michael Zevon
2019 Blackwood
Wilmette, Illinois

Rocky Mountain: 
To Be Elected

Southeast: 
To Be Elected

Northeast: 
Anne Mulvey
26 Prospect Pl.
Brooklyn, N.Y. 11217

Mark Ginsberg
Kevin Couter
Division of Individual and Family Studies
College of Human Development
Pennsylvania State University
University Park, Pennsylvania 16802
Entry Level Training Issues—
A Response to
Division 12 and ABPP

STEVE DANISH, Pennsylvania State University

The following statement represents a draft of a response to Division 12 and ABPP with regard to their statement opposing the granting of terminal Master’s degrees. Our Task Force’s charge from the Education and Training Committee has been to examine entry level training issues and to develop exemplary competency-based training programs at the M.A., B.A., and A.A. levels. Because we believe that such training programs should exist, we felt it both appropriate and necessary to respond to Division 12 and ABPP. However, before we present an official response to the Executive Committee for its approval, we would like to solicit the Division’s comments and reactions. Any feedback, be it an indication of support or nonsupport or a suggestion about how the statement could be better presented, is important. Send your comments to Steven J. Danish, Chairperson, Task Force 4, The Pennsylvania State University, S-IA Henderson Human Development Building University Park, PA 16802.

The statement is as follows:

APA has wrestled for a number of years with the question of full membership for persons with a Master’s degree. Both the Council and the APA membership as a whole have repeatedly voted down attempts to make persons holding Master’s degrees full members. Implicit in the denial of full membership status is the implication that membership represents an endorsement of competence and Master’s level psychologists are not as competent as doctoral. Additionally, the denial seems to be a result of the protective and exclusiveness of psychology. As psychologists struggle for acceptance within the health industry, they fear that the “watering down” of the profession by admitting their Master’s level colleagues will jeopardize their hard fought gains. Thus, the denial of full membership seems to be an extension of the controversy that psychology has had with psychiatry—who has the right to be called the “real” helpers?

Having won the “Battle of Membership”’s segment of the psychological profession, led by Division 12 and ABPP, has advanced to the next major testing ground, the rights (rites) of training. In recent statements both groups have called for the termination of Master’s degree training programs in clinical psychology and “personal counseling” as well as in other training programs in the “helping professions.” Several reasons are put forth for this position: a “scientific explanation” about the ineffectiveness of the less than Ph.D. psychologist, a concern for the welfare of the consumer of the helping services and a concern for the welfare of doctoral level psychologists. The first two reasons are linked. If doctoral level psychologists were more effective than their Master’s level colleagues, then consumers of helping services would be better served by the doctors. However, there is little evidence pointing to the systematic effectiveness of counseling and therapy or other helping services being dependent upon the degree level of the service. Nor does the title of the department or the discipline in which the training takes place seem to be a critical factor in effectiveness. The little evidence available suggests that the crucial factors are whether the service provider has been trained and the quality of the training. Further, given the preference for doctoral level clinicians to enter private practice, one must question whether the consumers and the public at large would be better served than they are now by ending terminal Master’s degree training. If Division 12 and ABPP were interested in conducting evaluations on the topic, some questions to study might be: (1) the percentage of direct service provided by Ph.D.s versus M.A.s in mental health agencies; (2) the cost of these services when done by Ph.D.s versus M.A.s; (3) the likelihood of state agencies expending the additional funds to replace M.A. level psychologists with Ph.D.s; (4) the number of Ph.D.s versus M.A.s providing services to the underserved populations like rural residents, the elderly, the young, the lower SES clients; (5) and the relative effectiveness of the services delivered by Ph.D.s and M.A.s.

Until answers to the above questions are established, it is more likely that terminating M.A. programs would better serve the welfare of doctoral level psychologists than the general public. The result will be a closed shop.

The issue is intriguing to contemplate, but the argument for or against the termination of Master’s degree training programs is academic. Psychology is out of step with the realities of mental health needs. The NIMH plan described in the August 1976 Monitor indicates the dissatisfaction with the training approach of the core disciplines including psychology. The emphasis is on training primary service providers. If psychology turns its back on Master’s level training, it may find itself isolated from the mainstream of the mental health system as subdoctoral level personnel from other disciplines deliver the majority of the services and receive the bulk of the training funds.

However, the real problem faced by psychology goes well beyond the question of what to do with M.A. training programs. For right behind the M.A. programs are a burgeoning number of B.A. programs and A.A. programs. The real issue psychology must face is the question of what constitutes effective helping and how do we train individuals to be competent helpers. By “effective helping” we are not restricting our definition to psychotherapy. Effective helping includes remedial therapies as well as preventive and enhancing interventions. Following the delineation of these helping interventions the requisite skills, knowledge and attitudes necessary to implement these effective helping programs must be specified and sequenced. From this specification competency-based direct service training programs for different intervention modalities could be developed. These training programs would not necessarily be linked to degrees. Most, if not all, programs would not require a doctoral degree since their emphasis will be on direct service. Doctoral degree psychologists could serve as program developers, trainers, supervisors and other indirect service agents as the Vail Conference report has suggested.

The challenge to APA is a basic one. It is not whether to support Division 12 and ABPP’s stand on terminating Master’s level training. It is whether APA will support a guild-credentialing model of service delivery or one based on competence. Until a clear understanding of what constitutes helping is determined and the requisite knowledge, skills, and attitudes are delineated, a competency-based program is impossible. We, the Entry Level Training Task Force of Division 27, are involved in identifying various helping roles and developing competency-based training programs for these roles. We would like to solicit the support and participation of Division 12, ABPP and other Divisions interested in this effort in the completion of the project.

10 Votes For Division 27

Your response to the Council Apportionment Ballot (which will be mailed early in November from APA) will determine the number of Council Representatives for Division 27 for 1977. Please allocate all, or at least some, of your votes to Division 27, and ask your colleagues (from any Division) to cast as many votes as they can for Division
FIELD TRAINING AND INTERNSHIP MANUAL AVAILABLE

The Internship and Field Training Task Force of the Division 27 Education and Training Committee has completed a fall, 1976 revision of the manual which first appeared early in 1976. This manual deals with the variety of community psychology field experiences available, how to find or create innovative placements, and how to assess prospective placements. Copies of the manual are available for $2.50 from Dave Stenmark, secretary treasurer, Department of Psychology, University of South Carolina, Columbia, South Carolina. Make checks payable to Division 27.

Dialogue

COMMUNITY PSYCHOLOGY AND THE REAL WORLD

PHIL BERCK, Student Member, University of Illinois

Having recently returned from two nonacademic conferences (National Neighbors Annual Conference, Philadelphia; National Peoples Action, Washington, D.C.), I have become aware of my confusion regarding the relationship between community psychology and the real world; this brief comment is intended to share that confusion. It is by no means a definitive statement, but rather an attempt to stimulate ideas and elicit reactions with the hope of getting closer to defining the community psychologist’s role in today’s community.

Both convention groups were composed of grass-roots organizations from throughout the United States, whose primary concerns are the quality of housing, education, crime prevention, and related services in their neighborhoods. The contents of their concerns are not as important as the processes in which they appear to be engaged.

I met a vast diversity of people, including teachers, students, full-time community organizers, homemakers, cashiers, food cooperative managers, psychologists, social workers, public officials, housing directors, etc. Regardless of occupational background, all were at least part-time neighborhood organizers representing larger groups of people “back home.” Everyone was concerned with creating change, particularly in their own neighborhoods. Each person seemed to be diligently working towards goals not unlike those espoused by those who call themselves community psychologists: goals like equitable distribution of educational and housing resources, improved interracial interactions, the attenuation of institutional racism, the redistribution of economic resources, and political clout, and the increased acceptance of a pluralistic community.

In the process of communicating my goals and proposed means as a community psychologist, and in learning of their means and goals, I quickly became aware of sharp operational contrasts between the action-oriented psychologist and the activist-organizer.

My position, like that of my colleagues at the University of Illinois, embraces a community psychology defined as a multidisciplinary pursuit encompassing components of psychology, urban planning, criminal justice, sociology, and political science, complemented by a grass-roots social action base. We view community psychology as a unique combination of conceptual models, empirical research, and active involvement in the social change process.

The conference participants, on the other hand, are directly and almost exclusively engaged in the struggle for change towards more closely-knit communities, responsive and responsible institutions, equitable distribution of all resources, and the like.

Ideologically, then, the concerns and interests of the community psychologist and the activist-organizer are certainly compatible. But what happens when these ideologies are operationalized? Is the community psychologist in a position to offer technical assistance to others who are actively involved? If so, how do the present accomplishments of the community psychologist stack up to the track record of the community activist?

I have yet to come up with any clear set of answers. I have, however, noted several contrasts worthy of contemplation. The first issue involves the empiricist’s tendency to be concerned about generalizable data. The researcher inevitably searches for facts, natural laws, relationships, and models either descriptive or applicable to multiple settings. The activist-organizer, however, appears less interested in summarizing all the data or accounting for all the variance, rather he or she is concerned with change for his/her neighborhood. Information about other neighborhoods and communities is relevant to the extent that it has utility for enhancing local efforts or intensifying action-group solidarity across neighborhoods. Thus the activist-organizer perceives the local setting as a central hub in a network of related locales. The empiricist tends towards a more global, overseas viewpoint. It is not yet clear that the latter perspective has more utility for bringing about change.

A related dimension which seems to contrast the community psychologist with the activist-organizer can be described as the level of active involvement. Community psychologists distinguish themselves from other academic and professional pursuits (e.g., sociology) in part by their action orientation. At conferences as early as Swampscopt and as recent as Austin, community psychologists have likened their participant role to that of the community organizer. Despite this commitment, few psychologists have displayed behavior consistent with these public statements. Contemporary community psychology’s involvement might more appropriately be labeled “cautious tinkering,” in the shadow of the activist-organizer’s front-line commitment and “battlefield” involvement.

The last salient contrast involves the use of research and funds. Often government agencies are willing to fund research designed to investigate and identify social problems, rather than fund projects that attempt to resolve them. Low-cost housing shortages, for example, need no documentation; they exist. Racism exists. Skewed distributions of income, food, and power exist. In the words of more than one conference participant, “we need low-cost housing, not research!” As a researcher involved in program implementation and evaluation, I cannot completely concur. But many forms of research can function as diversions from action, in the name of elucidation. To gain some perspective, the researcher may want to weigh the potential utility of expected research results against what could be accomplished by merely dispensing the same funds to clients under investigation. Of course, funding agencies (especially federally supported ones) are not as likely to grant funds for that purpose, since research is a much “safer” proposition than action. Polemics aside, even psychologists engaged in “socially relevant” research need to consider the functional utility of their activity.

I believe that community psychologists can contribute to social change. But instead of inventing programs and research projects, we must collaborate and communicate with those actively engaged in the change process. To enhance their efforts, research skills and technical expertise must be focused in directions that both community activists and community psychologists consider useful. Only then can the idealistic goals of community psychology satisfy the real aspirations of those in the community.
Program Evaluation in Community Psychology

HOW IS PROGRAM EVALUATION RESEARCH DISTINCT FROM TRADITIONAL RESEARCH

BRENNA H. BRY, GSAPP, Rutgers University

This column is designed to stimulate dialogue. Thus, I am starting with a topic about which I have strong views, and I am including a reply by another psychologist with equally strong views.

The distinction between traditional and program evaluation research is important because of the problems that develop when the distinction isn't clear. One hears complaints like, "The director doesn't care about outcome data!" or "Our funding was cut even though research shows poor people have more needs!" I submit that such complaints will lessen (not vanish) as the distinction between program evaluation and traditional research become clearer.

It is easiest to distinguish between program evaluation and traditional research by asking the question, "is the research being done to aid decision-making?" If the answer is, "yes," it is a program evaluation; if it's, "no," it's not. Since most decision-makers do not collect and analyze their own data, my definition of evaluation research suggests that it is a service function. And that is exactly how I see it. That is, program evaluators serve the needs of decision-makers.

Defining program evaluation as a service function has many implications. First, since one person (the program evaluator) is serving the needs of others (the decision-makers), they all must continuously negotiate and agree upon contracts. (I thank Frances Ricks of Dellerest Children's Center, Toronto, for this concept.) Consequently, anyone doing research to answer a question for him or herself instead of for some decision-makers is not doing pure program evaluation.

This negotiation requirement makes interpersonal skills very important in evaluation research. The interpersonal skills are needed not only to maintain relationships with the decision-makers but also to maintain relationships with line workers. An evaluator must receive accurate data from them to fulfill his/her contract with the decision-makers, and line workers do not provide data to someone who threatens or alienates them.

Another consequence of defining evaluation research as a service function is that conflicts between research imperatives and human service imperatives are not easy to resolve. One cannot merely say "research comes first" or "service comes first," for the priorities are much more complex than that. Thus each conflict must be considered individually, weighing the impact of different decisions upon each of the agency goals. In one situation the human service needs seem more compelling. In another situation, the research objectives "win out." In sum, program evaluation research involves more day to day judgments regarding methodology than does traditional research.

Defining evaluation research as a service function also has implications for reporting the results. Timing is very important; the decision-makers need the results at particular times. Language is very important, too. While a program director may understand technical research writing, the lay member of his/her board will not. So evaluation researchers must help program directors communicate the research results to lay people in simple, understandable terms.

Defining program evaluation as a service also determines what kind of question will be asked. It will not be a theoretical question (although they need to be asked by somebody); it will not be about the orderliness of the universe. Program evaluation research investigates only the effectiveness or impact of single programs (or institutions). And the results do not generalize very far to other types of programs.

These are a few of the distinctions between program evaluation and traditional research that come to mind. I welcome responses, additions, corrections from other community psychologists. Specifically, I have asked Tony Broskowski to add his response right here.

RESPONSE: PROGRAM EVALUATION AS DISTINCT FROM EVALUATION RESEARCH

ANTHONY BROSKOWSKI, United Community Planning Corporation and Harvard Medical School

Brenna Bry distinguishes between traditional research and program evaluation research. I consider it important to draw some further distinctions between "evaluation research" and "program evaluation." Evaluation research is guided by the standards of science, with primary concerns for reliability, validity, and the ability of one's design to allow for causal interpretations. While such concerns are relevant for program evaluation, they are not always primary—nor should they be. In my experience, program evaluation must be viewed as an integral aspect of program management and planning. Thus, program evaluation is an internal activity, not something that is conducted by "objective outsiders." Program evaluation is undertaken to improve ongoing service programs, and is secondarily geared to the discovery of new knowledge. Bearing a staff responsibility to management, a well-trained program evaluator must master the skills of business management as well as the skills of traditional social science research. For example, evaluators must know how to do valid cost-effectiveness comparisons, which in turn depends on the ability to do cost-accounting by unit of service. Also, planning skills and knowledge of alternative needs/demands assessments are also required. Program evaluators must understand organizational dynamics and the way management factors influence services.

It is critical to view program evaluation as an internal organization capacity. That must grow in a developmental fashion. The capacity to measure level of effort (input) must precede the capacity to measure the level of performance (quantity and quality of output), the level of adequacy (output relative to need/demand) and the level of efficiency (outputs relative to inputs). Therefore, program evaluation must begin with the design and implementation of basic management information systems (MIS) that are necessary to measure program efforts and costs. Once an MIS is operating, the measurement of client or program outcomes is not only easier, but more likely to influence subsequent management decisions by relating outcomes to the amount and types of efforts and costs required.

Program evaluators cannot restrict themselves to measuring client outcomes, with or without control group comparisons. Measures of program accessibility, continuity, and comprehensiveness are also critical. Furthermore, there are many different perspectives on what constitutes a "good" or "effective" program. These perspectives include those of professional service providers, managers, legislators, funders, general public, a client's family, and the client. A useful evaluation approach must be able to measure multiple criteria that address more than one perspective, particularly in cases where there is a conflict among perspectives and
a competition for scarce resources. For example, a "good program" to a service provider may be based on professional standards of quality, regardless of costs. A "good program" to a manager or funder may be one with a low unit-cost. A "good program" for a discharged mental patient may not be a "good program" from the general public's perspective. Without training beyond the methodologies of research design, and without knowledge beyond a single discipline (e.g. community psychology) the program evaluator is likely to measure trivial criteria of limited interest, (most likely criteria of interest only to a limited audience of social scientists who read subject-oriented academic journals).

Program evaluators must begin to address the issues implicit in the single-input fallacy, the belief that a single service or treatment, in isolation of others, will be sufficient to restore a typically multi-problem individual to an effective level of functioning. It is our assertion that the impact of any one categorical service (e.g. psychotherapy, job training, etc.) no matter how effective in resolving single problems, cannot exceed the level of systemic effectiveness, i.e., the degree to which the categorically organized programs in the community are linked together into accessible and efficient networks in order to help people with the common mix of problems they experience. Program evaluators, therefore, must be reasonably knowledgeable about a wide range of human service programs (e.g., rehabilitation, social services, health, education, corrections, etc.), and methodologies to evaluate systemic accessibility, continuity, and impact.

While recognizing the importance of scientifically guided evaluative and policy research, large scale social experimentation, and pilot research and development, I feel program evaluation should be judged by a different set of standards. Based on the above distinctions, I would propose the following definition for program evaluation.

"Program evaluation is a process of making reasonable judgments about program effort, effectiveness, adequacy, and efficiency. Furthermore, evaluation must assess systemic accessibility, comprehensiveness, continuity and the relevance of services in relation to shifting needs and demands. The program evaluation process is based on systematic data collection and analysis and is designed for utilization in current program management and future planning (Attkisson and Broskowski, 1976)."

Thus program evaluation activities may range from routine program monitoring to the use of formal research designs. While encompassing a wide range of management and scientific methods, it is the focus on internal improvement of local and ongoing programs, their accessibility, effectiveness, and efficiency, that distinguishes program evaluation from similar but distinct endeavors.

References

Community Action

SOURCEBOOK OF MENTAL HEALTH PROGRAM EVALUATION STUDIES TO BE COMPILED

A collection of program evaluation studies in mental health settings is being put together with funding support from the National Institute of Mental Health. The project is based on Program Evaluation in Community Mental Health Centers, a 1976 publication of program evaluation efforts in NIMH Region II edited by Gerald Landsberg, MSW and Roni Hammer, M.A. of the Maimonides Medical Center CMHC in Brooklyn, New York, and William Neigher, Ph.D. of the CMHC of Passaic and Clifton of St. Mary's Hospital in Passaic, New Jersey. The national project adds Charles Windle, Ph.D., and J. Richard Woy, Ph.D., both of NIMH, as collaborating editors.

The need for more program evaluation resources is clear. The "bold new approach" of the CMHC movement in the '60s has come face to face with the accountability and tighter federal dollars of the '70s. By evaluating the nation's mental health programs it is hoped that resources will be used more effectively to the benefit of those who receive services. The expected contribution of program evaluation has been heralded by administrators and evaluators, and by funding sources and community groups.

There are questions, however, that remain to be answered. Will timely and relevant evaluation studies be successfully carried out in local mental health programs? Will they be used in a "new commitment" to data-based decision making by program administrators? While the efficacy of mental health program evaluation has its supporters and skeptics, all concerned agree that its chance to prove itself is at hand. With new Community Mental Health Center legislation (PL 94-63 mandating program evaluation in each local Center, more and more program evaluation will be carried out by evaluators of various disciplines and training.

The Program Evaluation Sourcebook is designed to assist evaluators by bringing together examples of program evaluation efforts in such areas as treatment effectiveness, costs of providing services, identifying groups and individuals in need of mental health services, and assessing the effectiveness of consultation and education programs. The Sourcebook will have a national Editorial Review Board to select the studies that will be included.

The Sourcebook will also include a number of topics of general concern in evaluating mental health programs and systems. Some of these chapters focus on citizen involvement in the evaluation process, increasing the utilization of program evaluation findings, the context and development of program evaluation in mental health settings, and new Federal Guidelines for program evaluation in Community Mental Health Centers.

INTERNSHIP AND FELLOWSHIPS IN CLINICAL PSYCHOLOGY

Applications are available for the Pre-doctoral Internships and Post-doctoral Fellowships in Clinical Psychology at the suburban Philadelphia branch of the Devereux Foundation, a group of residential treatment, therapeutic education and rehabilitation centers. An assignment to branches in California or Texas may be possible. The 12-month internships provide training and experience with mentally and emotionally handicapped children, adolescents and young adults presenting problems of learning and of personal adjustment. Devereux is approved by the APA for doctoral Internships in Clinical Psychology and in Counseling Psychology by the
International Association of Counseling Services as an Accredited Counseling Center. The Earl D. Bond Branch of the Devereux Foundation has received accreditation as a Psychiatric Facility for Children and Adolescents by the Joint Commission on Accreditation of Hospitals.

Information and applications are available from Dr. Henry Platt, Director, The Devereux Foundation, Institute of Clinical Training, Devon, Pennsylvania 19333.

FOSTER CARE PROGRAM

The Bucks County Department of Mental Health/Mental Retardation is developing a foster care program for emotionally disturbed children and youth, the goal of which is to provide an alternative living situation to children who do not need hospitalization, yet who, for one reason or another, cannot remain in their natural homes. The unique aspect of this program lies in the fact that these children will remain in the custody of their natural parents and will, hopefully, be diverted from the local Child Welfare program. In addition, this program is not a group home program, but rather is one in which a one-to-one relationship can be provided to the child. Furthermore, these foster parents will be specially trained to cope with the unique needs of these children and to deal with their own concerns and fears resulting from their role as foster parents, as well as any problems that might be presented by their natural children, neighbors, etc.

We are looking to communicate with any other person or agency who has experience in a similar program, and we are especially looking for information regarding a training program for the foster parents. Anyone who would like to share their experiences with us can contact me at (215) 343-2800, extension 288, or write me: Mary Ann Bolla
Bucks County Department of
Mental Health-Mental Retardation
Neshaminy Manor Center
Doylestown, Pennsylvania 18901

INFANCY PROGRAM

The Community Mental Health Center of Escambia County, Florida for the past two and a half years has established a Preventive Infant Mental Health Program called the Preventive Education Services. This program consists of four services: 1) Direct work in an intensive care nursery regional clinic with parents of premature and ill infants. 2) Outreach Program of developmental education for parents of lower income and social economic background. 3) A life skills training center where academic, vocational, homemaker, parenting and personal skills are developed for clients utilizing classroom and nursery lab settings. 4) Infant Mental Health counseling services for parents who are referred by the courts and other agencies for cases of child abuse and neglect, mental retardation and mental illness.

The staff is presently engaged in evaluating and researching the outcome of such services and would like to communicate with other mental health centers and other groups which are involved in infancy and developmental research. This group is interested in running a dialogue conference in the Pensacola area in the spring of 1977 to which only people presently at work in such programs would be invited. If interested in the research, the development of this program, or other further questions concerning the future conference, please contact Dr. James Messina, PhD, Director, Preventive Education Services, Community Mental Health Center of Escambia County, 1201 West Hernandez, Pensacola, Florida 32501.

COMMUNITY PSYCHOLOGY IN TRANSITION: PROCEEDINGS OF THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON TRAINING IN COMMUNITY PSYCHOLOGY

The manuscript is about 550 pages which should be about 400 pages in book form, and we are hoping for a Spring, '77 publication. The Newsletter will keep readers informed. The editors are pleased with the product and it embodies material of paramount importance not only to Community Psychology, but to all situations where psychologists are engaged in training activities related to remediation, prevention, intervention, and public policy formation.

Changes in the American Journal of Community Psychology

The Executive Committee of The Division and Plenum Publishing Company has just announced several new developments for The American Journal of Community Psychology.

1. Charlie Spielberger has decided to withdraw from his role as Editor, joining the Associate Editors in the special and distinguished role of "Founding Editor"

2. Jack Glidewell took on the role of Editor as of September 1, 1976

3. After several negotiations about how to reduce the 18 month publication lag, it was decided to continue quarterly publication but to increase the number of pages to 480, a number equal to that of bimonthly publication. The lag will now drop.

4. The subscription rate will be increased from $32 to $48 for institutions, from $16 to $24 for Individual subscriptions, but only from $10 to $12 for Division 27 members. Further, the Division 27 rate of $12 will be available to all APA members.

5. The Executive Committee of The Division made a commitment to add at least 120 new subscriptions during the next year. If you are not now a subscriber, by all means complete the order blank below to get the current low $12 rate. The AJCP is the official journal of Division 27 and has become a prime medium of communication among community psychologists everywhere—and among many other community agents.

6. All community psychologists are urged to check to see that the libraries of all the institutions with which they are associated are subscribers to AJCP. If they are not, request that they subscribe immediately.

Plenum Publishing Corp.
227 West 17th Street
New York, NY 10011

Please enter my subscription to the American Journal of Community Psychology. I am a member of Division 27, APA.

Enclosed is $12 for one year.

Please bill me $12 for one year.

Name

Address

City State Zip
American Journal of Community Psychology

Editor: Jack Glidewell
University of Chicago

Associate Editors
Bernard Bloom
University of Colorado
Emory L. Cowen
University of Rochester
Ira Iscoe
University of Texas at Austin
James G. Kelly
University of Oregon
Robert Reiff
Albert Einstein College of Medicine
Irwin G. Sarason
University of Washington
Charles D. Spielberger
University of South Florida
APA Division 27 Editor: Edison J. Trickett
Yale University
Book Review Editor: Patrick E. Cook
Florida State University

The study of community psychology—dealing with prevention of behavior disorders, program evaluation, and the community as a social system—has had growing implications in the field of mental health. The American Journal of Community Psychology is devoted to research and theory on interactions between individuals, organizations, and social structures.

This quarterly emphasizes empirical investigations and covers such topics as:

- promotion of positive mental health
- early detection and prevention of behavior disorders and individual dysfunctions
- effectiveness of mental health consultation and community programs
- development and evaluation of new roles and techniques for the delivery of social services
- the creation of social environments that facilitate human growth and development
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COMMUNITY PSYCHOLOGY SERIES:
Sponsored by Division 27 of APA
General Editor: Daniel Adelson, Ph.D.

Issue #1: Man as the Measure—The Crossroads
edited by Daniel Adelson, Ph.D.
Provides 10 papers with special focus on Berkeley to determine how social action can be initiated within the academic setting, and to explore the difficulties under conditions of rapid community change. School desegregation, student activism, the reactions of Berkeley youth and blacks to social problems and political events, and the response of the university to the community are among the topics covered.
"A stimulating volume . . . excellent reading for students and teachers alike."—JOURNAL OF INDIVIDUAL PSYCHOLOGY

This Series has as its central purpose the building of philosophic, theoretical, scientific and empirical foundations for action research in the community and its subsystems. The Series is off to a good start."—CONTEMPORARY PSYCHOLOGY
87705-0589 Hardbound, $10.95
87705-023-6 Softbound, $4.95

Issue #2: The University and the Urban Crisis
edited by Howard Mitchell, Ph.D., Director, Human Resources Center, University of Pennsylvania.

This provocative book critically examines the unmet obligations of professionals in the university setting. Contributors to this volume, all university-based personnel, predict that the urban crisis will be posing even more turbulent challenges to the "ivory tower" establishment, and suggest that attention be paid to inventive collaborations between universities and the surrounding community. The theories and program models offered make this book of special value to community psychologists.
877705-1399 Hardbound, $10.95
(student text price—3 or more—$7.95 each)
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