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The Community Psychologist, Volume 35, Number 2, Spring 2002
Editor's Column

By Paul A. Toro, Wayne State University, Detroit, Michigan

Special Feature on Systems Change
As Guest Editor, Jack Tebes has assembled a fine set of papers for this issue's Special Feature. While, as community psychologists we often “dream” of making large-scale changes in various systems, we don’t accomplish such changes nearly as often. The six papers in this Special Feature show how systems change can be done in diverse settings. The Special Feature is the first of two recently stimulated by SCRA President Abe Wandersman (see his President’s Column in the Fall 2001 TCP). The other, on “clinical-community psychology,” is scheduled to appear in the next (Summer) issue of TCP (Guest Editors are Jim Cook, Maury Nation, and Thom Moore).

We have a number of other interesting items in this Spring 2002 issue of TCP. The Regional and International News, edited by Judy Primavera (SCRA’s new Regional Network Coordinator), includes information from all five US regions as well as three international regions. The Women’s Column includes a thoughtful piece by Leticia Arellano and Christina Ayala-Alcantar on the utility of a feminist perspective in a Latina/o cultural context. Also included is SCRA’s program at the upcoming APA Convention in Chicago (put together by our APA Program Chair and Member-at-Large, Kelly Hazel) plus a description of the “social justice” track at the APA Convention that has been developed by SCRA and 4 other APA divisions (written by Andrea Solarz who is chairing the track). Now that we are more or less “on time” with the production of TCP, you should even have this listing of APA events well in advance of the Convention! I’m looking forward to seeing many of you all at APA in August.

Sawssan with her Biennial poster from Atlanta

More Introductions
In my first column as TCP Editor (Fall 2001 issue), I introduced Sawssan Ahmed and Nathaniel Israel, who are serving as TCP’s Associate Editors. Here, let me tell you a bit more about them. I have also included photos (I also wanted to include a photo of Jasmine Gibson, our Production Editor, but she was camera shy). Sawssan and Nate are both doctoral students in clinical/community psychology here at Wayne State and are currently working as Research Assistants with my Research Group on Homelessness and Poverty. They have been doing a wonderful job as Associate Editors. Sawssan has special interests in the roles of ethnicity, religion, and gender in people’s lives. She has been the editorial liaison for the Cultural and Racial Affairs and the Women’s Committees, as well as various interest groups (i.e., Community Health, Prevention and Promotion, and Student and Training Issues). Nate has interests in program evaluation, disabilities, social policy, and adolescent development. He has been the editorial liaison to the Rural, Disabilities, Self-Help and Lesbian/Gay/Bisexual/Transgender Interest Groups as well as the Community Practitioner (a new section of TCP that first appeared in the last, Winter, issue).

Nate enjoying a little sun in our Detroit offices

Please contact me, or either Associate Editor, if you have any ideas for future Special Features or other comments on how to enhance TCP. Our e-mail addresses are: paul.toro@wayne.edu, saahmed@sun.science.wayne.edu, and ae9088@wayne.edu.

SCRA WEB PAGE
http://www.apa.org/divisions

The SCRA Listserv enables SCRA members and others to engage in stimulating discussions. It also provides access to job postings, grants opportunities, and information about SCRA events. To subscribe, send your e-mail to: Listserve@Listserve.UIC.EDU. Leave the subject area blank, and in your message area type: Subscribe SCRA-L <yourfirstname> <yourlastname>.

The SCRA Women’s Listserv enables SCRA members and others to access the best source of information and comment relative to women in SCRA. It is also the main source of communication about issues relating to the SCRA Committee on Women. To subscribe, send your e-mail to: Listserv@LIsTserv.UIC.EDU. Leave the subject area blank, and in your message area type: SUBSCRIBE SCRA-W <yourfirstname> <yourlastname>.

The SCRA Student Listserv is student initiated, run and maintained. Steve Russo, from the University of Kansas deserves credit for the listserv’s audacious start. The SCRA Student Listserv also has “social coordinators,” who will implement special events on the listserv, like having a “guest of the month,” to elicit Q&A, etc. To subscribe, send your e-mail to: listserv@ukans.edu. Leave the subject area blank, and in your message area type: SUBSCRIBE S-SCRA-L <yourfirstname> <yourlastname>.
President's Column

By Abe Wandersman, University of South Carolina

Working with Large Systems

In December, 2001, the South Carolina newspapers were filled with stories about school report cards. For the first time, each school in the state was going to get a grade—excellent, good, average, below average, or unsatisfactory. Many schools were in a panic. These grades would be posted in the newspapers and on websites. The report card approach was authorized by the Education Accountability Act (EAA) because the South Carolina legislature was concerned about South Carolina scoring low on several education measures. The report cards and remedial mechanisms were outlined and authorized in the legislation. The intention of the school report cards is that they will serve as a diagnostic tool that will bring attention to education and allow parents, community members, and the state department of education to place pressure on schools to perform better.

The report card grade is based on achievement, as measured by standardized tests. In addition, the report card contains survey information from teachers and students. The report card will also contain information from parents' perceptions of how well their child's school does at facilitating their involvement in the home and school to support education. The intention is to use the teacher, student, and parent information to help guide efforts to improve school performance. There are 1200 public schools in South Carolina, and each school has a report card. The parent survey will be given to all parents of fifth, eighth, and eleventh grade students. A team of clinical-community and school psychologists from the University of South Carolina (Renee Lindsay, Patricia Stone Motes, Jessica Snell-Johns and me) and from the University of British Columbia (Laurie Ford and Debbie Amaral) developed the parent survey and piloted it with 900 parents. The pilot data were used to develop the final survey that will be given to all South Carolina parents of fifth, eighth, and eleventh graders. We are very pleased that our expertise and our school experience is very relevant to the Special Feature highlighted in this issue of TCP: "System Development and System Change." At the beginning of my presidency, I wanted to identify and further the opportunities available to community psychologists in two arenas: 1) working with systems large and small, and 2) enriching the clinical-community interface (the theme of the next issue of TCP). I am very thankful to the editors of this issue—Jack Tebes, Joy Kaufman and Rod Watts for helping to produce such a wonderful issue. I also thank Paul Toro for his great behind-the-scenes work.

SCRA: The Good Society

The 2005 Biennial

Please give serious consideration to hosting the 2005 Biennial. The Biennial is one of the most important functions of SCRA and is a major force in our sense of community and organizational viability. Each previous site has reaped untold rewards as a result of hosting. Jean Ann Linney and Jack Tebes of the exec committee have volunteered to talk with you about your potential interests and questions. We would like to receive applications by July 1, so that we can discuss them at the SCRA Executive Committee meeting in August at APA.

Criteria for selection of sites include:

- Significant likelihood of income accruing to SCRA: Will the conference serve as a revenue generator?
- Potential cost to participants: How much will a package that includes housing and meals be? How much more will registration be? Is this affordable to students?
- Support from sponsoring institution: Does the proposal indicate available or potential financial or in-kind support?
- Meeting facilities: Do these allow for the creation of a sense of community? Do they seem amenable to diverse kinds of formats? Do they seem comfortable? Attractive? Safe?
- Transportation accessibility: Are there international airports nearby? If not, does the proposal indicate other types of transportation that can be provided?
- Handicapped/disabled access: Does the facility allow easy access for handicapped/disabled individuals? Sites should make every attempt possible to adhere to the guidelines for accessibility adopted for the SCRA Biennial Conference.
- Diversity: Does the proposed site adequately address how diversity issues will be included in the conference, in terms of themes, local site context, planning committee, presentation review criteria, and/or planned conference content?
- Surrounding sites: Is the site near an exciting city, beach, etc.? Is this favorable or would it be distracting?
- Working group: Is there an available working group?
- Experience: Do the folks have experience organizing conferences? Is it positive?
- Regional balance, considering locations of other recent Binennials.

Treasurer of SCRA

At the midwinter meeting in January 2001, the SCRA executive committee voted unanimously to extend the term of Leah Gensheimer for one year. Leah was appointed to fill a term because of a resignation. The executive committee voted to extend the term due to the importance of managing the transition of working with our new membership office and maintaining our membership numbers. We have been asked by APA to confirm with our membership that you have no objections. If you have an objection to extending Leah's term by one year, please let me know as soon as possible.

SCRA's Listserv

I encourage you to join the SCRA listserv so that you can keep up-to-date on society matters and interact with your colleagues on issues of importance. Details on how to sign up for the listserv appear on page 3 of this issue.
Women's Column

To Be or Not to Be a Feminist:
Does Feminism Have Any Utility for Latinas/os?
By Leticia M. Arellano, Ph.D.
University of La Verne
Christina Ayala-Alcantar, Ph.D.
California State University, Northridge

AUTHORS’ NOTE: The authors extend their deepest appreciation to Dr. Maxine Baca Zinn for her valuable comments and support. The following column is an excerpt from a book chapter in progress titled "To Be or Not to Be a Feminist: The Utility of Multiracial Feminism Within Chicano/a Psychology." Our focus on the Latina experience allows for a more contextually relevant exploration of multiracial feminism and its application, but does not preclude such an analysis for other groups.

While many Latinas do not consider or publicly acknowledge themselves as feminists, we find that their research, clinical practice, teaching, activism, and attitudes, indicate the contrary. It appears that the “F” word remains taboo, even today. In light of the history of elitism and racism by White feminists, and the retaliation from Chicana/o communities during El Movimiento, we concede that feminism remains controversial and in many instances, unappealing. This begs the question, “Does feminism have any utility for Latinas/os?”

As Chicana psychologists, we recognize the need for an analytical framework to address a vast array of issues confronted by Latinas. We argue that feminism has great utility, not simply for Latinas, but for our community. This idea was heightened for both of us as doctoral students enrolled in a course taught by Chicana sociologist, Dr. Maxine Baca Zinn at Michigan State University titled “Gender and Power.” We were exposed to an array of contemporary feminisms (e.g., gender reform, gender resistance, and gender rebellion) and learned about an inclusive form of feminism known as multiracial feminism (Baca-Zinn & Dill, 1996).

Building upon various intellectual perspectives, multiracial feminism, developed by Baca Zinn and Dill (1996), integrates several emergent viewpoints created by women of color. As an “evolving body of theory and practice,” multiracial feminism is informed by six basic tenets.

Interlocking Inequalities

The first tenet of multiracial feminism proposes that gender is not a binary, categorical variable. Gender is not a descriptive characteristic nor is it a variable that independently explains differences across groups. Gender is a social structure. Further, gender is experienced simultaneously with other social structures such as race, class, and sexuality. The experience of being a man or woman is interlocked with other social locations (e.g., being Chicano/a, working class), leading to “multiple ways” that individuals experience themselves as gendered beings (Baca Zinn & Dill, 2000, p. 26).

This tenet also maintains that the range of gendered experiences created by these interlocking social locations result in inequalities. That is, certain locations are more oppressive than others, as they are the consequence of multiple systems of domination. For example, by virtue of the multiple systems of domination due to their gender, ethnicity, and social class, Latinas are frequently regarded as a “triple minority” (Flores-Ortiz, 1998; Gloria, 2001; Mirandé & Enriquez, 1979; Vasquez, 1984).

Extending the triple oppression concept, sexual orientation, particularly for bisexual and lesbian Latinas, also produces “quadruple oppression” (Gloria, 2001; Yep, 1995).

The experience of multiple forms of oppression and disenfranchisement poses challenges to their mental health (Comas-Diaz, 1987; Vasquez, 1984). For example, Latinas also find themselves in organizational environments where subtle forms of discriminatory practices tax and deplete their energy. As major socializing agents, institutions erect barriers that Latinas must confront. Zambrana (1988) suggests that Latinas/os experience “cultural assault” due to injury or assault to their identity and self-esteem. The continuous experience of those assaults leads to stress and marginalization. Exposure to stressful events also increases vulnerability to psychophysiological conditions, such as cardiovascular disease, diabetes, gastrointestinal problems, and borderline hypertension (Argueta-Bernal, 1991).
Intersectional Nature of Hierarchies

The second tenet of multiracial feminism proposes that all hierarchies of social life are intersectional. Social structures are interactive and social locations are rooted in different hierarchies. Social locations lead to differential forms of power and subjugation. The intersectional nature of gender, class, race, and age illustrates how older Chicanas are differently embedded in positions created by the hierarchies of social life. It is often suggested that Chicanas gain status as they age because they are held in high esteem due to their role as abuelitas (an endearing term for grandmothers) (Facio, 1996). In addition, they are frequently at the pinnacle of the social hierarchy in extended family networks among Chicana/os, due to their age-status. Mothers and grandmothers are regarded as “powerful forces” within Chicana/o families and culture.

However, while they possess power in their families, they simultaneously experience powerlessness. Facio’s (1996) findings also demonstrated how the cultural prescription of grandmotherhood contributed to a status of powerlessness. Powerlessness was demonstrated in the potential exploitation of older Chicanas as caregivers or convenient babysitters. Power struggles were also exposed as older Chicanas struggled to redefine their womanhood. They challenged cultural expectations at the risk of being disrespected. For example, although the family simultaneously provided support, care, and respect, it simultaneously stressed conformity and control. Older Chicanas were expected to remain single and refrain from seeking male companionship, to respect the memory of their dead spouse or partner. In addition, they risked being judged as “bad women” by their families and communities since seeking male companionship was culturally disrespectful. Strong objections from their children also resulted in the withholding of financial support, discontinued regular visits and phone calls, or attempts to impose guilt.

Relational Nature of Dominance and Subordination

The third tenet of multiracial feminism challenges the notion of a universal experience of womanhood. Baca Zinn and Dill (1996) propose that dominance and subordination exists across women. More specifically, they argue that race is a decisive social structure that creates differences among women and assists in the subjugation of women of color by White women.

Hurtado (1989) suggests that the experience of subordination for different groups of women is determined by social positions of power. More specifically, “each oppressed group in the United States is positioned in a particular and distinct relationship to White men, and each form of subordination is shaped by this relational position” (p. 833). Hurtado further argues that White women’s oppression by White men takes the form of seduction through psychological and material rewards. Conversely, the oppression of women of color takes the form of rejection. Therefore, women of color have less access to positions of power and privilege than their White counterparts because White men do not regard them as providers of racially pure offspring. Relationships with affluent White men also provide White women with a social position of power. Yet, White women seldom acknowledge these positions of power and privilege.

Resilience and Strengths of Women

The fourth tenet of multiracial feminism proposes that women possess strength and resiliency. While many women of color encounter barriers due to social structures such as race and class, they fight and “create viable lives for themselves, their families, and communities” (Baca Zinn & Dill, 2000, p. 27). Latinas are no exception.

For example, Pardo’s (1990) research on the Mothers of East Los Angeles (MELA) illustrated how working-class Mexican American women transformed traditional familial and cultural networks to politically mobilize themselves to prevent the building of a prison and toxic waste dump in their neighborhood. The inclusion of their spouses and family members demonstrated their political astuteness and their creative strategies of resistance. They instituted creative strategies to fight various social institutions. For instance, while they elected their male counterparts as president of their organization, women held complete authority and control of the day-to-day activities. Their subversion was demonstrated when a male president attempted to exert his power by insisting they hold their fundraiser on Mother’s Day. Pardo reported that on the day of the fundraiser, only the president and his wife appeared. After this incident, the president no longer attempted to impose his will.

Inclusion of Diverse Methodologies and Theoretical Approaches

The fifth tenet of multiracial feminism suggests the use of an array of methodological and theoretical frameworks when attempting to understand the experience of gender. Currently, the epistemology of psychology and research methodology tends to “embody male Anglo-American values and worldviews” (Comas-Diaz, 1991, p. 602) which is limited in scope.

Standpoint theory is one tool that can assist with this process. Standpoint theory recognizes the critical position Latinas and other women of color have in observing and understanding phenomena that is not apparent to White men and women because of their vantage point. That is, the privilege of race and class does not always allow White men and women to recognize the experiences of people of color. Espin (1995) expands upon this idea when she compares privilege to a glass pane that is not seen by individuals in positions of power. She states:

Those who do not partake of that privilege, however, know very well the existence of that pane of glass; they know it is impossible for them to go through this barrier - the more effective precisely because it is unseen. In fact, the non-privileged can be better ‘knowers’ and more knowledgeable. Their vision tends to be clearer; they see themselves, they see the glass pane, and they know who is on the other side of that glass. That is why women and other oppressed people have a clearer vision of reality than white males and other oppressors (p. 129).
Given this vantage point of understanding, it is imperative that Latinas continue to challenge theoretical models that essentialize the experience of gender and ignore the influential role of social structures in the construction of gender. Lived experience is an alternative way to understand the social world and the experience of various women. Moreover, marginalized locations are appropriate for understanding social relations that remain concealed from privileged vantage points. Latinas challenge dominant conceptions of truth by the use of their own voice and experience.

**Latina Image and Identity**

The final tenet of multiracial feminism proposes that women’s experiences are diverse and continuously changing. While sharing rich cultural legacies, Latinas represent a group of heterogeneous women (Flores-Ortiz, 1998; Gloria, 2001; Vasquez, 1984; Zavella, 1997), and each selects her own self-referent based on political, social, historical, and economic realities. As an illustration, Zavella (1997) notes, “We are Chicanas, Mexicans, Mexican Americans, Spanish Americans, Tejanas, Hispanics, Mestizas, Indias, or Latinas, and the terms of identification vary according to the context” (p. 187).

Similarly, their identities are created and influenced by numerous social categories, such as gender, age, sexual orientation, class, physical capacities, ethnic identity, language, religious affiliation, mental and physical characteristics, educational level, occupational status, generational status, geographical location, and political outlook (Gloria, 2001; Zavella, 1997).

**Conclusion**

We believe that using a multiracial feminist framework will expand and improve what is currently understood about the Latina/o experience. We cannot maintain a narrow focus on intrapsychic variables, nor can we pursue a limited focus on psychological variables. The need to address the psychological realities of Latinas, as well as their individual, historical, social, economic, and ecological realities is essential.

**References**


Students' Column

By Michèle Schlehofer-Sutton and Bianca D.M. Wilson

Call for Nominations for Incoming Student Representative

It is time once again to elect an incoming SCRA student representative! Having student representatives is an important way to make sure that student issues are given full consideration in SCRA. In addition, serving as student rep is also a fun and rewarding learning experience. If you would like to nominate yourself or someone else for the incoming student rep position, or have additional questions, please contact Michèle at Michele.Sutton@cgwu.edu. Nominees will be asked to prepare a one-page statement on why they are interested in the position, what topics or issues related to student representation in SCRA concern them, and what (if any) prior leadership or representative service they have held, such as serving in student government. All student members will be sent an election ballot by mail after nominations have been received.

Report on the Mid-winter Meeting

Last January, we attended the mid-winter meeting of the executive committee. Student issues were given room for discussion at the meeting, and we are pleased to announce that the executive committee has approved the use of the money gained from the student initiative fund for use as grant money for pre-dissertation or master’s thesis research! Please see below for further information on this new grant.

Announcing the Special Issues Graduate Student Research Grant

We are currently finalizing our award guidelines for the Special Issues Graduate Student Research grant, a grant that is specifically designed to fund pre-dissertation or master’s thesis research in under-funded areas. This grant specifically seeks to fund research in the following areas: public policy, oppression, and community development and organization. We are currently deciding on the review process, and would like your feedback! Would it be better to have the two student representatives or members of the executive committee be responsible for ranking the grant submissions and awarding the funds, or a combination thereof? How many people do you think should be involved in reviewing grant applications? Please let us know what you think! Please send your suggestions to Bianca at biancaw@uic.edu.

APA

The annual APA convention is an excellent opportunity for students to present their work and meet leading researchers in their field. In addition, the annual APA convention provides SCRA student members from a number of diverse programs with the opportunity to meet and socialize. As you are aware, this year’s APA convention will be held in Chicago from August 22nd to 25th. We are currently in the process of organizing both formal and informal student-centered activities for the convention, and would like your input: what types of activities would you be interested in attending? Please email your suggestions and comments regarding scheduling student activities at the APA convention to Michele.Sutton@cgwu.edu.

APA Travel Awards

It is time once again to submit your application for an APA travel award! We will be awarding 3 travel grants at $150.00 each this year! Application forms will be sent through the general SCRA listserv in March. If you have any questions, contact Michèle at Michele.Sutton@cgwu.edu.

Regional & International News

By Judy Primavera (jprimavera@fairl.fairfield.edu)

Hello everyone. This is my first TCP column as the newly elected Regional Network Coordinator (RNC). I am pleased to present for you news from all five U.S. regions as well as updates from three international regions.

I would like to start by thanking Paul Toro for the terrific job he did as Regional Network Coordinator. I know that when I was a Regional Coordinator it was always comforting to know that you could count on Paul for a quick response to any inquiry and support in any new endeavor you wished to pursue as an RNC. His high level of professionalism and organization has made the transition into the job of RNC a pleasant one. Paul has graciously agreed to become editor of TCP. This is his third issue. Congratulations Paul!

Kudos are also in order to Kelly Hazel for successfully conquering the Herculean task of preparing SCRA’s 2002 APA program under the added stress of decreased program time. The program is living proof that community psychologists do, indeed, know how to make the most out of limited resources.

And now a “nudge” to the folks in the Southwest/Rocky Mountain region … We still need a new first year Regional Coordinator. With the Biennial coming up in your region, it’s a great chance to get more involved with SCRA.

The “news” below will start with a report from the Northeast region. However, at this time I’d like to acknowledge the work of three people who worked to revitalize the annual SCRA meeting in the Northeast. This regional meeting had been lying dormant for many years — I am not sure how many but I believe that the last regional meeting was organized by Frank Wong and Jan Gillespie in the late 1980’s. The problem faced by our RCs was that “stand alone” conferences were difficult to run due to issues of space, manpower, and cost. But in 1998 Joe Ferrari (yes, Midwest Joe! Yes, DePaul Joe!) was on the advisory board for the Eastern Psychological Association’s annual conference and he paved the way for SCRA’s affiliation with EPA. That year, Vicky Banyan and Cathy Crosby-Currie organized a SCRA “town meeting” at EPA. In 1999, Cathy organized a lengthier program. The rest is history! By partnering with EPA, the Northeast once again has an annual regional meeting. Thanks to Joe, Vicky and Cathy.

Northeast Regional News, By Olga Acosta (olgacostajuno.com)

The Northeast region is gearing up for the SCRA program at the Eastern Psychological Association conference to be held in Boston on March 9th. We have an exciting program planned including: a keynote address by Lois Holtzman, Director of the East Side Institute for Short-term Psychotherapy whose talk is entitled “Practicing a Psychology that Builds Community”. In addition, Meg Bond, Khanh Dinh, and Anne Mulvey from U Mass, Lowell will give a Plenary...
Session entitled “When Cultures Meet: University Outreach in a Multi-Cultural Community”. We have a number of symposia and paper sessions planned on a variety of topics including: “Capacity Building, Program Planning, Implementation and Evaluation with CBOs”; “Assessing and Responding to Community Risks: Survey Methods and Ethical Dilemmas”; and, “Information Technology and Community Psychology”. In addition we have 4 workshops, a poster session with 8 posters and our day will end with a Town Meeting facilitated by Bill Berkowitz on the topic of “Community Psychology in the Aftermath of Recent World Events”. In total, we have 48 presenters representing 18 universities or agencies.

Our first year coordinator is Joy Kaufman from The Consultation Center of Yale University School of Medicine. Joy is an Assistant Professor of Psychology in Psychiatry at Yale and the Director of Program and Service System Evaluation at The Consultation Center (joy.kaufman@yale.edu)

Southeast Regional news, By Jennifer Wollard
(jwoollard@crim.ufl.edu)

I would like to tell SCRA a bit about our new first year RC, Lorraine Taylor from University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill (ltaylor@email.unc.edu). Lorraine joined UNC’s Developmental Program as an assistant professor in July, 2001. Lorraine received her PhD from the University of Virginia in 1997. In her research, Lorraine makes use of an ecological systems framework to explore questions concerning parenting and child socialization. She is interested in the impact of social, cultural, and economic factors on the development of young children and their families. Specifically, her work focuses on understanding the impact of poverty and welfare use on parents and children, particularly among rural and African American families. She has published work on poverty and welfare receipt among rural families with young children. In addition, Lorraine is also interested in intra-familial processes that influence children’s emotional development, including parental attitudes about emotions and parent-child interactions. A recent project is focused on understanding the roles of ethnicity and economic hardship on children’s emotional socialization in a sample of African American and European American low-income families. Thus, Lorraine’s work addresses the ways in which both extra- and intra-familial influences work together to affect such child outcomes. Lorraine is also a faculty affiliate at UNC’s Center for Developmental Science and is working on a NSF collaborative study of child development in North Carolina.

Midwest Regional News, by Lorna London (london@luc.edu)

Our new first year regional coordinator is Renee Taylor, Ph.D. She is an assistant professor at the University of Illinois-Chicago in the Department of Occupational Therapy (rtyaylor@uic.edu).

The Midwestern region of SCRA will host its annual affiliated meeting as part of the Midwestern Psychological Conference on Friday May 3, 2002 at the Palmer House Hilton Hotel in Chicago, IL. We received a number of excellent presentations and are featuring a number of faculty and student-led poster and paper presentations, as well as panel discussions and symposia highlighting community-based interventions. We are excited because this meeting gives students an opportunity to showcase their work and dialogue with leaders in the area of community psychology in a friendly, collegial atmosphere. We encourage those who will be attending the MPA to join us for our meeting on May 3, and to stay with us for dinner that evening at Berghoff’s restaurant, just two blocks from the Palmer House Hotel. For further information please contact Lorna London at 847-853-3347.

Rocky Mountain/Southwest Regional news, by Susan Wolfe
(smwolfe915@aol.com)

Perhaps the biggest news from the Southwest / Rocky Mountain Region is that the 2003 Biennial conference will be held at New Mexico Highlands University in Las Vegas, New Mexico. The theme will be “Incorporating Diversity: Moving From Values to Action.” The conference planners are looking for suggestions for keynote speakers, or other suggestions for conference programs and activities and hope to have a Call for Proposals out in the fall. If you have ideas, please e-mail them to Jean Hill at jeanhill@worldplaces.com.

In addition to the opportunity to learn from all of the great speakers and presentations, network with colleagues, and catch up with old friends, this conference will provide a wonderful opportunity to visit the Southwest and indulge in its unique and rich culture and history.

When I heard the conference would be held in Las Vegas, NM, I decided to find out where it is located and what would be interesting about going there. My web search showed that the town is located only an hour north of Santa Fe, which is a beautiful place to visit, browse the art galleries and buy some of the great handmade jewelry. As I explored further, I found that Las Vegas is also a great place for those who like outdoor activities. There are many places to hike and view wildlife, camp and fish. The town sits between the Rocky Mountains and the Great Plains, so attendees can expect incredible views. This location is also rich in history and culture. It was once a major trading place on the Santa Fe Trail. It is currently the home of a unique Northern New Mexican Spanish community and has been influenced by Native American, Northern European and Jewish cultures. The city boasts over 900 buildings on the National Register of Historic Places, and because of the diverse influence, these buildings range from Spanish adobe homes to Victorian architecture. Pecos National Historical Park is only 30 miles to the west. This park has 12,000 years of history that include the ancient pueblo of Pecos, two Spanish Colonial Missions, Santa Fe trail sites and was the site of the Civil War Battle of Glorieta Pass. After reviewing several web pages and learning about this site, I’m very excited about attending the 2003 Biennial and suggest that everyone start making plans!

Otherwise, things in this region have been quiet. We are currently searching for a new first year regional representative and would very much welcome nominations or volunteers!

Western Regional news, by Eric Mankowski (ebm@pdx.edu)

Several SCRA affiliated or sponsored presentations will be made at the 2002 Western Psychological Association (WPA) meeting in Irvine, California, April 11-14, including: (1) Dr. Jim Kelly, University of California – Davis, will be giving an invited talk at WPA entitled, “Reflection With Action: Opportunities in Community Psychology”. Jim’s talk will be geared especially toward gaining the interest of new and potential students in the field of community psychology. (2) A roundtable discussion on Education and Training issues in community psychology chaired by Mary-Prieto Bayard, University of LaVerne, this one focusing on issues and challenges of programs and community settings in meeting the needs of current students in terms of their future professional activities, especially in a changing socio-political era. (3) An annual membership meeting on current activities and interests of western regional members. And (4) There will be a number of papers, posters, and symposia on a variety of topics in community psychology.
We continue to be encouraged by the increasing presence of SCRA at the WPA meetings. A special program of presentations will be made possible through coordination and assistance from the WPA Executive Committee.

Ken Miller, San Francisco State University has agreed to become the new first year representative for the western region of SCRA (kmiller@sfsu.edu). Thank you, Ken, for your interest and commitment!

There is interesting SCRA activity in the bay area. Emily Ozer, Ken Miller, and Rhona Weinstein have organized the Bay Area Community Psychology Network as a way of enhancing the sense of community among Bay Area community psychologists. The group held its first meeting on the campus of the University of California at Berkeley this past November 2, 2001. The meeting was well attended, with a nice mix of graduate students, and both younger and more senior members of the field. Several speakers briefly addressed the topic of the identity of the field of Community Psychology, and this followed by a lively discussion of some of the salient tensions and issues within the field (e.g., the role of prevention within Community Psychology, the challenge of staying true to fundamental CP principles and values while working in academic settings that may promote very different principles and values, and capacity of Community Psychologists to effectively address social problems).

There was a lot of enthusiasm for making the group an ongoing network that will meet on a regular basis. The next meeting is tentative scheduled for some time in February at the University of California San Francisco, with the specific date and location to be announced.

European news, by David Fryer (d.m.fryer@stir.ac.uk)

Community psychology, at least that done critically, has continued to struggle for adequate recognition and implementation of its recommendations - if not for survival - in most countries in the last few years. However, it has become relatively well established in much of the USA, Australia, New Zealand, South America, South Africa and many European countries, at least compared with its position in the UK.

Recently, however, the position in the UK has started to change at last in encouraging ways. In the UK community psychology has been taught at undergraduate level at only three Universities (the University of Stirling, Scotland, the University of Northumbria at Newcastle, England, Thames Valley University, London, England and Manchester Metropolitan University, Manchester, England). Until this year, postgraduate teaching in community psychology has been largely confined to Exeter University, England, where community psychology was taught as part of the clinical and educational psychology professional courses. However, 2002 has already seen the establishment of the first M.Sc. courses in community psychology (‘taught’ and ‘by research’) at the Manchester Metropolitan University, Manchester, England. This important expansion in teaching and learning opportunities in relation to community psychology coincided with the appointment of Carolyn Kagan to the first Chair in the UK in Community Social Psychology. See www.compsy.org.uk for further details.

The British Psychological Society (BPS) also seems at last to be warming to community psychology. In 2001, Professor Julian Rappaport was awarded a Visiting Fellowship of the British Psychological Society. Julian’s visit was co-ordinated from Stirling and he lectured widely about community psychological issues around the UK.

In 2002, Professor Isaac Prilleltensky, Director of the Wellness Promotion Unit in the Department of Psychology, Victoria University, Melbourne, Australia, will be visiting the UK as a Visiting Fellow of the British Psychological Society. He is spending several days as the Guest of the University of Stirling and also giving papers to community and critical psychologists in London and Manchester.

2001 saw the British Psychological Society (BPS) celebrate its Centenary 1901-2001 and in the spring of 2001, the BPS held its Centenary Conference in Glasgow. This included a Symposium entitled International Perspectives on Community Psychology. The contributors were: David Fryer (Stirling, Scotland - also the convener); Carolyn Kagan, (Manchester Metropolitan University, England; Heather Hamilton (Waikato, New Zealand); Jim Orford (Birmingham, England); and Julian Rappaport (Champaign Urbana, USA). The event was over -subscribed with all seating and standing room inside and even just outside the room taken.

In July 2001 the BPS collaborated in the mounting of the VII European Congress of Psychology at the Barbican Centre in London and Community Psychology was given the status of having a dedicated Keynote Lecture in the programme. David Fryer of the University of Stirling, Scotland, gave this keynote lecture.

In March 2002, A Collaborative Community Psychology Event, ‘Bringing together theory and practice, is being held in Scotland. A number of issues have come together to shape this meeting. Firstly, the UK Community Psychology Network holds occasional national meetings at which those interested in community psychology in the UK can meet to explore common interests, offer each other support, organise for the future etc. The Stirling Group offered to host such a Network meeting.

Secondly, critical reflection on previous international community psychology congresses by a number of community psychologists belonging to the Network suggested that CP conferences often reproduce many of the features of our social arrangements seen as problematic by critical community psychologists. (See e.g. McKenna, S. and Fryer, D. (2001), The third European conference on community psychology: a Scottish perspective, The Community Psychologist, 34, 2, 10-12). It has been suggested that consideration should be given to trying to make community psychology meetings more thoroughly community psychological in process as well as in content. In particular we should, through our conferences and meetings as elsewhere in our practice, strive to facilitate a range of stakeholders working together to achieve emancipatory critical understanding of social issues, to challenge oppression and contribute to positive change through working at multiple (including socio-structural) levels.

Thirdly, whilst initially planning the Network event, a range of stakeholders in a community near Glasgow) began to address issues in relation to mental health and well being in their own community. Some of these stakeholders and the community psychology group at Stirling decided to collaborate, with the blessing of the University of Stirling, which is keen to promote campus-community working. The meeting provides opportunities for taking ideas and practice forward beyond rhetoric.

Fourthly Isaac Prilleltensky agreed to attend and contribute to all three days of this collaborative community event. Thus this meeting attempts to bring together community members and activists, professional and non-professional community workers, academics and social Scientists to promote positive mental health and to prevent distress.
In November 2002 the IV European Congress of Community Psychology takes place in Barcelona, Spain. The theme is "Community, Ethics and Values". The scientific committee is drawn from the European Network of Community Psychology and the Organizing Committee is led by Alipio Sanchez (see the Call for Papers that appeared in the last (Winter) issue of TCP under SCRA Community News; for additional details, see www.europe-community-psych.org).

Positive though much of this is, the last year has been dominated, however, for European Community Psychology, by the sad death in 2001 of Professor Marie Jahoda, arguably the first European community psychologists who did pioneering community psychology in the 1930s in Austria. An obituary of Professor Jahoda, written by David Fryer, appeared in The Psychologist, 14, 7, 383, 2001. A Special Edition of The Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology, due 2002, will critically celebrate the past, present and future relevance of Marie Jahoda's work for the understanding and solution of real world problems.

Latin American news, by Lidia Natalia Dobrianskyj Weber (lidia@uol.com.br)

In Latin America and especially in Brazil, there is a strong movement of psychologists to study and create ways of working with street children. There are psychologists who want to describe a method created to observe children of the street in their natural environment. The discussion emphasizes that observational, exploratory and descriptive studies are essential to validate the process of creative specific methodologies to understand and analyze human development at risk. This kind of work also has a focus to change the social representation of a "street kid". The street child has been described as a forsaken person, abandoned without parents and social care, and excluded from the opportunity to have a common life. Identification of factors within the environment that make one child more able to survive on the streets than another can be of great value. There is research that examines the relationship between social support and street adolescents' adaptation to life on the streets (defined as the ability to obtain food, to find shelter, and to grow normally); the results show that street children with more social support (greater number of supportive persons) would adapt better to life on the streets. It has been hypothesized that street children with higher quality support would adapt better. We need to recognize the great necessity of work with street children, as well as other excluded populations. Currently, there are few community approaches in Latin America. Basically we have psychology professors doing research and NGOs doing field interventions. Many of the NGOs are supported by foreign resources. We need more support from our own (Brazilian) Government in order to provide more resources for these children. Community psychologists can help make this happen.

Book Reviews


Review by John D. Piette, Ph.D.

Center for Practice Management and Outcomes Research
Veterans Affairs Medical Center and University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, Michigan

While one might expect that major public health initiatives would be rationally formulated and based on an understanding of community needs, most are motivated by a number of factors, of which "needs" form only one part. Community priorities, political and fiscal constraints, and sociocultural realities are among many influences on program planning and policy-making and all of these shape the empirical dimensions of public health such as the collection and analysis of epidemiologic data. In Needs Assessment and Public Health, the authors discuss needs assessment within this larger context and provide practical advice to readers about how best to develop public health programs that are likely to survive in the real-world.

The authors begin by discussing the organizational context within which many needs assessments take place, then focus more narrowly on the stages of needs assessment, and finally, move to the process of identifying programmatic solutions and implementing policies. The book takes a decidedly pragmatic approach, and focuses mainly on needs assessments and policy-making within local and state government bodies. Though, the book may be a useful introduction for students in public health and public policy, most of the chapters will be especially useful for government officials who can identify with the examples provided and apply the specific advice within their own agencies.

Though, the book may be a useful introduction for students in public health and public policy, most of the chapters will be especially useful for government officials who can identify with the examples provided and apply the specific advice within their own agencies.
Petersen and Alexander define the substantive focus of needs assessment quite broadly, e.g., noting that “the successes of health reforms in slowing the growth in health care expenditures, in containing cost, and in improving access to care, in terms of both health insurance coverage and utilization of health services, are fundamental questions of needs assessment, as are the assessment of changes in health care quality, content, appropriateness, and population coverage.” Many would argue that this formulation includes fields that are related to needs assessment but outside of its purview such as health economics, program evaluation, and health services research. This definitional issue may be only academic, although, given the book’s brevity, the authors are only able to focus on what is common among these fields rather than the large areas of differences that define them as separate disciplines.

The book is well organized and includes concrete, practical advice for upper-level program planners and policy-makers involved in various phases of the needs assessment process. Bulleted lists are used throughout the book to succinctly present key points in a way that busy policy-makers are likely to find helpful. Chapter 2 includes a detailed step-by-step overview of the conduct of needs assessment, with advice from the planning stage to program development and resource allocation. Nitty-gritty details are included which may seem superfluous to many, but undoubtedly will be invaluable to some (e.g., “meeting rooms of sufficient capacity need to be booked.”)

Chapter 3 provides a concise and practical introduction to the use of primary and secondary data for needs assessment including discussion of the strengths and pitfalls of various approaches. Widely available public use datasets are highlighted and a list of specific data sources is included. Town meetings and focus groups are described along with discussion of when these might be helpful and how they can be conducted successfully. As throughout the book, practical advice is given regarding unanticipated repercussions of seemingly straightforward assessment strategies. For example, the authors point out that conducting community surveys can raise expectations in the eyes of the public that a given problem will be addressed and ultimately solved. These details emanate from the authors’ own experience conducting needs assessments in the real world and could help officials avoid some of the mistakes Petersen and Alexander undoubtedly have witnessed.

In Chapters 4 and 5, the authors move beyond the needs assessment process narrowly defined to a discussion of strategies that shape its success, such as the ways in which to structure community involvement, ongoing communication with key constituent groups, interaction with the media, and the use of performance measures for resource allocation. The remaining chapters focus on the selection of feasible policy solutions for identified problems and ways to promote desired programs. Specific advice is included regarding lobbying officials (with specific templates for such discussions) and the use of community advocates. As always, these sections are concrete and practical. For example, the authors include a “top 10” list of tips for advocacy and suggestions for what to do when the governor does not include your proposal in his or her legislative package.

As already noted, the authors view needs assessment as encompassing all phases of the policy development process including not only “the identification of problems or needs...” but also “the identification of effective, efficient, and socially acceptable solutions to those problems [and] getting those solutions enacted into policy.” Each of these areas is complex, and all are described only briefly. For readers with specific interest in one phase of the process or a specific substantive focus, this book may be too general to be of much value. Nevertheless, insight into these processes is of interest to most people involved in needs assessment, particularly when such advice comes from individuals such as Petersen and Alexander who clearly are speaking from experience.

This book effectively makes the case that needs assessment is more than just number-crunching. While this is true, number-crunching is a central element of the process and many readers may feel that it is given insufficient attention. Even higher-level staff could benefit from a conceptual presentation of the basic statistical issues pertinent to the collection, analysis, and interpretation of needs assessment data. For example, statistical power and sample-size, reliability and validity of measurement, confounding, and the clustering of data within geopolitical units, are all important concepts to understand whether one is a producer of public health data, the manager of these staff, or a consumer of needs assessment reports. Readers interested in these issues should be aware that they are largely ignored in this book.

One heuristic used successfully by the authors throughout the book is the consideration of three hypothetical case examples illustrating differing approaches that state public health agencies can take to needs assessments. The first state represents an example of a “bottom-up” approach to needs assessment, with local leaders given substantial flexibility in conducting their needs assessments and state goals gleaned largely from these reports. The second state represents a more “top-down” approach, beginning the needs assessment process by creating a new state-level unit responsible for community assessment and planning. The third state provides an example of a partnership between public health agencies and large private health plans. In that scenario, the needs assessment team selects a policy focus early in the process (adolescent pregnancy, domestic violence, and work-site injuries) and the needs assessment effort is largely run by the private health care agencies with the goal of identifying ideas for community- and employer-based interventions addressing these problems. Through questions at the end of each chapter, the authors ask readers to apply what they have learned to problems faced within each of these hypothetical states. Both the scenarios and the chapter review questions are well done, and they add coherence to the book.

Needs Assessment in Public Health gives readers a general overview of issues important for the management and conduct of needs assessments, along with specific advice for policy-making and program development. The book could be used in graduate courses for students of public health and public policy. It may be most useful for individuals with some experience in this area already, since the focus is general and key examples could have little meaning to the uninitiated. Readers expecting technical advice regarding the collection, analysis, and interpretation of needs assessment data will not find it here. However managers and health planners will find the principles and practical advice to be valuable.
This special issue is focused on system development and system change. The issue includes six contributions that illustrate the extraordinary scope, diversity, and potential the field has for contributing to knowledge and action in this area. In many ways, community psychology is uniquely suited to designing, implementing, and evaluating system development and system change efforts. This is true for several reasons. First, the focus of our field has always stretched beyond the individual and beyond the clinical to the social systems in which such matters are embedded, even though individual psychologies and clinical matters have been an integral part of our history and, for many, an important part of our present and future (Levine & Perkins, 1987). Second, our emphasis on human strengths, social ecology, diversity, prevention and promotion, empowerment, and participatory citizenship enables us to think about system development and system change from a variety of perspectives (Dalton, Elias, & Wandersman, 2001). And third, our commitment to understanding human phenomena at multiple levels of analysis, such as the individual, the family, the school, the worksite, the neighborhood, and the community, and the value we place on scientific rigor, make us especially well-suited to designing and evaluating change efforts so that we can generate knowledge (Tebes, Kaufman, & Chinman, in press; Tebes, Kaufman, & Connell, in press).

One of the striking things about the system development and change efforts described in this special issue is the perspective they adopt in relation to the various systems that are being changed. In the years immediately surrounding the 1965 Swampscott Conference, those who eventually came to call themselves community psychologists were, for the most part, out of the mainstream in their analysis of social problems and what should be done about them, and the role of psychologists in relation to the systems and institutions established to address those problems. As these papers illustrate, this is no longer the case. Community psychologists and like-minded professionals from other disciplines now most often work “within the system” to effect large-scale system change. Increasingly, they are in positions of influence and responsibility in political and social institutions, and are well-positioned to lead the implementation of change efforts. The papers included below provide a number of remarkable examples of how this is being done.

**Six Exemplars of System Development and Change**

Two papers describe local change efforts. The paper by Suarez-Baleazcar and Kinney features a remarkable grassroots change effort to employ web-based technology to enhance the lives of a low-income, predominantly African-American community in a 42-block area in Chicago. The project, known as Every Block a Village Online, provided community leaders with the equipment and assistance to utilize WebTV to facilitate access to information and enhance communication among community members to address areas of concern to the community. Suarez-Baleazcar and Kinney provide a number of examples of how the use of the internet, email, and a community web page empowered individuals to effect critical changes to improve the quality of members lives.

Another local effort is described in the paper by Ward, Crusto, and Gordon. The authors detail an innovative approach to systemic school reform focused on preparing urban, minority middle school students for college. The program emphasizes upgrading the school math curriculum in order to ensure that students complete basic math requirements in order to make college feasible. Ward and her colleagues describe how this is being implemented in three urban centers in Connecticut -- Bridgeport, Hartford, and New Haven -- through a variety of system-wide changes in the way math is taught and supported at the middle school level, and through an extensive district-level intervention, known as the MAAX (Maximizing Adolescent Academic Excellence), which builds college awareness skills through a developmentally-and culturally-relevant curriculum.

Several papers describe successful state-wide change efforts. Emshoff and his colleagues describe Family Connection, an ambitious state-level initiative focused on improving the lives of children and families in Georgia. Family Connection is the largest statewide network of community collaborators in the country, and includes representation from the business, civic, and faith communities; public and private service providers; elected officials; educators; and family members. Both quantitative and qualitative data on various benchmark indicators for children and families is being tracked over time to determine the impact of this initiative and the various strategies that may be most influential in effecting positive system change.

The paper by DeChiara, Unruh, and Wolff describes an extraordinary transformation in health care access in Massachusetts that is attributable, in part, to the success of the Health Access Networks, or HAN. The HAN is a system change effort established as part of a mini-grant program funded by the Massachusetts Medicaid and Public Health agencies to increase health care outreach and enrollment. The authors detail various successes of this initiative, including: the many process-level benefits observed at both the local and state-wide level; the dramatic increase in Medicaid enrollments; and a number of structural system improvements and practice changes observed.

A final paper that focuses on a state-wide system development and change initiative is described in the paper by Kirk, Evans, and Dailey. The authors summarize early efforts to effect change in Connecticut’s publicly-funded behavioral health services through the use of managed care. Drawing on their varying backgrounds in community psychology and a recovery perspective, the authors outline how managed care is being used by the Department of Mental
Health and Addiction Services -- the state agency responsible for behavioral health services to adults -- to reduce rehospitalization and treatment dropout rates, increase access of services to minorities, enhance culturally-competent services, and strengthen peer-support and engagement initiatives in the system of care.

In the issue's final paper, Olson and his colleagues describe how Oxford House, a consumer-run program for individuals in recovery from substance abuse problems, serves as an exemplar of second-order change, that is, change that is systemic because it addresses not only those processes that directly cause a given problem but also those that exacerbate or maintain the problem or influence it indirectly. As a result, second-order change is often paradoxical and transforming because it challenges previous conceptions about the problem and the limited, and ultimately ineffective, earlier solutions crafted to address it. By focusing on barriers to implementing the Oxford House model more widely, the authors illustrate how second-order change is possible and essential, and how overcoming these barriers forms the basis for subsequent systemic change.

Promises and Perils for Community Psychology

Since Swampscott, community psychologists have made enormous strides in their capacity to effect system change from within. Whether as researchers, practitioners, policy makers, activists, or educators, community psychologists and those from related disciplines increasingly find themselves being called upon to conceptualize, implement, or evaluate system development or change efforts. These opportunities for leadership also carry great responsibility. It is now we who are at risk of institutionalizing our influence, we who are in danger of being co-opted by established interests, and we who may develop change efforts that are out of touch with the marginalized, the disenfranchised, and the silent who long to be heard. As a field, what ultimately matters is the power of our ideas and the quality of our actions. The efforts at system development and change described in this special issue are welcome reminders of the potential for our field to generate knowledge and to serve the public interest. If they are any indication, the future holds considerable promise.
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services provided, to the fee-for-service system that permitted collection of significant, contemporaneous, clinical information about the type, pattern and timeliness of services clients were receiving, just the kind of information necessary to help unify the behavioral health system.

After several years of fact-finding, negotiating and planning, in June 1997, the Connecticut General Assembly gave the DMHAS permission to establish a managed behavioral health program for state General Assistance (welfare) recipients. The newly formed General Assistance Behavioral Health Program (GA-BHP) became our laboratory for testing the model for a publicly managed system of care. Although managed care techniques had been used extensively in state behavioral health systems throughout the nation, we wanted to avoid pitfalls that had detracted from many of these efforts. Chief among the problems seen in other states was that managed care organizations (MCOs) funded using capitated reimbursement had a powerful incentive to deny needed care or to unreasonably foreshorten the length of treatment in order to decrease costs and improve corporate profits (Koyanagi, 1995). In order to overcome this problem, we planned a strategy that changed the incentive structure, creating support for quality client care and strengthening the emphasis on public sector values. As an initial step, DMHAS contracted with an Administrative Services Organization (ASO) that had had considerable private sector managed care experience. The ASO operated the utilization management, provider credentialing and claims payment systems using policies and utilization management criteria set by DMHAS. Below we discuss some of the key features of the DMHAS/ASO relationship and the structure of the GA-BHP that helped us to use managed care technology to achieve public sector goals.

Building Communication and Consensus

Creating and sustaining a statewide behavioral health reform requires changing the way people think and conduct their day-to-day business throughout the system. In order to achieve this type of change it is important to build substantial support within the system for the principles and values on which the reform is based. This is accomplished through a combination of leadership and consensus building. Communicating the merits of the reform requires considerable planning and effort, but is key to its success.

In Connecticut, we focused on: keeping our message of reform clear and simple; building consensus for reform within DMHAS leadership; achieving buy-in for reform from behavioral health consumers, providers, and leaders in the executive and legislative branches of government; and, providing these constituents with programmatic details and a realistic time frame to evaluate the reform effort.

Innovation as a Change Agent

Although there were many administrative and technical requirements needed to support the managed care initiative, these details were merely the instruments by which we hoped to improve client access and make important changes in the quality of clinical care. Specifically, we used the change initiative to introduce new solutions to some familiar problems, such as: addressing the revolving door by reducing utilization among frequent service users and rapid recidivists; enhancing culturally competent services through the use of peer engagement specialists and non-masters-level clinicians; and, reducing treatment dropout rates by emphasizing a recovery house approach.

Early Evidence of System Change

Several items stand out as highlights of the DMHAS effort to reform a publicly managed system of behavioral healthcare for adults. While the work is far from complete, certain changes appear to have taken hold. Here are some examples:

- Initial results indicate lower utilization of acute care services and improved functioning among clients receiving intensive care management services. Additionally, continuity of care rates have improved (as measured by the percent of program clients who successfully transition from acute treatment to rehabilitative levels of care).
- There is increased use of client-level data to examine utilization patterns throughout the system and to identify providers that might benefit from technical assistance.
- The availability of large quantities of client utilization and claims data is making it possible to examine important disparities in treatment and outcomes across client groups. These patterns can only be seen when data is disaggregated into its component subparts. This information is particularly relevant to our developing understanding of the needs of various racial and ethnic groups.
- An aggressive communication strategy has enabled DMHAS to conceptualize and articulate policy and content in a far more rigorous manner.
- The state’s private non-profit providers are better prepared to thrive within a competitive managed care environment.
- Providers have made important advances in both their clinical and administrative practices (e.g., improved coordination of services between levels of care and across provider agencies; improved billing and account reconciliation).
- Consumers report a greater sense of involvement, including growing support for managed care based on its benefit for clients.
- Providers express an increased (and in some cases new) understanding and appreciation for their role as contributors within an overall system of care.
- Resistance to change has diminished and we have not seen the pattern of problems (e.g., grievances and lawsuits) that have plagued implementation of capitated managed care plans.
- DMHAS has developed an infrastructure and improved its skill repertoire in anticipation of managing care for the Medicaid, aged, blind, and disabled populations.
- As DMHAS grows increasingly accustomed to using data and system-level indicators, it has become easier to identify system changes that need to be made and to implement evidence-based practices. Use of system-level data also has helped to shift attention from a traditional focus on programs to one that encompasses systems relationships and interventions.
- Cultural competence has been defined in standards and included in provider contracts. A massive staff training effort has been accomplished. Programmatic changes have improved access among African Americans, Latinos and are beginning to show changes among other racial and ethnic groups (e.g., Southeast Asians).
Increased confidence and collaboration within the system of care, coupled with the enhanced availability of data, has set the stage for establishing a process for ongoing system improvement designed to support recovery for adults using Connecticut's publicly managed behavioral healthcare system.

Next Steps
Even with these preliminary successes, far more remains to be done. As we move forward, our plan is to rely on a quality improvement strategy that assumes enhancements can be made within complex organizational systems. We plan to focus our continuing system development and system change efforts on: strengthening further our move toward a recovery-oriented system of care; using reimbursement rates as an instrument of change; converting grants to fee-for-service payments and other alternative reimbursement mechanisms; and, using research to strengthen behavioral healthcare.
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Evaluating community-based initiatives like Family Connection is a challenging task. There are as many variations on the model as there are local collaboratives; each initiative has a unique community history and context, a particular mix of community members, and a distinctive approach to improving results for families and children. In addition to the wide variation, there is an intrinsic complexity to the work of collaboratives for they naturally fall outside the boundaries of a single agency, discipline or program. In addition, as part of a broader initiative, local collaboratives must be looked at on local, regional, and state levels. Finally, Family Connection collaboratives are constantly changing -- some changes are intentional (e.g. actions flowing from the implementation of the community plan) while other changes are outside the control of the local collaborative (e.g. changes in state and federal policies).

The Family Connection evaluation has two primary goals. The first goal is to understand the initiative and assess its significance. The second goal is to strengthen the ability of community collaboratives to improve child and family well-being. Integral to both these goals is building the capacity to conduct and use evaluation effectively and efficiently. This requires the active involvement of community members in designing and implementing the evaluation and interpreting the findings.

It has often been stated that Family Connection is not a program. While most people nod knowingly in response to this statement, it begs the question, “Then what is it?” Consensus on the answer to this question and its implicit sub-questions (e.g., “What is systems change and why is it good?”) might be difficult to achieve. However, there is a theory of change that has guided the work of Family Connection from the beginning. Simply stated, the theory of change is that community based collaboratives -- in partnership with state and regional agencies that engage in systems changes with respect to decision-making, financing and strategy mix, and who deliver effective direct services to children and families as well as environmental change strategies designed to indirectly affect children and families -- will offer the best opportunity to improve the well-being of children and families.

Given the theme of this special issue, we will emphasize the three interrelated domains of systems change engaged in by collaboratives: changing how decisions are made, changing how families are supported, and changing the current system of financing and budgeting.

Decision making: Changing how decisions are made. Family Connection believes that engaging citizens at the local level in collaborative decision-making bodies enables them to be in more control and more accountable for results in their own communities. Measures to demonstrate this change include governance structure and inter-agency responsibilities (e.g. common forms).

Strategy mix: Changing how families are supported. Most state expenditures are made when families are in trouble, rather than investing in preventing problems. Many of the problems communities face -- child abuse, juvenile crime, teen pregnancy, dropping out of school -- can be averted with preventive supports and services. Family Connection promotes a community-based approach with family friendly policies and practices and an emphasis on primary prevention. Measures to demonstrate this change are focused on how services are created and delivered, such as integration of services, co-location of staff, and family involvement.

Finance: Changing the current system of financing and budgeting. Family Connection tries to build a linkage between budgets and strategies that work. Communities are encouraged to pool resources from state, federal, local and private funders in order to finance effective strategies. Measures to demonstrate this are focused on how funds are redirected, leveraged in a new way, and/or “blended” to better fund the work of the collaborative.

Initial Findings

Findings from the initial set of analyses are very encouraging:

• With few exceptions, the benchmark data show consistently positive trends in the lives of Georgians over time;

• The efforts of the collaboratives appear to be related directly to improvements in the benchmark data - the greatest improvements in benchmarks occur among collaboratives which indicate that they are addressing the specific benchmark; and

• Several elements within Family Connection’s Theory of Change appear to combine to influence improvements in key benchmark indicators – collaborative governance, service strategies, years in the initiative, and several contextual variables.

Trends for selected benchmarks. Data re-analyzed by the Evaluation Team verify the well-documented consistent statewide improvements in benchmark indicators over time. The most accessible source for these data is the web-enabled Benchmark database available at: [www.georgiafamilyconnection.org](http://www.georgiafamilyconnection.org)

Collaboratives that address particular benchmarks. Counties that targeted specific benchmarks tend to show the most improvement in the areas they addressed. This is especially interesting since it suggests the possibility of a direct cause-and-effect relationship between a collaborative’s actions and successful outcomes. Correlations between counties’ addressing the selected benchmark and improvements in those selected benchmarks are each substantial and in the predicted direction.

Initial Test of Variables Which Combine to Influence Changes in Selected Benchmarks. In order to begin to examine systematically which combination of independent variables combine to influence changes in selected indicators, the Evaluation Team conducted a series of multiple regression analyses. In keeping with the overall theory of change, the multiple regression analyses identified a rather consistent set of predictor variables associated with collaborative governance, implementation strategies and context. The initial analyses explain 47% and 15% of the variance associated with the first two benchmarks chosen for analysis.

Looking across the two sets of initial analyses, the following nine predictor variables have been identified: 1) formal or informal governance structure; 2) whether or not the collaborative addresses the benchmark; 3) year; 4) years in Family Connection; 5) type of county (urban, rural, suburban, exurban); 6) children living in poverty; 7) voter participation; 8) length of time the collaborative coordinator has been serving in office; and, 9) length of time the collaborative chair has been in office.

Seven of the nine predictor variables contribute substantially to variation in the percentage of infants born healthy. Of the potential predictor variables, only county status and voter participation do not appear to contribute significantly to variations in this benchmark. Six of the predictor variables contribute substantially to variations in students who graduate from high school on time. Collaborative governance structure, children in poverty, and the length of time the
collaborative chair has been in office, do not appear to explain changes. Changes in both of the sampled benchmarks are influenced substantially by whether or not the collaborative addresses the benchmark and by the length of time that the collaborative has participated in Family Connection.

**Conclusions and Future Directions**

Several conclusions are suggested in this early look at benchmark indicators. First, life is getting better for the children and families of Georgia. Second, this improvement in benchmark indicators is even more pronounced for the Family Connection communities that have targeted (directly or indirectly) the benchmarks. And third, some of the improvement in benchmark indicators is associated with specific characteristics of the setting and of the collaborative, such as type of governance structure.

Despite these encouraging results, there is much progress to be made in measuring some of the key elements of the theory of change. Efforts are underway to increase both the depth and precision of measurement. More sophisticated quantitative and qualitative analyses will focus on collaboratives that are particularly successful or unsuccessful at creating change in targeted benchmarks to try to determine the dynamics of community collaboratives and systems change efforts that seem to be related to successful outcomes.

The question stated by multiple audiences is, “Are we making a difference?” The Evaluation Team has expanded the question to ask “What kinds of collaboratives, in what kinds of settings, creating what kinds of systems changes and implementing what kinds of activities, produce what kinds of results for children and families?”

While such a question suggests a multidimensional matrix of answers, the process of filling in the answers has begun, and the answers are very encouraging. Despite the growing popularity of the use of collaboration in delivering human services, the current literature is void of robust analyses; which demonstrate the relationships these initial analyses have begun to uncover. The current findings are certainly encouraging enough to stimulate a desire to know more. To accomplish this will require additional data collection, access to additional databases, and the use of additional analytic techniques.

---

**Increasing Access to Health Insurance for the Uninsured:**

**The Health Access Networks as a Model**

By Michael DeChiara, Ellen Unruh, and Tom Wolff

AHEC/Community Partners

In 1998, the Massachusetts Medicaid and Public Health agencies, with the support and urging of community groups and advocates, joined forces to issue mini-grants to community-based organizations working on health care outreach and enrollment. These mini-grants were distributed across the state in order to enroll a broad range of communities, representing a diversity of ethnic/cultural/racial groups. The mini-grants were the fundamental building block for subsequent developments in increasing health care access.

The Health Access Networks (HAN) were created with the goal of ensuring that the mini-grant process would lead to comprehensive, systemic changes in the health access field. The typical grant relationship preserves the roles of state bureaucracy as funder and the grassroots as funded program recipient, with neither party understanding nor respecting the needs and perspective of the other, nor seeking ways of working together. The HAN, however, have changed all of this. The HAN exemplifies systems change intervention, a process that takes its basis in the principles of community psychology.

The HAN were intended from the outset to provide forums in which state government, community groups, and consumer advocates could come together in a safe place to work collaboratively toward a common goal. The goal was to increase enrollment in new health care access programs for residents in Massachusetts. In creating the the HAN, AHEC/Community Partners – an organization committed to increasing collaboration, building citizen participation and improving community quality of life through health access and healthy communities initiatives--sought to serve as the convener of these usually disparate stakeholders, in a process of transforming the landscape of health access and mutually achieving the stated goals.

**Program Structure and Goals**

There are four specific program goals of the HAN: (1) to exchange information; (2) to share best practices; (3) to build linkages and relationships; and (4) to make policies, programs, and practices more effective. By structuring the HAN to meet these goals, the program was able to create successful mechanisms for bringing people together for increased collaboration.
**Exchanging Information:**

The HAN meetings build on the assumption that people need information to do their jobs correctly and fulfill the mandates they have accepted. In regards to health access, this means information about new programs or policies, updates about available resources, and/or an understanding of the broader context of health care politics and current events. These are essential in this rapidly changing field. The HAN meetings engage all participants to share this information. State agency representatives bring whatever program and policy updates they have; advocates provide the broader context; and community groups report on what they are seeing at the grassroots level. By sharing this information on a regular basis and making it available to all who attend meetings or read the meeting minutes, the playing field is leveled and people have an increased sense of involvement.

**Sharing Best Practices:**

Often when best practices are shared in meetings or conferences, the successes are highlighted and the failures are assumed to never have happened. For those who live in the real world and struggle with limited resources and tough solutions, hearing only about glowing success does not always serve as encouragement. The HAN, therefore, strives to promote sharing in a safe and respected setting with honest presentations. Community groups are encouraged to share recent efforts regarding outreach and enrollment, understanding that every community is different and that some things work in one place and not in another. What failed for one program may be “stolen” by another and be a wild success. With clear modeling and support by the AHEC/Community Partners facilitators, community groups have come to feel comfortable sharing openly, rather than simply presenting their successes. Notably, the trust that this requires often extends to the other meeting participants, encouraging frank sharing from state government and advocate representatives as well.

**Building Linkages and Relationships:**

When all is said and done, we are all people striving to do our jobs in the best way we see fit. Since we have different roles, we must acknowledge our differences of perspective and it is critical to respect and understand each other’s intent. The HAN meetings are held monthly and, therefore, create opportunities for people to go beyond stereotypes and learn more about the people who do “other jobs.” Over coffee before the meeting, during jokes and informal moments in the meeting, or simply through exchanges during the regular meeting segments, people come to understand and respect each other. State worker, community worker, and advocate turn out to be closer than they might have expected in their concerns and their commitment. And where there are differences, the differences become better understood, or at least better communicated.

What these HAN meetings do is create a strong foundation for collaboration. It is important at this point to reflect on the difference between collaboration and simple networking. The HAN meetings are not merely “feel good” sessions where people talk and have coffee and donuts on a monthly basis. Rather, they are forums for dynamic and significant exchange. True collaboration, according to Arthur Himmelman (2001), is “a voluntary, strategic alliance of public, private and nonprofit organizations to enhance each other’s capacity to achieve a common purpose by sharing risks, responsibilities, resources and rewards.” This is reflected in HAN meetings and relationships.

**Making Policies, Practices, and Programs More Effective:**

Through the HAN meetings, lessons and observations from the field can be voiced, respected, and documented. The knowledge and understanding of the front-line workers begin the powerful process of sending information “up the ladder” to the policy-makers. This is the beginning of an important feedback loop. Depending upon the consequences and character of these observations, advocates may get involved in problem solving, or the meeting conveners may simply request state agency representatives to be accountable and bring a response back to the meeting members.

Similarly, the meetings also provide effective and vital pathways for government agencies seeking to engage the grassroots. Government is often seeking to find “the community,” which it sees as elusive and beyond its grasp. Frequently, government officials want to either give community groups information about a new program or policy or solicit input from them. However, from behind governmental walls, it is often hard to find these groups without assistance. The HAN serve this very important purpose of making communities available. The meetings provide forums where government representatives can come and engage community groups, to provide important information or solicit ideas and comments. It is very effective “one-stop shopping” and, increasingly, various governmental bodies are using it for these purposes.

Since the HAN is a statewide program, the feedback and engagement dynamic is magnified, providing even broader impact. In Massachusetts, there are 6 regional meetings each month across the state, 10 months out of the year. As a result, timely information, best practices, and relationships are available throughout the state at a regional level. Likewise, regional groups can be effectively reached and engaged by state-level agencies and organizations in a comprehensive, yet local, manner.

**Neutral Facilitation of Process:**

The final piece of the equation is that AHEC/Community Partners serves as a liaison between the state government and the communities during periods between meetings. Representatives of AHEC/Community Partners are in constant communication with higher-level representatives of the state agencies and with the broad range of community organizations. The information raised by community groups at meetings is gathered, with themes identified, and brought to the attention of “central office” staff of the state agencies. Similarly, AHEC/Community Partners staff members help coordinate efforts to distribute information and coordinate trainings for community organizations on behalf of the state agencies. As a trusted neutral liaison, AHEC/Community Partners is able to advance the issues and goals of health access, effectively making government more responsive and open, and communities more engaged and participatory.

**Dissemination:**

AHEC/Community Partners disseminates meeting minutes monthly to HAN meeting participants and other interested parties. Quarterly, themes and highlights from the minutes are identified and published as *exChange*, a newsletter that brings current statewide health access issues to the attention of the various stakeholders, including community outreach workers, state agencies, and legislators.
Outreach Works, AHEC/Community Partners’ recent book, serves as a practical tool for other states or regions interested in replicating this model. This helpful resource outlines the specifics of how the program is designed, and how it can be adapted. Other material is available at www.ahecpartners.org.

Outcomes

The Health Access Networks have had a dramatic impact on health access in Massachusetts. The outcomes are very significant and can be seen both quantitatively and qualitatively. Quantitatively, there has been a large, well-documented increase in the level of enrolled, insured individuals in the state as a result of increased access to the health care system and its services. Qualitatively, there has been dramatic systems change involving newly-created, statewide partnerships between state Medicaid and public health agencies and community-based organizations/institutions. Effective communications, feedback, and collaboration have developed on multiple levels.

Quantitative change. Between June 1997 and June 2001 there was an increase of over 240,000 people enrolling in Medicaid and CHIP in Massachusetts, up from approximately 680,000. This is an increase of 36%. While no one initiative can account for the total increase of enrollments, it is clear that the Health Access Networks - by supporting community groups doing front-line enrollment, promoting best practices and greater effectiveness, and providing feedback about program implementation – provided the infrastructure that enabled much of this work. The Acting Commissioner for the state Medicaid agency credited the mini-grants and the HAN for playing a major role in the enrollment increase.

The Kaiser Family Foundation reported in Spring 2000, that of the 21 states it had surveyed regarding Medicaid enrollment rates between 1997 and 1999, Massachusetts had the highest increase at 32.4%. Notably, only six states surveyed had any increase in enrollment, and 15 had experienced reductions in their Medicaid rolls. The average for all 21 states surveyed was a reduction of 1.3%. All Over the Map, the Children’s Defense Fund report released in Summer 2000, identified Massachusetts as the state with the second best enrollment effort for the combined Medicaid and CHIP programs. Among the states with a CHIP program that had been operating for more than 1 year, Massachusetts was clearly the national leader in enrollment. According to the report, enrollment in Massachusetts from FY97 through FY98 increased at a rate of 10.84% per month over a 24-month period and a total of 179,532 children were newly covered.

A 1999 HAN-participant survey provided by an independent program evaluator indicated that 4 out of 5 respondents felt HAN was either effective or very effective in helping them promote health access in their communities; 94% said HAN was effective/very effective in disseminating information; 90% said it was an effective/very effective forum for sharing best practices; and 85% said it was effective/very effective in building relationships among participants.

Qualitative change. Examples of changes in policies, programs, and practices that have resulted from the HAN include:

1) An evolution in the Medicaid agency’s overall approach to outreach, with the emphasis shifting from glossy, high-end marketing to on-the-ground local community initiatives and follow-up.

2) The state agencies eventual understanding by state agencies of the need not just for community-based outreach, but also personalized enrollment assistance and follow-up with Medicaid applicants.

3) Direct incorporation by state agencies of rich community feedback into a variety of health insurance programs. For example, fine-tuning the messages to be more relevant for different cultures or audiences and distributing materials in multiple languages.

4) Addressing a cumbersome eligibility renewal process for Medicaid members -- which was causing unintended disenrollments -- by first refining its administrative processes (e.g., changing the notification letter and supplying self-addressed stamped return envelopes) and then launching an ‘Express Renewal’ pilot project, one of the first of its kind in the nation.

The result is a transformed landscape in Massachusetts. The fundamental change involves the dynamics between state government and community groups. The personal contact, the system level respect, and the new level of responsiveness have created what is truly “re-invented government.”
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Center within a particular region can influence the number of the attitudes held by various case managers at an inpatient treatment though the Oxford House model is free of mental health professionals.

that no professionals are directly associated with the operation of a particular house's sustainability. Members of our Oxford House team individuals referred to a house and therefore have an impact on a clients should be directed to an Oxford House. Therefore, even though the present goals because it is a grassroots movement that has barriers it faces continue to threaten the viability of the program as a national organization.

The independence-within-structure paradox is one of the primary reasons Oxford House works. Oxford House manages to provide a natural, free, liberating, and self-sufficient component to recovery that is likely to be at the center of its therapeutic benefits. Each resident must gain employment, which can lead to a sense of self-determination and empowerment, and there are no restrictions on the length of stay, which can lead to a greater sense of community as part of a potentially permanent family (Ferrari et al., 2001). Yet other factors indicate that substantial structure does exist within the houses—house rules are developed and set up by residents, residents "check" the actions and expressed attitudes of other residents, and "contracts" (i.e., warnings or monetary fines) are given when a member is not fulfilling his or her obligations (e.g., house chores). A larger structure is provided by a closely-knit group of houses within a particular region that form a "chapter," an inter-house political support structure that helps problem-solve more complicated issues that a house is unable to solve on its own.

When the structure within the Oxford House model is explained, mental health professionals usually begin to understand the utility of self-government to a wide variety of individuals. Debunking the myth that Oxford House is unstructured can free these professionals to direct their clients to Oxford Houses, and therefore contribute to the spread of this innovation.

Neighborhood Barriers that Prevent Second-Order Change

Obstacles set up by neighbors are often more difficult to overcome. Homes tend to be placed in middle class neighborhoods where residents can experience family life within a secure setting close to a variety of community resources, and where residents can be removed from environments where they are likely to face cues associated with past substance use. Unfortunately, neighbors are often reluctant to have non-traditional families move into their neighborhoods and they are considerably more fearful of the neighborhood's financial health and safety when the new individuals are all recovering from substantial substance abuse problems (Levin, 2001). This fear led to an incident in Fayetteville, North Carolina,
where an Oxford House was set to open for Veterans recovering from addiction. Before the house could open, fifty neighbors protested outside the house and others vandalized the home at night (Kinsler, 1999). Because of the protests, the landlord and others involved in opening the house decided that it would be more prudent to open the house in an alternative neighborhood.

The primary barrier for a house opening in a particular area can be attributed to preconceptions about the definition of a family and whether or not Oxford House residents fall within this category. Members on our team examining dynamics within Oxford House find that many of the activities in Oxford House are similar to the more traditional family—residents engage in the same social activities, social support, and socialization processes, for instance. Unfortunately, the similarity of Oxford House residents to any other family is not always easy for residents to communicate to neighbors, and in order to get this information across to the community, Oxford House residents often spend much time making one-on-one attempts to reach out to surrounding homeowners. In addition, Oxford House residents often become active in men and women's groups, create community fund-raisers, and through their employment, become further integrated within the community. More often than not, after time, residents manage to gain a high degree of acceptance as families within these communities.

**Political and Legal Barriers that Prevent Second-Order Change**

Politicians and policy makers hold many of the same myths held by mental health professionals and neighbors, but victories against these attitudes can be obtained through top-down political and legal channels. In 1995, the U.S. Supreme Court heard the case City of Edmonds vs. Oxford House to decide whether the laws in the City of Edmonds, which prevented ten Oxford House residents from living together, were discriminatory, and whether the city had failed to make reasonable accommodations for the group home (see American Civil Liberties Union, 1995). Under the Fair Housing Amendments Act of 1988, zoning ordinances for a collection of non-related individuals with disabilities—which covers individuals recovering from substance abuse problems—must be the same as ordinances for individuals who are related genetically or by law, or the city must make a reasonable accommodation. In a decision that had widespread implications both for the growth of Oxford House and many other social programs, Oxford House won the case, making it difficult for cities and towns around the country to hold similar discriminatory laws.

By winning the U.S. Supreme Court case, Oxford House prevented groups from acting on their stereotypes, but winning the case itself or, for that matter, changing the views of individual neighbors and mental health professionals does not bring about second-order change—only the innovative mechanisms of this grassroots organization can create this change. Nevertheless, breaking down the barriers created by first-order thinking is the first step for the diffusion of Oxford House and many other social innovations. None of the barriers faced by Oxford House were minor, but by overcoming them it was possible for the grassroots movement to spread nationally and work toward more widespread, systemic change.

**Conclusions**

Overcoming barriers at multiple levels has the potential to promote systemic change in a nation severely in need of innovative solutions for its substance abuse problems. Understanding and deconstructing barriers can liberate positive change agents, which, in turn, may affect other change agents to stimulate more comprehensive forms of influence. For instance, changing the attitudes of policy makers can lead them to provide more legal and financial support for opening Oxford Houses, thereby creating systemic change by supplying the nation with a cost-effective alternative to more expensive forms of treatment.

Changing attitudes throughout neighborhoods can create systemic change by permitting Oxford Houses to help recovering individuals become healthier and more positive forces within the community. As the number of Oxford Houses within a particular region increases, the potential for change spreads beyond neighborhoods and can positively impact the ecology of an entire town or city.

Finally, changing the attitudes of mental health professionals can help clients by increasing access to a liberating form of aftercare that may not only help maintain treatment gains, but also positively impact a number of commonly co-occurring mental disorders and medical conditions. For these reasons, influencing the whole system requires the targeting and breaking down of first-order barriers to assure that second-order interventions are unfettered in their efforts toward systemic change.
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of minority students that could benefit from programs and services of minority students. They typically identify individual students that postsecondary education programs. This excludes a large contingent support and enrichment to facilitate students' matriculation into specific eligibility criteria and provide intensive academic demonstrated some success in supporting the educational attainment academic support and financial aid to disenfranchised students for the past 38 years (USDOE, 2001). Although TRIO programs have joined longstanding TRIO programs as a major new initiative in the Department of Education's multi-million dollar strategic plan to extend support to low-income and minority students. Introduced under the Clinton administration in 1998 by U.S. Representative Chaka Pattah, D-Pa, GEAR UP provides a critical missing link—early intervention for middle school students and systemic school reform (Fields, 2001).

GEAR UP provides statewide, school district, and university partnership matching grants that target cohorts of students beginning in seventh grade and follows them through high school and into college. The primary goal of this initiative is to increase minority undergraduate enrollment rates in postsecondary education by influencing district-wide policies that promote academic excellence for all students. This includes eliminating policies and procedures known to negatively impact achievement outcomes and encouraging K-16 curriculum alignment. It also—involves collaboration with university partners to create seamless academic curricula in compliance with state and district standards that fully prepare students for college. As such, GEAR UP encourages states, school districts, and university partners to work together in creating educational enrichment opportunities to fully engage middle school students in rigorous academic curricula. GEAR UP also recognizes the need to support teachers in this endeavor and encourages the provision of innovative training programs that enhance the professional development and credentialing of teachers to improve the quality of instruction delivered to students in public schools. Early engagement and involvement of parents is another critical component of the initiative. Efforts are made to involve all parents with information regarding academic course sequencing, college planning, selection, and scholarships. GEAR UP also encourages community involvement to address the issues of program sustainability by identifying stakeholders and establishing partnerships that ensure program continuity beyond the end of the funding cycle (Silver, 2001).

A Closer Look: The Connecticut State GEAR UP Project

During the first round of funding, The Connecticut Department of Higher Education was one of the first state agencies awarded funding to implement GEAR UP. The Office of Educational Opportunity, a division of the Department of Higher Education, began implementation of their proposed strategic plan in three of the largest and poorest urban metropolitan centers in Connecticut—Bridgeport, Hartford, and New Haven. Data from the 1990 Census Bureau reports that the poverty rates for each of these cities is three to four times the statewide rate of 6.8%. Furthermore, the poverty rate is doubled for minority youth living in these areas.

The GEAR UP project has become a welcome addition to a continuum of longstanding minority advancement programs offered by the State of Connecticut. The College Board's EQUITY 2000 model is the principal element of Connecticut's school reform strategy that has Algebra I as its primary focus. Research from the College Board suggests that math is a primary gatekeeper for successful matriculation into college (Harris, 1998). Designed to impact the manner in which mathematics is delivered at the middle school level,
this project has devised a comprehensive plan that encourages school districts to offer Algebra I to all middle school students. The goal is that these students, once in high school, will be placed on an academic trajectory that provides them with the necessary sequence of math courses that ensures their access into the postsecondary option of their choice. Further, expanded educational enrichment opportunities are extended to all students in the form of tutoring, college excursions, a six-week summer program, Saturday mathematics enrichment program, and preparation for college entrance exams. College career centers have been established that house current software and resource materials on colleges and careers and are available to all students, teachers, and parents.

In addition to the array of academic support and enrichment programs offered to students is an affective component designed to heighten students’ awareness of college as a viable option for their future. Maximizing Adolescent Academic cXcellence (The MAAX) is a culturally relevant program that utilizes a developmental assets approach to support the academic and affective needs of urban adolescents. Through the integration of challenging academics and innovative affective programming this project seeks to improve students’ school performance by: a) developing requisite skills for optimal school performance, b) increasing self-esteem and sense of self-efficacy in mastering academic tasks, c) improving educational engagement, d) strengthening bonding to school and peers, e) increasing knowledge and awareness of college as a viable option, f) and heightening educational aspirations. The MAAX is designed to engage and motivate students in the learning process and challenge negative misconceptions many young people hold about their cultural heritage and their ability to achieve academically. Curriculum workshops feature eight modules and 35 sessions that highlight early college awareness, positive identity development, positive values, commitment to learning, enhancing social competencies, and managing important school transitions. Facilitated by trained undergraduate and graduate students from established university partnerships, middle school students receive the added benefit of developing positive relationships with role models that provide consistent messages about their ability to perform academically and share the realities of college life.

Since the inception of GEAR UP, considerable strides have been made in each of the targeted cities. District wide ‘College For All’ initiatives have been established that have the realignment of the K-12 curriculum as a primary focus. Policies have been established that have eliminated academic tracks and mathematics courses that fail to adequately prepare students for college. Heightened academic standards have been instituted that mandate successful completion of Algebra I and Geometry as a requisite for high school graduation. Professional development opportunities have been provided to train teachers in state-of-the-art instructional methods that engage students in learning Algebra. Guidance counselors have also benefited from innovative training sessions offered by EQUITY 2000. The role of the guidance counselor has been transformed from that of gatekeeper to student advocate, and as a result, counselors have been able to spend less time involved in tedious administrative functions and more time interfacing with students both individually and in groups.

Parent involvement is an integral part of this initiative. For example, in one district, parents are valued members of a curriculum committee team of teachers and administrators that review and provide feedback to the district about high school curricula across academic subject areas. Additionally, parents across districts participate in important information gathering sessions that empower them to be advocates for their children. Parents are taught how to successfully negotiate complex school systems, are informed of appropriate course sequencing for their college-bound child, are encouraged to participate in both in-state and out-of-state college trips, and are offered support in selecting and financing college as well as understanding the college admissions process.

Although it is premature to talk about the impact GEAR UP has had on achievement outcomes, thus far these early district highlights demonstrate that systemic change is underway. Over the next several years, our evaluation of this effort will track these systemic changes as well as those that take place at the individual student level. Although the systemic changes that have occurred thus far have been met with some measure of resistance, they have also led to constructive compromise for systemic school reform. GEAR UP affords us a unique opportunity to achieve substantive reform that has the potential to positively alter the course of so many young lives.
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Technology as a Tool for Facilitating Community Change
By Yolanda Suarez-Balcazar and Leah Kinney
Loyola University Chicago

In early 1999, a partnership between a community health organization, a medical center and a university was funded by the U.S. Department of Commerce and the medical center to develop, implement and evaluate a community-based initiative called Every Block a Village Online (EBVO). The overall goals of the project were to provide residents of a Chicago community with the skills and WebTV equipment to access health information and resources and address community issues. The project also attempted to bridge the “digital divide” in a low-income African American community.

Rhode and Shapiro (2000) indicate that although the use of technology has risen and the previous gender gap for internet users is virtually gone, low-income individuals, people of color, the elderly, and people with low levels of education are still far behind in terms of access and use of the Internet. Researchers have referred to this as the Digital Divide, which is the term used to explain the phenomenon of differently increasing rates of computer and Internet access based on demographic characteristics (Rhode & Shapiro, 2000). The Internet has become a tool for individuals to obtain access to information regarding jobs, housing, and health, among a wide variety of topics and areas. What has not been documented is the use of technology as a tool for community change, which is the focus of this paper.

Participants in this project included 42 African American Citizen Leaders (CLs) who were part of an existing grassroots community organizing effort called Every Block a Village. These forty-two residents lived in a 42-block area on Chicago’s Westside. This community is located in an economically depressed, low-income African American neighborhood with a number of health and safety concerns, including lack of preventive health care, high unemployment rates, and high crime rates.

Participants were self-selected or selected by the staff from the community health organization sponsoring the initiative. Participants were seen as having leadership skills in terms of their ability to connect with other residents, their level of participation, and activism in the community. Citizen Leaders were recruited and trained over a period of about 12 months. Citizen Leaders came to the Community Health Center and completed a 45-minute questionnaire assessing their sense of community, community empowerment, and attitudes toward technology. Also included in the assessment were demographic items, as well as health, crime, and safety-related questions. The same assessment was also conducted 12 months after using the unit.

After the initial assessment, the leaders received training on how to use home technology (WebTV) to access an electronic doctors’ office center, health and safety web pages, and ACCESS/VOICEMAX, a 24-hour telephone triage and information service. Leaders were also taught how to access the Internet, use email, and access the projects’ web page with community news. In addition, they were given printers, and all equipment was placed in their homes at no cost to them.

The initial training was followed by ongoing trouble-shooting, a support system, and frequent contacts with the community coordinator for the project. In addition, the researchers and two trained female community members were assigned CLs whom they called on the phone every 3 to 4 weeks to conduct follow-ups. The purpose of these phone calls was to document the use of the WebTV, provide support, and obtain input about links and resources the community desired to have placed on the Web page. This information was communicated to the Web master who frequently updated the web page with community information, resources, a calendar of events, and links to web sites of interest to the community. CLs were responsible for informing their blocks about the availability of the units at their homes and local community centers, and distributing information about community issues and events obtained from the Web page.

Documenting Web Stories

Studies done in economically deprived urban neighborhoods have shown that state and city programs for social change are rarely implemented and can often be very slow in achieving their desired effects. Often these neighborhoods receive little support from local officials. As one Citizen Leader once said, “No one cares about our community, not only the police are afraid to come to our blocks but once an express carrier didn’t want to deliver my package because they were afraid to come to our neighborhood.” However, researchers have suggested that African Americans, when compared to other groups, tend to be very active in their communities and show high rates of community participation and social action efforts (Wandersman & Florin, 2000).

During the three-year duration of the project, social action efforts were evident in this highly spiritual neighborhood. Citizen Leaders and residents were not only accessing information through the Internet but also using it as a tool for facilitating social change. How does a community faced with high crime and poverty rates address these problems? Such changes depend upon the actions of a group of very committed individuals who would like to improve the quality of life of their communities.

We recorded about 450 stories obtained from Citizen Leaders, many of which illustrate collective and individual efforts in taking action to improve their communities. We assume that many more efforts took place but were not necessarily shared with the researchers. We classified a Web story as successful when the obtained information was used for oneself, shared with a family member, friend, or neighbor, or resulted in an action that was actually taken to address a social/community concern. Several individuals benefited from the information obtained through WebTV. In 43% of the stories the information was for the Citizen Leader herself; in 29% of the stories family members and relatives benefited; in 15% neighbors benefited and in 13% of the stories the community benefited from the information or action taken. We also analyzed the most frequently searched topics addressed in the stories, and they
The Internet as a Tool for Community Change

Following Dalton, Elias & Wandersman (2001), we describe four approaches to community change—social action, community development, consciousness raising and advocacy—that were evident by this program. All the action-related stories could easily fit into at least one approach. The following are examples of specific actions taken using WebTV and the Internet as tools for system change.

Social action. Saul Alinsky, one of America’s best-known community organizers, referred to social action as the power of individuals acting together to improve their social conditions. In one of the examples we recorded, a Citizen Leader had called City Hall several times and asked to have an abandoned van removed from her block. After several failed attempts to get the city to remove the van, Citizen Leaders decided to use WebTV. Emails were sent to City Hall by Citizen Leaders, and within a week the van was removed.

Community development. Community development efforts focus on strengthening neighborhood residents’ relationships by working together to identify a community problem, resources, and ideas for addressing the issue (Selender, 1997). Citizen Leaders’ involvement in Every Block A Village Online also included the original Every Block a Village grassroots group, which met once a month and worked toward addressing a number of community issues. For instance, one of the problems identified included vacant lots often used as open garbage fields. CLs used WebTV to organize a community garden. Specifically, technology was used to obtain information about gardening, to obtain technical assistance and free seeds from the city, to mobilize the community about helping out in the garden, and to communicate with one another about maintaining the garden.

In another community effort, residents identified the problem of a lack of activities for youth. The grassroots group began a youth group. Community youth, mostly children and grandchildren of CLs and residents were invited to form a group and learn about technology. Youth were trained on how to use WebTV and were given leadership training. WebTVs were used again to train youth, obtain resources, and to communicate with one another. Youth in the community started using WebTVs and the local centers’ computers to do their homework. Some of the youth became so good at using WebTV and computers that they assisted the project by providing one-on-one assistance to CLs and residents who needed extra help.

Consciousness raising. Friere’s (1973) consciousness raising approach involves strategies to increase the awareness of individuals about social issues that affect them. These often involved reflection, forums, or open discussions. Several examples illustrate residents’ efforts to gain critical awareness about an issue as a prerequisite for action. In one example, the community experienced the abduction and murder of a well-known teenage girl from the community. Apparently, some residents knew who the criminal was but were afraid to speak. Citizen Leaders used WebTVs to communicate with one another and organize the community to find her. In addition, CLs organized community meetings, vigils and meetings with the police to increase awareness about crime. In fact, the Citizen Leaders believed that the use of WebTVs spearheaded the capture of the offender.

In other examples, CLs used WebTVs to open discussions about crime and drugs in the community and to continue these discussions through the project’s Listserv. Another interesting forum was organized with media representatives to talk about the media portrayal of their community. Furthermore, the local community technology coordinator organized a technology event, in which over 100 members of the community participated, to raise awareness about computer centers and facilities available in the community that residents could use.

In partnership with the police department, the project was able to obtain up-to-date crime data mapped on the web page using Geographical Information Systems. CLs could view the patterns and type of crime by block on a monthly basis. CLs were given a code and passport to access these maps. CLs used these data to discuss crime awareness at monthly meetings and to discuss ways to work closely with the police department to address crime.

Advocacy. Advocacy efforts are another important approach to social change. Advocacy has been defined as efforts to influence decision makers in terms of policy issues, services or practices (Balazar, Seekins, Fawcett & Hopkins, 1990). A number of examples illustrate CLs advocacy efforts. For instance, CLs organized various meetings with the local Alderman and local politicians to advocate for more effective enforcement of crime and gang activity. These mobilizing efforts often involved sending a message to city officials, obtaining support from the community-based organization to sponsor the event, and disseminating information to the community about the event. In another example, residents used technology to organize a meeting with the local police department and advocated for confidentiality when reporting gang and drug activity in the neighborhood.

Conclusion

Overall, after three years of working with an active group of Citizen Leaders, we have realized that for many of the CLs the newly acquired skills regarding obtaining information, accessing resources and services, and communicating with one another became important strategies for improving their communities. One Citizen Leader once said, “I love my unit, with it I can do so much for my community.” Other CLs made reference to “how wonderful and empowered” they felt by using something they thought was not for them. Many have moved into using computers and have played a crucial role in training other residents, including children and youth on how to access the Internet. Some CLs reported obtaining job promotions and feeling better about job skills because of there new acquired skill.

As by-products of the project, the sponsoring center now has a new technology center, and many community public sites such as recreation centers, community centers, and schools have opened their doors for residents to come and use their WebTVs or to learn how to use computers. We believe projects like this are helping to close the digital divide and expand the new paradigm in communication culture.
References

From Briefcase to Backpack:
Diary of a Businesswoman Turned Community Student
By Susan Staggs
University of Illinois at Chicago

Day 1. I arrive on campus. I am shocked to observe that the average age of college students these days appears to be 9. As I walk across campus, I surreptitiously compare my face and body to other female students. This comparison does not favor me, but I react sensibly as any mature adult would. That lasts about 3 minutes. I then sob uncontrollably and wander aimlessly for the remainder of the day.

Day 5. I receive an email informing me that my office is ready for occupancy. The email neglects to mention that the “office” is actually a card table in the basement that I am to share with 12 other graduate students.

Day 10. I receive my first RA assignment. I email my advisor a detailed 3-year project plan. It includes a phase-activity-task breakdown, resource allocations, deliverable descriptions and cost-benefit analyses. During our subsequent meeting, I am dismayed to note the disheveled condition of her office. There are papers strewn everywhere. Worse, there are sticky notes plastered all over her computer. I make a mental note to work with her on her process efficiency skills. She smiles as she reviews my plan. I interpret her smile as a sign that she is quite impressed with my planning skills. Later I learn that she is holding back hysterical laughter.

Day 20. I take my first statistics test. I am unable to recall my actions during this day. A clinical student later explains the phenomenon of repressed memory to me. I note its usefulness as a coping mechanism for future statistics classes.

Day 25. I experience “collaboration.” A fellow RA and I work on the same project. She asks if I would like to meet to “work on it together.” I panic. I am an entrepreneur. I work alone. She must not know this. To deal gracefully with this unpleasant situation, I fake a heart attack, then act like I’m okay once I’m outside the building. That afternoon, I attend a “meeting” of graduate students on how to “promote authentic involvement” in division activities. There is no agenda. There is no overhead presentation. There are no handouts. Instead, students talk about “issues” to “process” their feelings in a “supportive group environment.” I feel a palpitation coming on and estimate that at this rate, we will make our first official decision 15 years after graduation.

Day 30. I receive my first paycheck. I realize that I will not be able to hire a housekeeper. I go into shock and am rushed to the infirmary.

Day 31. I run out of money.

Day 45. I think I see a way that I can use my business skills to be of service to the senior students, who are developing regression models for their dissertations. I point out to them that instead of spending hours typing numbers into a computer, they could just fire up some graphics software and draw a couple of boxes and arrows. I must have picked a bad time to come to their rescue, because they don’t speak to me for 2 months afterwards.

Day 60. I realize that I am now a brilliant scholar. In a burst of intellectual energy, I develop a new theory to explain poverty. I present my ideas to my advisor. She does not hold back hysterical laughter.

Day 90. I enter the research lab to find a stack of papers as high as my waist in the middle of the floor. My project manager tells me that the information on these documents needs to be entered into the computer. I ask her where the data entry department is, and she tells me to look in the mirror.

Day 120. I finish my first semester. I do not fail, nor am I asked to leave. This surprises me greatly. I reflect on the graceless way I stumbled through my first excursion to this foreign land. I meet with fellow students to process my feelings in a supportive group environment. On the way home, I walk downtown and look at all the businesswomen racing to meetings in their Ellen Tracy suits, laptops in tow. I know they have housekeepers. I know they have more than 11 cents in the bank. For a brief second, I long for my former life. Then I regain my composure and begin scribbling ideas for my master’s thesis on sticky notes.
WINNER!
APA 2001 SCRA Student Poster Competition

The Executive Committee of SCRA is pleased to announce the winner of this year’s APA Student Poster Competition. The winning poster: “Social Networks and Psychiatric Disorders: A Rural-Urban Comparison” presented by Colin A. Depp, B.A., and Suzanne Meeks, Ph.D., University of Louisville.

Abstract: Social network structure and functioning of 327 community-residing severely mentally ill individuals were compared between rural and urban communities of residence. Due to folklore and prior studies indicating that urban residence is associated with greater risk for psychiatric morbidity and social impoverishment, it was hypothesized that rural-residing individuals would have larger and more supportive social networks when compared to urbanites. Participants underwent a structured clinical interview and an empirical assessment of their social networks. Using 1990 census data, participants’ residences were dichotomously and continuously assessed. Urban individuals with schizophrenia actually appeared to have stronger indigenous supports, whereas rural individuals depended more heavily on service providers. Social networks were strongly related to symptoms of schizophrenia and functional adjustment. These results contrast with prevailing notions about the strength of rural social ties, particularly in those diagnosed with schizophrenia.

Colin Depp is a graduate student in clinical psychology at the University of Louisville. His interests are in clinical geropsychology, and his research work has primarily focused on community-based care of elderly people with severe mental illness as well as intervention for caregivers of patients with dementia. He plans to pursue a career in academic research. As the first author on the poster, Colin will receive a free one-year membership in SCRA for his research work has primarily focused on community-based care of elderly people with severe mental illness as well as intervention for caregivers of patients with dementia. He plans to pursue a career in academic research. As the first author on the poster, Colin will receive a free one-year membership in SCRA for winning the competition. Let’s all extend a heartfelt congratulations to a job well done. This year’s poster competition was tough as there were a number of exceptional posters representing the best of the future of community research and action. Two other poster presentations deserve honorable mention as they received equally high ratings, tying for second place:

“Childhood Predictors of Adolescent Depressive Symptoms in a Latin American sample.” Eduardo Lugo, MA, DePaul University.

“Predicting Community Integration and Quality of Life by Residential Characteristics.” Diana C. Seybolt, Ph.D., VA Capitol Network MIRECC, Baltimore MD; and Jean Ann Linney, Ph.D., University of South Carolina

The Executive Committee would like to thank this year’s international panel of volunteer judges who took time out of the very busy conference schedule to view and evaluate the 21 student poster presentations: Bianca Guzman, Haven Battles, Toshi Sasao, Iain Butterworth, Pat O’Neil, Carlton Parks, Eric Mankowski, David DuBois, Emily Ozer, and Ken Miller.

Thank you all
Kelly Hazel, SCRA Member at Large

SCRA Program at APA 2002 in Chicago

All sessions are 50 minutes in length unless otherwise indicated. It is possible that days and times for sessions may have changed since TCP went to print. Check your APA program for confirmation of session scheduling.

FRIDAY, August 23, 2002 (Friday’s sessions will most likely be held in the convention center)

8:00am “Psychological resources in faith-based communities: Applications, adaptations, and innovations,” Chair: Sally S. Canning, Ph.D., Wheaton College

“Adapting ICPS for a Faith-based, Inner-city Elementary School”
Glenda F. Harvey, M.A.T., Circle-Rock Preparatory School/Veritas Group, Southfield, MI
Sally S. Canning, Ph.D., Wheaton College
Brian D. Haworth, M.A., Wheaton College

“Empowering the Faith Community to Address Sexual Assault”
Alex Galloway, Psy.D., Christ Community Medical Clinic, Memphis, TN

“Enhancing Family Relationships in the Community”
Sally S. Canning, Ph.D., Wheaton College
Ted H. Chen, M.S.W., M.B.A., Big Idea Foundation, Lombard, IL
Bill Haljun, Big Idea Foundation, Lombard, IL
Brian D. Haworth, M.A., Wheaton College
Kathleen Meese, M.A., M.P.H., Wheaton College

9:00am “Religion and community coping: Jasper’s response to James Byrd’s murder,” Chair: Ricardo Ainslie, Ph.D., Texas Psychological Association, Austin, TX

“The Murder of James Byrd as a Community Trauma”
Ricardo Ainslie, Ph.D., Texas Psychological Association, Austin, TX
Melissa Holt, B.A., University of Texas at Austin

“Churches and Community: How Jasper’s Ministers Kept the Peace”
Kalina M. Brabec, B.A., University of Texas at Austin

“Religious Coping in Community Trauma”
Angelica Chaison, B.A., University of Texas at Austin

10:00am “Cultural Competence: Creating social change through teaching, research, and action,” Co-chairs: Irene J. Kim, Ph.D., University of California, Davis, and Lorna H. London, Ph.D., Loyola University Chicago

“Race Relations: Community Psychologists’ Roles and Responsibilities”
Lorna H. London, Ph.D., Loyola University Chicago
Yolanda Suarez-Balcazar, Ph.D., Loyola University Chicago
Gary W. Harper, Ph.D., DePaul University
Aparna Sharma, M.A., Loyola University Chicago
"A Qualitative Approach to Exploring Issues of Cultural Competence"
Victoria K. Ngo, B.A., Vanderbilt University

"Challenges in Implementing Cultural Competence in California Children's System of Care"
Winnie Mak, Ph.D., University of California, San Francisco

"A Comparison of Provider and Client Perspectives on Cultural Competence"
Irene J. Kim, Ph.D., University of California, Davis
Roger Boothroyd, Ph.D., University of South Florida
Julie A. Slay, M.A., University of Hawaii, Manoa

"An Individualized Approach to Developing Cultural Competence in Psychotherapy"
Eunice C. Wong, M.A., University of California, Santa Barbara
Discussant: Nolan W. S. Zane, Ph.D., University of California, Davis

11:00-1:00pm Invited Address. "Valuing Diversity: Communities Helping Communities," Chair: Melvin N. Wilson, Ph.D., University of Virginia
Bobbi Reichtell, The Slavic Village
Dwight Tillery, Community Foundation for Palm Beach & Martin Counties
Kien Lee, Association for the Study and Development of Community
Meg A. Bond, Ph.D., University of Massachusetts in Lowell
Discussant: Tom Moore, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign

2:00pm "Science and Community Psychology," Chair: Abraham Wandersman, Ph.D., University of South Carolina
Seymour Sarason, Ph.D.
Jean Ann Linney, Ph.D., University of South Carolina
James G. Kelly, Ph.D., University of California, Davis
Richard H. Price, Ph.D., University of Michigan

3:00pm POSTER SESSION (Note: these are not in the order as they will appear in the program)
Chair: Jack K. Tebes, Ph.D., Yale University

"Mentoring Minority HS Students with Disabilities: Knowledge and Expectations" Curtis J. Jones, M.A.; Teresa Garate-Serafini, M.Ed.; and Marie A. Montalbano, B.A. — University of Illinois at Chicago

"The Urban Passage Mentoring Project: Evaluation of a Mentoring Program" Fabrizio Balcazar, Ph.D.; Kimberly Hall, M.A.; and Teresa Garate-Serafini, M.Ed. — University of Illinois at Chicago

"Using Mentoring to Foster Positive Race Relations in Children" Lorna H. London, Ph.D. — University of Illinois at Chicago

"Promoting Positive Behaviors in Aggressive Adolescents: A Community-Based Group Intervention" Katherine A. Paz, B.S.; Catherine P. Bradshaw, M.Ed.; and Robert D. Latzman — Cornell University

"Three Dimensions of Religiosity and their Impact on At-Risk Adolescents" Sawsson R. Ahmed, B.A.; Paul A. Toro, Ph.D.; and Sylvie Lombardo, Ph.D. — Wayne State University

"The Impact of Volunteering on Psycho-Social Characteristics in Young People" Diann S. Eley, Ph.D.; and David Kirk, Ph.D. — Loughborough University


"Effects of School Environments on Confidence to Succeed among Minorities" Leticia Padilla, B.A.; and Elizabeth Lozano, M.A. — Western Psychological Association, Los Angeles; Kimberly R. King, Ph.D. — American Psychological Association, Los Angeles

"Giving Voice to a Silenced Majority; Non-Parenting, African-American young women" Rona Benhorin, B.A.; Harriette E. Winms, M.A.; Jannelle D. Brallage, B.A.; and Anne E. Brodsky, Ph.D. — University of Maryland, Baltimore County


Carlton W. Parks, Ph.D. — Alliant International University

"Ethnic Pride and Prejudice; A Longitudinal Assessment of Attitude Change" Lorna H. London, Ph.D.; John S. Lewis, M.A.;
Christopher Cooper, M.A.; Dawn M. Greco, M.A.; and Matt Miller, M.A. — Loyola University Chicago

"Making Schools LGBT-Positive" Margaret S. Schneider, Ph.D.;
Anne Dimito, M.Ed.; and Robb Travers, M.A. — University of Toronto; Dino Paolletti, M.Ed. — Central Toronto Youth Services

"Faculty Development as a Cultural Competence Promotion Strategy" Toshiaki Sasao, Ph.D.; Takuya Yoshida, B.A.; and Azusa Koyama, B.A. — International Christian University, Tokyo

George E. Leary, M.A. and Andrey Vinokurov, Ph.D. —
University of Maryland, Baltimore County; Jessica L. Kohout, Ph.D. — American Psychological Association

Charles R. Drew University of Medicine & Science; W. LaVone Robinson, Ph.D. — DePaul University

"Effects of Psychoeducation on Attitudes towards HIV-Positive individuals" Gyda Eyjolfsdottir, B.A.; and Railk Heidmarsdottir, B.A. — University of Texas at Austin

"Community Factors and Unsafe Sex: A Multilevel Analysis" Robin Lin Miller, Ph.D.; Bianca D.M. Wilson, M.A.; and George J. Greene, M.A. — University of Illinois at Chicago; Lillian S. Lin, Ph.D.; and Esther Sumartojo — Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Atlanta; Ann Steue, Ph.D. — Columbia University; Yvonne Stevenson — Medical College of Wisconsin

"Youth-Initiated HIV Risk and Substance Use Prevention Program" Kathy Goggin, Ph.D.; Daniel Wise, M.S.W.; Sarah Kennedy, M.A.; Tom Murray, M.A.; Donna Burgess; Jackie Reese-Smith, B.A.; Nicole Terhune; and Kristine Broadus, B.A. — University of Missouri at Kansas City; Kimberly Metcalfe, M.A. — University of Kansas at Lawrence; Alicia Downes, M.S.W.; and Holly Buckendahl, M.S.W. — Kansas City Free Health Clinic

"Relationship Between Parenting and Sexual Behaviors" Chisina T. Kapungu, B.S.; and Grayson Holmbeck, Ph.D. — Loyola University Chicago

"Effects of Religiosity and Sexual Double Standard on Sexual Intent" Michael Kitto, B.S.; and Asucena I. Cervantes, B.A. — Claremont Graduate University

"Effectiveness of Sexual Assault Interventions: A Behavioral Approach" Leslie D. Strategier, Ph.D. — Four Rivers Behavioral
"The Role of the Mutual- Help Residence in the Mental Health Delivery System"  
Bradley D. Olson, Ph.D., DePaul University  
Leonard A. Jason, Ph.D., DePaul University  
Joseph R. Ferrari, Ph.D., DePaul University  
Margaret I. Davis, Ph.D., DePaul University  
Josefin Alvarez, Ph.D., DePaul University  

"Professionals and Consumers as Partners in Research to Assess Mutual Help Processes and Outcomes"  
Sarah E. Diwan, Ph.D., University of Chicago  
Patrick W. Corrigan, Psy.D., University of Chicago  

"Chronic Fatigue Syndrome and Self-Help: Search for a New Paradigm"  
Renee R. Taylor, Ph.D., University of Illinois at Chicago  
Stefanie Maxwell, Ph.D., University of Illinois at Chicago  

"Facilitating Thriving Partnerships Between Self-Help Groups and Professionals"  
Greg Meissen, Ph.D., Wichita State University  
Scott Wituk, Ph.D., Wichita State University  
Shelly Tiiemeyer, MSW, Wichita State University  
Amy Commer, B.A., Wichita State University  
Mary Warren, M.A., Wichita State University  
Discussant: Keith Humphreys, Ph.D., National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism, Bethesda, MD  
Harold I. Perl, Ph.D., National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism, Bethesda, MD  

3:00pm Presidential Address  
Introductions by Matthew Chinman, Ph.D., Rand Corporation; and Pamela Imm, Ph.D.  
"Community Science: Prevention Science is Necessary But Not Sufficient"  
Abraham Wandersman, Ph.D., University of South Carolina  

4:00pm "Contemporary community activism among urban youth,"  
Co-Chairs: Kevin Cokley, Ph.D., Southern Illinois University; Shawn O. Utsey, Ph.D., Howard University  
"Activism as a Form of Creative Coping"  
Latoya C. Conner, Ed.M., Teachers College, Columbia University  

"Youth Activism and Community Leadership"  
Leanne Stahnke, M.A., Teachers College, Columbia University  

"Advocacy and Liberatory Education"  
Nova Gutierrez, M.A., Teachers College, Columbia University  
"Activism as Alternative Education"  
Doris Santoro, B.A., Teachers College, Columbia University  

5:00pm SCRA Business Meeting  

6:00pm SCRA Social Hour  

SUNDAY, August 25, 2002 (Sunday’s sessions will most likely be in held in the convention center)  

8:00am “Risk and protective factors for community violence exposure,” Chair: Michele Cooley-Quille, Ph.D., Johns Hopkins University  
"Early Childhood Risk and Protective Factors of Adolescent Violence Exposure"  
Rhonda C. Boyd, Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania  

Michele Cooley-Quille, Ph.D., Johns Hopkins University  
Nick Ialongo, Ph.D., Johns Hopkins University  
Sharon Lambert, Ph.D., Johns Hopkins University  

"Family and Peer Factors in Community Violence Exposure of Adolescents"  
Nick Ialongo, Ph.D., Johns Hopkins University  
Sharon Lambert, Ph.D., Johns Hopkins University  
Michele Cooley-Quille, Ph.D., Johns Hopkins University  
Rhonda C. Boyd, Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania  

"Community Violence Exposure Among a Cross-Ethnic Sample of Young Adults"  
Karren D. M. Campbell, M.A., University of Maryland  
Deborah C. Beidel, Ph.D., ABPP, University of Maryland  
Sharon Lambert, Ph.D., Johns Hopkins University  
Michele Cooley-Quille, Ph.D., Johns Hopkins University  
Discussant: Albert D. Farrell, Ph.D., Virginia Commonwealth University  

9:00am “First Steps in promoting healthy diverse communities: Focus on school readiness,” Co-Chairs: Laurie Ford, Ph.D., University of British Columbia; Abraham Wandersman, Ph.D., University of South Carolina  

"A model of the problem and solution: The SC First Steps Initiative"  
Abraham Wandersman, Ph.D., University of South Carolina  
Paul Flaspohler, M.A., University of South Carolina  
Lindsay Stillman, B.A., University of South Carolina  

"PIE is Healthy in Promoting Accountability in Diverse Communities"  
Paul Flaspohler, M.A., University of South Carolina  
Cynthia Flynn, Ph.D., University of South Carolina  
Janet Marsh, Ph.D., Clemson University  
Mary Payson, M.S.W., University of South Carolina  
Tammy Pawlowski, Ph.D., Francs Marion University  
Jeff Sheldon, M.S.W., University of South Carolina  
Mark A. Small, Ph.D., Clemson University  
Kevin Swick, Ph.D., University of South Carolina  
Chris Volf, M.S.W., University of South Carolina  
Floy Work, M.A., University of South Carolina  

"Getting to Outcomes with Appropriate Measures"  
Kathryn North, Ed.S., University of South Carolina  
Laurie Ford, Ph.D., University of British Columbia  
Nikki Rash, B.A., University of South Carolina  
Baron Holmes, M.A., S.C. Budget and Control Board  

"Best Practice in Using Effective Practice Experts: Lessons Learned"  
Elsbeth Brown, Ph.D., Winthrop University  

"Lessons Learned about Building Early Childhood Comprehensive Community Initiatives"  
Arlene Andrews, Ph.D., University of South Carolina  

10:00am “School-community partnerships: Strategies for effective after school programs,” Chair: Patricia Stone Motes, Ph.D., University of South Carolina  

"Benefits of After School Programs for Students, Families, and Communities"  
Jeannine P. Salone, M.S.W., University of South Carolina  
Dan Linton, Jr., M.Ed., Communities in Schools of South Carolina, Inc.
"At-Risk Students Participating in After School Programs: Self-Concept Patterns"  
Patricia Stone Motes, Ph.D., University of South Carolina  
Discussant: Laurie Ford, Ph.D., University of British Columbia

11:00am “The process of evaluating social service programs in public schools,” Chair: Bianca L. Guzman, Ph.D., Claremont Graduate University

“Gaining School Officials’ Support in the Evaluation Plan”  
Bianca L. Guzman, Ph.D., Claremont Graduate University

“Survey Construction for Public School-Based Program Evaluation”  
Michael Kitto, B.A., Claremont Graduate University

“Administering an Evaluation in a School Setting”  
Christina M. Villanueva, B.A., Claremont Graduate University

“Full Circle Evaluation: Evaluating the Educators as a Fidelity Check”  
Michele M. Schlehofer-Sutton, B.A., Claremont Graduate University

“Disseminating Evaluation Findings to the Community”  
Bettina J. Casad, B.A., Claremont Graduate University

12:00pm “School violence: Consequences, prevention, and evaluation,” Co-Chairs: Susan D. McMahon, Ph.D., and Erika D. Felix, M.A., DePaul University

“Bullying and Sexual Harassment Among Middle School Students”  
Erika D. Felix, M.A., DePaul University

“Violence Prevention Among Urban Youth: A Longitudinal Examination”  
Susan D. McMahon, Ph.D., DePaul University

“The Impact of School-Based Violence Prevention Programs: A Meta-Analytic Perspective”  
Alice F. Stuhlmacher, Ph.D., DePaul University

Discussions: Gary W. Harper, Ph.D., DePaul University

Collaborative Program on “Social Justice in an Age of Globalization” to be Featured at the 2002 APA Convention
By Andrea L. Solarz, Chair, Track on Social Justice in an Age of Globalization

What are the obligations, responsibilities, and opportunities for psychology to deal with social justice issues such as poverty and racism? Where does psychology need to go from here given the “new” domestic and global context after the horrific events of September 11th? What roles can psychologists play in overcoming social injustice? These are some of the provocative questions that will be explored during the program track on Social Justice in an Age of Globalization, which will be featured at the 2002 American Psychological Association annual meeting.

As most of you know by now, APA is experimenting this year with new formats in an effort to make the convention more attractive and interesting to attendees. In addition to the regular programming coordinated by the APA Divisions, a dozen tracks of thematic programs (scheduled so they do not conflict with substantive Division sessions) have been developed by clusters of Divisions. The Social Justice track was developed through a collaboration of Divisions: 9 (Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues), 27 (Community), 34 (Population and Environmental Division), 48 (Society for the Study of Peace, Conflict and Violence: Peace Psychology Division), and 52 (International Division).

We are especially excited that Congressman Jesse Jackson, Jr., has agreed to be the opening speaker for the Social Justice track on Thursday afternoon. Ruth Behar, an anthropologist, writer, and recipient of a MacArthur genius grant, will then talk about her experiences exploring culture and identity and show excerpts from her new documentary film, Adio Kerida. In the session on The Psychology of Rhetoric and vice versa: Examining the Language of Terrorism, Ted Sarbin and Joe Juhasz will explore how words that are descriptive in nature, such as “terrorist” or “terrorism” acquire meanings that arouse feelings and incite to action. The first day of programming will conclude with a moderated poster session. Attendees will have an opportunity to view a series of posters on Global Perspectives in Social Justice and Terrorism, and then participate in a discussion led by Anie Kalayjian, Brinton Lykes, and Rod Watts.

The program on Saturday will begin with an advocacy workshop on Connecting Research and Action for Social Justice and Human Rights featuring several psychologists who have integrated social action into their professional lives in creative and even courageous ways. Continuing Professional Education credits may be earned by those attending the session. A moderated debate on Psychology at the Front Lines: Is it Time for Action? will present different perspectives about when psychology should—or must—take action to address social issues. How much of a science base must be in place? Is there ever a moral imperative to act? These are the kinds of questions that the panelists might be asked to address. The track on Social Justice in an Age of Globalization will conclude with a Town Hall meeting on Terrorism, Poverty, Racism: Enemies for a Country at War? Incoming APA President Robert Sternberg will lead a panel of distinguished psychologists in a forward thinking discussion exploring where psychology needs to go from here given a “new” domestic and global context.

We invite you to join us at these exciting sessions. Be sure to check the APA program for final program information.

Program on Social Justice in an Age of Globalization
Thursday, August 22
Room E450a, Lakeside Center, McCormick Place

1:00-1:50 p.m. Invited Address: Social Justice in an Age of Globalization: Setting the Stage for Action
Participant: Honorable Jesse L. Jackson, Jr., U.S. Congress (D-IL)
Chair: Andrea L. Solarz, PhD, Independent Consultant, Arlington, VA

2:00-2:50 p.m. Invited Address and Video: Telling Stories That Matter: From the Heart to the World
Participant: Ruth Behar, PhD, University of Michigan
Chair: Gloria Behar Gottsegen, PhD, City University of New York

3:00 – 3:50 p.m. Symposium: The Psychology of Rhetoric and vice versa: Examining the Language of Terrorism
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Moderated Poster Discussion Session: Global Perspectives in Social Justice and Terrorism

Chair: Joseph B. Juhasz, PhD, University of Colorado
Participants: Theodore R. Sarbin, PhD, US Naval Postgraduate School; James Statman, PhD, University of Colorado.

4:00 – 5:50 p.m.

Participants: War on Terrorism, Salience of Nonviolent Alternatives, and Militaristic Attitudes. Linden L. Nelson, PhD, California Polytechnic State University.

State Terrorism: Hidden Roots of Mass Killings by Governments. Marc Pilisuk, PhD, Saybrook Graduate School and Research Center and Tod S. Sloan, PhD, Psychologists for Social Responsibility, Washington, DC.

Terrorism and Heroism as Seen by Islamic, Eastern, and Christian Civilizations. Yueh-Ting Lee, PhD; Victor Ottati, PhD, Loyola University Chicago; and Gonggu Yan, PhD, Beijing Normal University, Beijing, China.

Building the Psychology of Terrorism. Alicia Ordonez, MA, and Carlos Ruiz-Matuk, MA, Ball State University.

Terrorism and Worry in Rural America: Not So Far Removed. Daniel M. Mayton II, PhD, Silvia Susnjic, BS, and Timothy W. Richel, BS, Lewis-Clark State College.

Interpersonal Guilt and Responses to Terrorism. Lynn E. O’Connor, PhD, The Wright Institute and Jack W. Berry, PhD, Virginia Commonwealth University.

Predicting Responses to Terrorist Activity. Aaron Henderson-King, PhD, Donna Henderson-King, PhD, Katherine Fuller, Amy Kaufman, and Kurt Koches, Grand Valley State University.

Authoritarianism and Advice to the President Following September 11. Donna Henderson-King, PhD, Bryan Bolea, PhD, and Brad Baranowski, Grand Valley State University.

Thirty Minutes From Ground Zero: The Role of Community Partnership. Thomas Demaria, PhD, South Nassau Communities Hospital, Oceanside, NY.


Does Tragedy Magnify Differences in Ego Development? Kevin Lanning, PhD, Joseph Colucci, Jennifer Holm, Samantha Kane, and Ari Rosenberg, Florida Atlantic University, and John A. Edwards, PhD, Oregon State University.

Attitudes Toward Terrorism:
Opinions Since the 9-11-01 Attacks. Lisa Finnegan Abdolian, B.A., Harold Takoooshian, PhD, and William Verdi, PhD, Fordham University.

Psychosocial and Spiritual Impact of Terrorism:
Mental Health Care Givers’ Perspectives. Anie Kalayjian, EdD, RN, and Heather Kurtz, Fordham University.

Armenian Turkish Reconciliation:

Explaining Variations in Protest Behavior within the Israeli Settler Population. Jeremy Ginges, PhD, Solomon Asch Center for Study of Ethnopolitical Conflict, University of Pennsylvania and Tami Steinetz Center for Peace Research, Tel Aviv University, Israel.

Policing in Northern Ireland:
An Evaluation. Helena Carlson, PhD, University of California Santa Cruz.

Cross-National Views of Feminism Among Italian and Italian American Men and Women. Elizabeth G. Messina, PhD, Cristina Dorazio, and Daniela Montalto, MA, Fordham University.

RAWA and the Resistance of Afghan Women.
Alicia Lucksted, PhD, University of Maryland, Center for Mental Health Services Research and Anne Brodsky, PhD, University of Maryland Baltimore County.

Saturday, August 24
Room S105bc, South Building, McCormick Place

8:00 – 9:50 am. Advocacy Training Workshop: Connecting Research and Action for Social Justice and Human Rights (Continuing Education credit available)

Chair: Andrea L. Solarz, PhD, Independent Consultant, Arlington, VA.

Participants: Anne E. Brodsky, PhD, University of Maryland, Baltimore County. Activism as an Antidote to Academia: Working with RAWA.

Ivan Kos, PhD, International Psychology Associates. The Psychologist as International Agent (of Change, That Is!).


Jeanine C. Cogan, PhD, Eating Disorders Coalition for Research, Policy & Action. Scientist with a Cause: Bringing Eating Disorders into the Halls of Congress.

Debi M. Starnes, PhD, EMSTAR Research and Atlanta City Council. On Being a Psychologist (Researcher, City Councilmember, Innkeeper, Troublemaker, and Seeker).
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