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Trainers’ Forum is the official journal of the Trainers of School Psychologists and is published four times (September, December, March, and May) a year. The Forum publishes peer reviewed articles related to advancing training and supervision of School Psychologists within the field and higher education. It also publishes comments on previously published articles. Statements and articles contained in the Forum are the personal views of the authors and do not constitute TSP policy unless so indicated. The Editor of the Forum reserves the right to edit all copy and to refuse advertising. Advertising and announcements appearing in the Forum do not necessarily indicate official sanctioned, promotion, endorsement or approval on the part of the Forum or TSP. Articles, comments, classified advertising, and announcements should be submitted to the Editor. All official business of TSP appears on the TSP website which serves as the archival database for all TSP policy. It contains treasury reports, conference summaries, executive board summaries, and other official documents of TSP. Articles, advertising, and announcements may also appear on the TSP website: http://trainersofschoolpsychologists.org
GUIDELINES FOR AUTHORS

The Trainers Forum invites articles concerned with research and program applications related to the training of school psychologists. Pertinent areas include but are not limited to assessment and intervention practice. The Trainers Forum accepts articles that are both data driven and conceptual but consistent with best practices in the training of school psychologists. If you wish to contribute to the Trainers Forum please follow these guidelines.

- Manuscripts should be well organized, clear and concise and follow the latest edition of the Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association that is available at the Order Department, APA, 750 First St., NE, Washington, DC, 20002-4242 and at www.apa.org/about/publicprod.html and at www.apa.org/about/publicprod.html or by phone at 800-374-2721. The authors are urged to use active voice, avoiding passive voice. Stereotypic and biased language should be avoided. Follow the guidelines as published in the latest version of the APA Manual.
- All manuscripts should include a title page, separate from the manuscript, which includes the names of the authors, and university affiliation. The title page should also include the mailing address, telephone and fax number, and e-mail address of the first author. No author identifying information should be included in any other page.
- Manuscripts submitted to the Forum are usually 20 pages in length but length will vary. The importance of the article will supersede page length. Include an abstract of no more than 50 words in length. Do not use footnotes.
- All articles should be double spaced, including references and citations. Quotations of 300-500 words in length require the written permission from the copyright holder for reproduction.
- Check all references for accuracy and completeness. Make sure all references cited in the text are listed on the reference page and vice versa.
- Never submit material that is under consideration by another journal or periodical.
- Submit manuscripts and inquiries to Fred Jay Krieg at fred.krieg@marshall.edu.

Manuscripts accepted for publication in the Forum are edited for correctness and consistency of grammar, spelling, and punctuation. In some cases, portions of manuscripts are edited for conciseness and clarity of expression. Edited manuscripts are sent to the first author. Changes at this stage are limited to correcting inaccuracies and typographical errors. Authors must bear responsibility for the accuracy of references, tables and figures. Complimentary copies will be sent to all authors through the first author on publication of the manuscript.

SUBMISSION DEADLINES

Trainer’s Forum is published four times (September, December, March and May) a year. Employment notices, announcements, and advertisements (including display ads) are due by the 15th of the month prior to the month of publication.

ADVERTISING POLICY

Advertising and announcements appearing in the Forum do not necessarily indicate official sanction, promotion, or endorsement on the part the Forum or TSP. TSP is not responsible for any claims made in an advertisement or announcement. Advertisers may not, without prior consent, incorporate in a subsequent advertisement or promotional piece the fact that a product or service has been advertised in the Forum. TSP reserves the right to edit all copy and to refuse advertisements and announcements based upon legal, social, professional, and ethical considerations.

All advertising and announcements must be in keeping with the general scholarly and/or professional nature of the Forum. TSP retains the right to unilaterally reject or cancel advertising and announcements. Advertising and announcements submitted with the purpose of airing either side of controversial social, political, or professional issues will not be accepted for publication in the Forum. Classifieds, display ads, and announcements should be submitted to the Editor.

CLASSIFIED RATES

As a courtesy, TSP members will not be charged for Employment Notices or professional announcements (e.g., upcoming meetings, scholarship opportunities, grant opportunities, call for proposals). All others will be charged 50 cents per word for employment notices and commercial announcements. A minimum order is 50 words and no frequency or agency discounts apply. An invoice will be sent after publication. For information regarding display ads, contact Yuma I. Tomes at YumaTo@pcom.edu.
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Note from the Editor

Enedina García Vázquez

It is hard to believe that three years have passed since I became editor of the Trainers’ Forum. While it has been a pleasure working for the Trainers of School Psychologists, first as associate editor and as editor the last three years, it has also been a challenge. My first challenge as editor was to make sure that we had a quality publication. Luckily we were able to accomplish this with the help of our associate editors. In the past three years, we have instituted some changes to allow us to have a continuous stream of submissions, enabling us to meet our mission to publish four editions per year. As an effort to move toward establishing the Forum as a journal, we also changed the look of the Forum. It’s newer compact look, helps us highlight the great work that trainers are conducting throughout the country. We also established “special issues” to help us stay abreast of the changing needs of our profession. The special issues also help us to focus on areas that are key to graduate preparation of school psychologists. We are hoping that the changes we have made so far will continue to energize the profession, encourage our readers to submit their work, and establish the Trainers’ Forum as the journal for trainers.

It is sad to leave this post but know that I will continue to participate in future TSP activities. In fact, I am still working on enhancing the Trainers’ Forum website to make available past and current issues. Keep an eye on our site. There are more good things to come.

I am happy to introduce you to the new Forum leaders. Fred Krieg began his term as editor on July 1, 2009. Fred will be in charge of overseeing all Forum operations. Joining him is Yuma Tomes, currently serving as associate editor. Yuma is in charge of advertisement, which will be a great financial help. New to the board, is Elsa Arroyos who as associate editor will be in charge of upgrading and maintaining our website. April Padilla will continue to provide technical support in the preparation and publication of the Trainers’ Forum.

Fred Krieg is Professor of School Psychology and Program Director at Marshall University Graduate College in South Charleston, West Virginia. He has been a practitioner and trainer for over 30 years. Dr. Krieg has served as the West Virginia Delegate to NASP for eight years and served on the Executive Committee for two years. Dr. Krieg co-chaired NASP’s Mental Health Task Force and authored the Medicaid study. He has always been interested in combining theory into practice and has authored books, articles, chapters, and curriculums in the area of children’s mental health.

Dr. Krieg has served as president of the West Virginia Psychological Association and the West Virginia Association of School Psychologists. He has been honored by Governor Gaston Caperton as a Distinguished West Virginian. In
2007 he was given the Chloe Hollinger Award for providing exemplary services to the field of school psychology to the State of West Virginia. In 2003, Dr. Krieg received the West Virginia Special Friend of Children Award. Nationally, Dr. Krieg was named the 1993 NASP School Psychologist of the Year.

Dr. Krieg has presented at TSP meetings and has published in the Trainer’s Forum. He has served as a reviewer, Associate Editor, and will move to the Editor position on July 1, 2009.

Dr. Yuma Iannotti Tomes earned a B.A. in psychology (developmental) from The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (UNC). It was at UNC that Dr. Tomes was formally introduced to multicultural psychology and its affects on students, teachers, and administrators in public agencies. After graduating, Dr. Tomes pursued an M.A. and C.A.S. in school psychology from Appalachian State University (ASU). Finally, Dr. Tomes enrolled at Virginia Commonwealth University/Medical College of Virginia (VCU/MCV) to pursue a doctoral degree in (Educational) Psychology. At VCU, Dr. Tomes received the college’s prestigious SCHEV research assistantship in his first year. Additional awards, fellowships, and assistantships were to follow over the next three years.

Dr. Tomes has accumulated a diverse range of work experiences in the field of psychology and education over the last 10 years. Dr. Tomes has worked as a school psychologist for urban school districts, an Assistant Professor with Eastern Washington University in the Department of Counseling, Educational, and Developmental Psychology and currently he is the Director/Associate Professor of the MS in School Psychology Program at the Philadelphia College of Osteopathic Medicine.

Dr. Tomes’ major areas of interest are cross-cultural psychology, multicultural assessment, cognitive/learning styles, psychological/educational assessments, consultation, and gay/lesbian/bisexual/transgendered issues.

Dr. Elsa Arroyos is an associate professor and Director of Training in School Psychology in the Counseling and Educational Psychology Department at New Mexico State University (NMSU). Dr. Arroyos is a McNair Scholar from NMSU and earned her Ed. S. and doctorate degrees in School Psychology from The University of Iowa. Her interests include multicultural competencies related to practice and training, traumatic brain injury in children and adolescents, and mentoring of students and early career faculty. Dr. Arroyos is Co-PI for a personnel preparation grant focused on training bilingual school psychologists. She currently serves on the executive board for the New Mexico Association of School Psychologists and has been a member of NASP since 1997.
NASP Convention Opening Remarks at TSP Meeting

Gene Cash, NASP President

Good morning, Trainers of School Psychologists. It is my privilege to welcome you to the 41st Annual NASP convention with the theme of “Take Strides to Make a Difference”. It’s been 20 years since that NASP has been in Boston for a convention, and where better than the birthplace of our nation to celebrate major milestones? We are celebrating NASP’s 40th anniversary as well as the 20th year of the NCSP, and, I am happy to report, this is our second largest convention ever with almost 5,000 school psychologists here this week. That’s magnificent under any circumstance, but it’s particularly noteworthy given the economy and the financial challenges we are all experiencing. It is heartening and gratifying to see so many of you here and committed to teaching your students how to take strides to make a difference!

Not only do I wish to welcome you to the convention, but I also want to tell you that NASP is an association for ALL school psychologists and related professionals. It doesn’t matter what degrees you hold, what service delivery model you support, how you feel about cognitive assessment, your beliefs about the most effective method for identifying learning disabilities, the color of your skin, your cultural or ethnic background, your gender, your sexual orientation, or your political or religious beliefs. What does matter is that you make a positive difference in the lives of your graduate students, co-workers, and others with whom you come into contact. It’s also important that you be appropriately trained and credentialed for the work you do. It is not a membership requirement that you are a Nationally Certified School Psychologist (NCSP), although we encourage you to obtain and to maintain that certification. It is also not a requirement that you graduated from or teach in a NASP-approved school psychology program in order to be a member, although we certainly urge programs to apply for NASP approval. These are some of the examples which indicate that NASP is all about promoting excellence in education, helping to remove barriers to learning for all students, and, to those ends, ensuring that comprehensive mental health services are readily available to students and their families who need them.

Speaking of students, school psychology students in graduate programs across the country are joining NASP and attending our convention in record numbers, and we appreciate your support in helping to make this happen. However, we know that the economic crisis has affected both students and graduate training programs, making it difficult to retain faculty positions, to find internships (especially paid ones), and to obtain and to maintain jobs after graduation. NASP is attempting to address these daunting challenges in several ways. We have already been involved in helping school psychologists in several school districts across the country keep
their jobs. The details of one of those success stories are described on the NASP website in our Advocacy Action Toolkit and will be featured in a future issue of the Communiqué. We are also looking to partner with several other school psychology organizations to roll out a nationwide campaign to promote public awareness of the value of school psychological services, initially targeting administrators, school board members, legislators, and other public policy makers who control budgetary decisions. In addition, this week NASP will be considering a revision of our transitional dues to make it easier and less expensive for early career school psychologists to become or to remain NASP members.

NASP is also currently encouraging members and stakeholder groups, such as TSP, to help us finalize the 2010 NASP Standards documents. Now is the time to visit the NASP website to access both the draft documents and the feedback surveys posted there. It will have been a decade since our last revisions, and obviously situations and circumstances have changed. It is critical for you to facilitate change by providing NASP with your reactions and suggestions.

Like everyone else in these tough times, NASP has taken steps to reduce expenditures without cutting essential programs or reducing critical services. It is, for example, important to us to be supportive of TSP and to provide a venue for your meetings at our annual convention site. We are delighted to have you with us, and we look forward to a spectacular week here in the city which boasts the oldest public school system in the United States. Have a wonderful time, and thank you for your attention!
The Trainers of School Psychologists (TSP) Meeting was held on February 23rd and 24th as part of the National Association of School Psychologists 2009 Convention. Attendees were energized by the kickoff address, The Power of Resilience: Achieving Balance and Stress Hardiness in Our Lives, delivered by Dr. Robert Brooks. The evening was followed by a full day of presentations. Gene Cash, NASP President, provided a welcome. The following summaries represent two of the panel presentations (If it Ain’t Broke, Should We Still Fix It? A Discussion on New Directions in Training for School Psychology and Supervision in School Psychology) and a presentation by Tom Fagan. The summaries were composed from the PowerPoint presentations and references cited can be found in the PowerPoint presentations available on the TSP website.

If it Ain’t Broke, Should We Still Fix It? A Discussion on New Directions in Training for School Psychology

**Moderator: Tammy Hughes**

**Panelists: Jeffrey A. Miller, Rick Short, & Cecil R. Reynolds**

Examining the Professional Practice Doctorate (PPD) in School Psychology: Starting a Dialogue about the Future of Practice

*Presented by Jeff Miller, PhD*

Jeff Miller discussed the importance of examining the Practice Doctorate in School Psychology. Currently, there are two training tracks school psychologists can follow: the Ph.D. research track and the PPD (Psy.D. or Ed.D) practice track. By earning a Ph.D. or PPD degree, a school psychologist can gain more control of their futures. Dr. Miller presented the reasons one should consider a PPD degree. He stated that changes in the Special Education Law might contribute to a shift in the role of school psychologists. In addition, retiring school psychologists are not being replaced and there is an encroachment of other professions in our roles.

By obtaining a doctorate degree, a school psychologist will enhance their roles. In addition, forces in psychology cause having a doctorate beneficial. These forces include complications in obtaining Medicaid reimbursements by non-
doctoral school psychologists, the Mental Health Parity, the MLA Exemption Issue, and the Task Force on the Future of Psychology. Dr. Miller argued that having a PPD will prepare school psychologists for these roles and settings.

Different forces in training have also increased the benefits of obtaining a PPD. In all fields of education, training standards continue to expand leading to “credit creep”. In addition, programs now require just as many credits as doctoral programs causing the cost of receiving a doctorate degree to be the same as a non-doctorate. Education professionals in all areas are also moving to a “residency” model, which is consistent with the trend of increasing required practicum experiences in school psychology training programs over time. This issue is relevant to school psychologists in that a certificate in school psychology does not have the transferability that a doctorate would have over time.

Dr. Miller defined a PPD as a “doctor’s degree that is conferred upon completion of a program providing the knowledge and skills for the recognition, credential, or license required for professional practice”. He further explained the ongoing issue and the need to differentiate the difference between a PPD and a Ph.D degree. He stated “a professional doctoral degree should represent a preparation for the potential transformation of the field of professional practice, just as the Ph.D. represents preparation for the potential transformation for the basic knowledge in a discipline” and emphasized that one is not less than the other. An argument against acquiring a doctoral degree would be that students would not have fewer benefits from either degree. Future steps to begin advocating for doctorate programs in universities were discussed.

School Psychology’s Growing Pains:
Preparation for Modern Practice

*Presented by Rick Short, PhD*

The mission of the field of School Psychology and its training continue to expand at a rapid rate. Possible results of this expansion include changing roles, increasing role responsibilities, lowered expectations, and public uncertainty about basic school psychologist competencies. There are also expansions related to both program and degree issues. Program issues include the disparity between expanded training and current practice and the increasing length of programs, especially the specialist training. Degree issues include the convergence of practice training (doctoral vs. non-doctoral) and the divergence of models of training (doctoral vs. non-doctoral).

Issues regarding the field of school psychology and the larger field of professional psychology have come about through such things as the Model Licensure Act and training program variations (practitioner, scientist-practitioner,
and scientist models). Dr. Short offered suggestions for future action: continue as we are in the field, limit the field, lengthen the Ed.S., move some competencies to post-degree, or to advance the degree. Advancing the degree would mean moving to professional doctorates in health professions, moving to the professional degree in school psychology and creating our own doctoral degree.

Specialization in School Psychological Training and Practice

*Presented by Cecil Reynolds, PhD*

The importance of maintaining School Psychology as a specialized profession was discussed. Because School Psychology is a profession and not a technical occupation, a school psychologist must be knowledgeable and possess certain skills. Dr. Reynolds defined a *profession* as an occupationally related social institution that maintains a high level of public trust, provides essential services to society, is based on scientific discipline, and has a body of knowledge specific to the profession. In addition, in a profession, professional associations are present. These associations control the profession’s standards, provide accountability to the profession, and promote freedom from on the job supervision. Dr. Reynolds goes on to describe the differences between a profession and other forms of work. A professional’s practice is based on the scientific basis of the profession, and is theory and research driven. In order to achieve a science-based practice and preparation, a school psychologist must reject unsupported or disproven theories or cumulative scientific evidence. Also, they must adopt a Research-in-Action perspective in their daily practice and school psychology training. It is necessary for a specialization in school psychology to continue for several reasons:

- The knowledge explosion
- The half-life of knowledge and the necessity of continuing education
- Advances in science methods
- The demands of evidence-based practice
- The increased demands on schools as points of service delivery

It is therefore important that school psychologist as a profession, remain specialized. In order to achieve this, a school psychology-training program must follow standards such as the National Association of School Psychologist (NASP) blueprint for training and practice. NASP recognizes and promotes Master’s and EdS degrees as appropriate entry levels to practice and requires 60 hours of coursework including practica and internship. There are areas of assessment and measurement that can be included such as Observation, Interviewing, Standardized norm-referenced tests, Functional behavioral assessments, Curriculum based
assessments, Measurement, Evaluation, Ecological/Environmental assessments, Technology-enhanced assessment, Progress monitoring, Research methods, and Statistics. According to Dr. Reynolds, the need to maintain school psychology as a profession, the explosion of knowledge, the breadth of parameters of the practice, and the ever-increasing demand on schools to deliver services highlights the need for specialization within the school psychology profession.

Forty years of NASP, School Psychology, and Influences on Trainers and Training Programs

*Presented by Tom Fagan, Ph.D.*

The field of school psychology has faced many challenges and undergone many developments within the last 40 years. Several important events and developments include the Boulder Model and VA Internships (late 1940’s), the accreditation of school psychology by NCATE (1960’s), up to the evolution of the “practitioner model,” Psy.D and non-traditional training programs. APA and Division 16 have together accomplished a great deal for the field. Some of these accomplishments include the building of a network of trainers and programs, published surveys of training programs, and program accreditation.

When Tom Fagan accepted his first position in 1969, general conditions for trainers were much different. There were credentialing standards put forth by APA and Division 16 but no national consensus on training was available. There were approximately 20 school psychology state associations and no geographically representative organization for the field as a whole. Additionally, there was no national directory of training programs and local and state trainer groups were available but none on the national level. In 1969, trainers needed a separate identity as school psychologists; one separate from those involved in the clinical, counseling, or educational psychology field.

The growth of training programs is likewise much different now than in the past. According to Dr. Fagan in 1954 there were 28 programs, in 2007 the number skyrocketed to 238. There has also been growth in student enrollment, from a total of 7,450 (combined Masters, Specialist, and Doctoral) in 1977 to a total of 8,952 in 2006.

Another challenge to the field is the market for faculty. In the past several years, nearly 45% of all program institutions have sought one or more faculty positions. In 2007-2008, 80 programs sought to fill 100 positions. In 2009, 46 programs searched for 48 faculty members. The interest of doctoral students in accepting academic careers seems to be waning. Also, overregulation has become a concern given that within a relatively short amount of time we have shifted from no formal national regulation of training programs to a largely prescriptive
regulation of programs. Fagan stated that perhaps our concern for the quality of students admitted, the accomplishments of the faculty, and the very process of education has been lost. He posited that the field has become externally controlled, thus negating the autonomy of the institution and its faculty to guide the training of future school psychologists.

It is likely that the future of the field will show a fairly stable number of program institutions, small increases in doctoral programs, persistent faculty shortages that will threaten expansion and quality, a continued increase of combined doctoral programs, and persistent APA-NASP (doctoral-non-doctoral) conflict. Fagan believes that more trainers need to be placed into NASP leadership positions, with TSP and CDSPP needing to join forces and raise concerns to APA and NASP leadership, and that now, more than ever, is a time for action rather than complacency or reactivity.
trainee and the written evaluation philosophy and policies agreed upon by faculty should be made easily accessible to current and prospective trainees. In addition, trainees should be well informed regarding the risks and benefits of completing required training in the school psychology-training program of their choice. This approach assists in promoting trainee awareness of the importance of informed consent.

The third phase, Ongoing Evaluation, includes formative evaluations that often focus on developmental trainee skills where trainee performance on expected professional trajectories are observed and feedback is provided. The focus of this third stage is on trainee development of foundational skills, functional skills, and an integration of knowledge, skills and attitudes that comprise the complete picture of professional behavior.

The last phase of the four-phase model is the Summative Evaluation phase, which is provided prior to graduation and often for inclusion in the professional portfolio. Sources of information include program faculty, final internship supervisor evaluations, and comprehensive exams as either independent sources or integrated into a more comprehensive summary. The summative evaluation serves as the final evaluation of a trainee’s development of relevant professional knowledge, skills, and professional behaviors.

**Common Areas where Problems Occur with Supervisees and How to Address Them**

*Presented by David E. McIntosh*

David E. McIntosh presented information regarding ways to address common issues that arise during supervision. Common areas where problems with supervision can occur include those related to competencies, behavior, personality differences, and mental health issues. Issues with competency include a trainee’s lack of knowledge of psychological principles and theory, academic curriculum, principles and theories of test and measurement, and statistics. In addition, there may be unfamiliarity with scoring software, lack of appropriate knowledge of ethical principles, poor writing and editing skills, difficulty integrating and applying concepts, and a lack of knowledge regarding technology. Other important areas of deficit related to competency include unfamiliarity with current research, scoring errors, and not following standardization when administering tests.

Behavioral issues may include supervisee non-compliance with supervisor requests, tardiness, being ill prepared, and procrastinating. A supervisee may display an expected amount of resistance, as supervision can often be an anxiety provoking experience. Supervisees may also display defensiveness that may be an additional result of supervision-induced anxiety. This resistance on the part
of supervisees may be due to a fear of inadequacy, supervision as a requirement, feeling a loss of control and a fear of evaluation.

Personality issues may include poor communication skills, poor listening skills, the supervisee assuming that he/she knows more than the supervisor, a feeling of entitlement, passive-aggressive behavior, and a lack of respect for individual or cultural differences between supervisor and supervisee.

Lastly, Mental Health issues include acute and chronic stressors, thought disorders, and high functioning autism or asperger’s. Supervisors should avoid escalation of any disagreement with supervisees and may consider conducting workshops on supervision and should be aware of all program policies and procedures.

Who Supervises the Supervisor?

Presented by Judith Kaufman

Judith Kaufman presented information related to the supervision of supervisors. She began her presentation by conducting a brief survey related to supervision (i.e. how many had supervised, how many courses in supervision were taken, how supervision competencies happen, etc.).

The use of supervision is integral for bridging the gap between the University and the field, for reinforcement of learned skills, and is a critical vehicle for continuing education. Competencies for supervisors focus on knowledge, skills and values and as such these areas should be incorporated in our evaluation of supervisors. The assessment of supervisor competency can be achieved via several methods. Licensure/certification may not necessarily ensure competency but may help with the establishment of benchmarks. Additionally, supervisee evaluations and program faculty and/or practicum/internship coordinator evaluations may be used to assess the effectiveness of supervisors.

Professional development of supervisors must also be maintained and supported; there are many sites and supervisor to choose from in many regions, however in some there are few qualified individuals limiting choices. Based on a brief survey of supervisors, Dr. Kaufman indicated that in order to ensure the quality of supervision and facilitate growth, supervisors might be offered benefits such as free courses, free Internet, library access, money, continuing education workshops, and gratitude. Targeted educational workshops, university organized peer supervision groups, mentoring of new or less experienced supervisors, and collaborative supervision can be used to support growth and development for supervisors. Field based supervisors are an essential component of the training enterprise and require the same attention, education, and nurturance as many of our students do.
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Outstanding Contributions To Training Award

Joe Prus (pictured below with Leigh Armistead and Roe Mennuti) was recognized with the Outstanding Trainers Award at the TSP conference held at the 2009 NASP Annual Convention. Joe is most deserving of this award given his tireless dedication and service to the field of school psychology, TSP and NASP.

Joe is a graduate of the University of Kentucky School Psychology Program. He has been a full-time school psychology trainer for almost 29 years, has directed Winthrop University’s School Psychology Program since 1991, and has chaired the Department of Psychology at Winthrop since 2005.

Joe published over 30 articles, chapters, and books, and has made over 50 presentations at national and regional conferences. He has also been active in grant writing and administration, and most recently served as the evaluation coordinator for a Teaching American History grant given to five school districts in South Carolina.

Joe has been active in NASP dating back to the 1980s. He has chaired or co-chaired the NASP research committee; public relations committee; and the accreditation, credentialing, and training committee. He chaired the Program Approval Board from 1993 to 2005, and has been involved in the drafting group for every major revision of NASP standards since 1994.

Joe’s service has been broad. He represented school psychology as a liaison to NCATE since 1997. In this capacity, he has chaired various NCATE committees and boards and currently serves as the Chair of the NCATE Executive Board, whose members include state superintendents of public instruction, presidents of such national organizations as the National Education Association and National School Boards Association, and representatives of national associations related to math, science, reading, and other specialties and disciplines.

Joe continues to serve NASP as a member of the Program Approval Board and as co-chair of the Graduate Preparation Workgroup. He continues to teach,
consult with local agencies, and to help plan continuing professional development activities for school psychologists. In the mid 1980’s he helped fashion a cooperative Continuing Professional Development (CPD) program between Winthrop and the South Carolina Association of School Psychologists that continues to provide quality CPD to school psychologists from through the state each year.

The profession, TSP and NASP are indebted to Joe for his excellent service in the graduate preparation of school psychologists.

Congratulations to Everyone!

Sponsors for the 2009 TSP-NASP Conference!
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Trainers In School Psychology Poster Session 2009

Tuesday February 24, 2009, 6:00-8:00pm
Westin Staffordshire (3rd Floor), Boston, MA

Poster #1
Including Social Justice in the Training of School Psychologists

Chieh Li; Louis Kruger

Student Team Members: Christina Mule, Gina Cicala, Bethany M Smith, Kathleen L Lippus, Jessica L Cataldo, Stephen E Howley, Kimberly A Santora
Northeastern University

Abstract. This poster presents how one school psychology program has infused its training program with training on issues related to social justice. The presenters will share how faculty and students collaborated on a three-pronged approach in their collaborative learning about social justice in school psychology. One prong involves integrating social justice content in courses, such as those addressing NASP training standards pertaining to (a) data-based decision making and accountability, (b) student diversity in development and learning, (c) legal, ethical, and professional issues of school psychology. Another prong involves engaging students in research on social justice. The third one is to carry the social conscience from classroom to field practice in school psychology. The poster will provide participants with an overview of the issues and examples of students’ products. Sample works include research-based intervention and prevention strategies in promoting social justice generated through course work for racial, cultural, linguistic, and sexual minorities, the homeless, Children with HIV/AIDS, and victims of Cyber-Bullying; system-wide interventions such as policy change, preservice and in-service training; recruitment of multicultural staff; building safe and warm environment for all children; and addressing the impacts of high-stake testing for students from low socioeconomic or culturally and linguistically diverse background.
**Poster #2**

Using Online Surveys to Enhance Course and Program Effectiveness

*Theresa M. Nowak, Ph.D., Dan Florell, Ph.D., Andrea Hale, Ph.D.*

*Eastern Kentucky University*

*Abstract.* To fully appreciate course and program evaluations, trainers need to consider the procedure-process relationship so assure that what is being done actually effects change in our programs and students. Although student evaluations of faculty exist in most universities and colleges, many concerns have been raised about the validity and fairness of these systems. To combat some of the inherent problems, trainers can use their own evaluations that are specific to course requirements and activities. This poster will provide background about student evaluations of faculty, give specific information about online survey services (*Survey Monkey* and *Zoomerang*), and provide an example that takes the reader step-by-step from posting a survey to data analysis.

**Poster #3**

Maintaining Contact with Alumni by Utilizing Social Networking Sites: A Case Study

*Dan Florell, Ph.D., Teri Nowak, Ph.D., Andrea Hale, Ph.D.*

*Eastern Kentucky University*

*Abstract.* There are several advantages for school psychology training programs who can maintain contact with their alumni. This includes receiving feedback regarding the training program, lining up practicum and internship placements, and developing professional contacts in order to implement programs and research in the schools. Unfortunately, many students become disconnected from their training programs when they go on to their internship and drift even further away once they graduate. This process results in the loss of a valuable resource for training programs. This poster will focus on one university’s efforts to improve alumni connectedness with their training program by utilizing a social networking site. There are several steps that must be implemented to start an alumni
These include setting up on a site that is popular with graduate students, having graduate students link to the training program, and deciding on appropriate material to post to the site.

**Poster #4**

Beyond “Bilingual” in Bilingual School Psychology: Implications for Preservice Specialization

*Valerie J. Cook-Morales, Ph.D.*

*San Diego State University*

Abstract. This poster presents an innovative model for training of bilingual (Spanish) school psychologists, including an annual immersion and fieldwork experience in Mexico. The bilingual of bilingual school psychologists includes professional proficiency in Spanish and represents specialization and depth of study in language development, bilingual models and methodology, cultural inclusion and responsiveness, and Latino cultures. While our School Psychology Program courses and field experiences build many of these competencies, a federal grant extends the preparation through on-going seminars and an annual month-long immersion in Mexico. Fall seminars focus on bilingual content and spring seminars focus on cultural content (with changing foci each year). The immersion, in a different location each year to expose trainees to the many cultures of Mexico, involves Spanish instruction, fieldwork in the schools, living with a family, and cultural excursions to explore the interface of colonial and indigenous cultures. Participants will (a) become familiar with the knowledge, skills, and abilities needed by bilingual school psychologists, (b) be able to self-assess their program’s capacity to develop a bilingual specialization, (c) learn about funding sources, (d) be aware of an immersion opportunity for their students, and (e) walk away with a variety of course syllabi related to bilingual training.
Poster #5
Culturally Sensitive School Psychology
New Zealand Model

Stephen M. Levine, Ph.D., Georgian Court University
Michele M. Levine, Ph.D., Center for Psychology and Education
Jean Annan, Ph.D., Massey University, New Zealand

Abstract. United States is experiencing a significant increase in the cultural and linguistic diversity of the pupils and families that are served in the schools. School Psychologists need to provide culturally and linguistically sensitive services irrespective of the specific activities in which they engaged and irrespective of whether they work in urban, suburban and rural schools. The experiences and practices of educational [school] psychologist in New Zealand/Aotearoa may serve as a model that may improve the practice of school psychologists in the United States. The poster will review and examine New Zealand/Aotearoa educational psychologists training and practices of educational psychologists that insure the cultural sensitivity. Finally, the poster will explore how school psychologists may improve the delivery of services to pupils of diversity.

Poster #6
Increasing Cultural Competency Through International School Psychology Experiences

Bryn Harris, Ph.D., University of Colorado Denver
Rebecca Martinez, Ph.D., Indiana University

Abstract. Schools are becoming internationally diversified and trainers of future school psychologists have a responsibility to prepare future school psychologists to work in these diverse settings. As trainers, it is our responsibility to increase their multicultural competency through a variety of methods. One method is by offering international school psychology practicum experiences. This presentation will provide information about how two school psychology graduate programs created international practicum experiences - one in Mexico and one
in Guatemala. Both programs are in different phases of development as the Guatemala program is established and the Mexico program is in the development phase; thus, we hope to offer great insight to trainers interested in starting an international program. Information regarding program development, alignment with program, NASP, and ISPA standards, student learning objectives, and possible funding sources will be discussed. In addition, information will be shared about how to structure the experience, course content, as well as possible ways to evaluate students’ professional growth. Lastly, an emphasis will be made on how to integrate international experiences for school psychologists if the host university does not currently have international programming.

**Poster #7**

Grant Training Models for Preparing Future School Psychology Faculty and Practitioners in Empirically-based Practices for Autism and Externalizing Disorders

_Elaine Clark, Bill Jenson, Dan Olympia, Janiece Pompa, Jennifer Venegas, Mikala Saccoman, Megan Clifford_

_The University of Utah_

_Abstract._ The University of Utah School Psychology Program received three U.S. Department of Education OSEP grants last year totaling $2.2 million. A Leadership grant is intended to provide multi-year funding for 8 doctoral students to prepare for academic careers, specializing in autism. Two additional Combined Priority grants provide funding to prepare masters degree students to work with school-age students with externalizing problems (e.g., Serious Emotional Disturbance/Behavior Disorders) or secondary school students with Autism. Up to 72 graduate students will receive support, but most are expected to participate on both grants for two years of funded training. This is an unprecedented opportunity to attract students from underrepresented groups. The poster will summarize the goals and objectives of each grant, including the training curriculum, specialized courses and seminars, involvement of department and college faculty, student participation in SEA and LEA activities, and
focused practicum and research activities related to the individual grant areas. Writing assignments, product development, and professional paper and conference preparation will also be described.

Examples of the ways to coordinate training activities across the grants, and involve faculty in other departments and colleges will be presented. Further, information about recruiting students appropriate to each of the grants will be summarized.

**Poster #8**
Alternative Licensure in School Psychology: What Does it Mean for Training and Practice?

*Robyn S. Hess, PhD*
*University of Northern Colorado*

*Rick Short, PhD*
*Middle Tennessee State University*

*Abstract.* The field of school psychology faces two critical issues at this point in time: a growing shortage in the number of licensed practitioners and trainers as well as a rapid change in the competencies needed to effectively carry out one’s practice. This juncture creates the opportunity to explore alternative routes to state certification or licensure for those who hold degrees in other areas of psychological practice. The purpose of this poster is to define “respecialization”, to articulate the issues related to alternative licensing options, present the perceived needs of those who do enter the field of school psychology from other practice backgrounds, and explore the potential role of training programs in this process.

**Poster #9**
Recruiting Strategies: Enlisting Tomorrow’s School Psychologists

*Patrick L. Aretz; Joel Erion, Ph.D.*
*Edinboro University of Pennsylvania*
Abstract. The purpose of the present study was to explore ways to improve the recruitment of graduate students into our school psychology program. A total of 53 school psychology graduate students participated in three focus groups. These groups were assessed to identify factors that led participants to enter their current programs. Specifically, participants provided information regarding how they first learned about the field of school psychology, what attracted them to the field, what concerns they had about the field, how they learned about their current programs, what other programs they considered, and on what basis they selected their current programs. Results were consistent with those found in the literature in that most students were attracted to the education field but didn’t want to pursue a teaching career. In addition to obtaining data during focus groups, school psychology program coordinators were asked to provide information on their current recruitment practices. E-mail responses from program coordinators indicated that graduate programs in school psychology utilized few recruiting strategies. Considering the present shortage of qualified practitioners, school psychology graduate programs must emphasize factors participants identified as important in their decisions to enter their current programs.

Poster #10
School Psychologist Job Satisfaction and Implications on Recruitment and Retention

Andrea Scheitler, Lana Renzelman, Robin R. Sobansky, Ph.D.
University of Nebraska at Kearney

Abstract. This presentation explores the possible impact of job satisfaction on retention and recruitment of school psychologists and looks at job satisfaction related to aspects of service delivery such as RtI and mental health services. Job satisfaction data were collected in Nebraska utilizing the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire and compared to national findings. The purpose of this presentation is threefold: to raise awareness of the positive aspects of the profession for purposes of recruitment; outline the unsatisfying aspects of the
profession as potential areas for improvement to enhance retention; and finally, to show the importance of a grass roots movement in recruitment and retention. Trainers of school psychology can take this information and use it within current curriculum in training programs to prepare students for the potential strong points and frustrations in the field of practice.

**Poster #11**

Factors Related to School Psychologists’ Comfort Working with Poverty: Are Training Institutions Doing Enough to Ensure Competency in This Area?

Karen Wille; Jamie Ellsworth
University of Nebraska at Kearney

*Abstract.* The purpose of this presentation is to describe a research project that was conducted to determine what factors relate to school psychologists’ comfort level working with children of poverty. Influential factors affecting comfort level working with children of poverty and the need for training institutions to incorporate or further develop this type of preparation into their programs will be discussed. Participants will become better aware of the need for school psychologists to be competent in the area of poverty, and trainers of school psychology attending this session will be able to evaluate their own program and assess the need for change if they determine their program is not currently addressing the culture of poverty.

**Poster #12**

Relationship of select admission and outcome characteristics for graduates of a specialist-level school psychology program

Joel Erion, Edinboro University of Pennsylvania
Kirk John, California University of Pennsylvania
Marie C. McGrath, Immaculata University
Abstract. This poster presentation will explore the relationship among various admission characteristics and outcome measures for 71 graduates of three specialist-level school psychology programs in Pennsylvania. Admission criteria examined will include undergraduate grade point average (UGGPA) and Miller Analogies Test (MAT) results. Outcome measures will include graduate grade point average (GGPA), performance on the Praxis II/National School Psychology Exam (NSPE), and faculty ratings of professional work characteristics and subject knowledge. The strength of the relationship among these admissions and outcome measures will be examined. Results will be considered in light of previous meta-analyses examining the relationship among various admission and outcome variables. Potential impact on recruitment, retention, and national certification of school psychology students, as well as program assessment practices, will be examined. Issues related to measurement of knowledge and professional work characteristics of students in specialist-level school psychology programs will be discussed.

**Poster #13**

**Education and Training for Systems Change**

*Susan G. Forman, Lew Gantwerk, Karen Haboush, Johanna Morrow, Matthew Strobel, and Melissa Anderson*

*Rutgers University*

Abstract. For several decades, school psychology literature has called for increasing practitioner understanding of a systems orientation to service delivery and of the change agent role. In the most recent Blueprint for Training and Practice, the National Association of School Psychologists specifies “systems-based service delivery” as a primary domain of competence for training and practice in school psychology. Yet, the training of school psychologists focuses largely on individual differences, while understanding of context and systems issues has received little attention. This poster addresses methods of education and training designed to develop school psychologists’ knowledge and skill in systems-based service
delivery. The development and content of coursework that can assist school psychologists in understanding how they can assume the role of change agent in educational settings are described. This coursework emphasizes the process of implementing innovations and the individual, group, and organizational factors that influence implementation success. The development and content of systems level practicum experiences for school psychology graduate students are also described and descriptions of three sample placements are presented. Such placements allow students to experience the various systems that impact the functioning of individuals and classrooms. In addition, the nature of supervision for systems level fieldwork is addressed.

**Poster #14**

*International Collaborative Research*

*Max McFarland, Ed.D., NCSP; Teara Archwamety, Ph.D., Tammi Ohmstede Beckman, Ph.D., NCSP, Andrea Scheitler, Karen Wille*

*University of Nebraska at Kearney*

*Abstract.* This presentation describes one training program’s efforts to “internationalize school psychology”. The International Collaborative Research (ICR) Initiative has been developed by the School Psychology Graduate program and Department of Counseling and School Psychology at the University of Nebraska at Kearney. Its mission is to coordinate/orchestrate the collaboration on research projects between the graduate students and faculty in the UNK College of Education and our international counterparts. This initiative supports the College of Education, Graduate College, and departmental missions and student outcome objectives related to scholarly inquiry and productivity. Moreover, the initiative has enables us to expand and formalize research with international partners.
**Poster #15**

Training Models and Applied Experiences in School Psychology: The Match between Model and Practice

*Kimberly Watcke, B. S.; Julie Gomez, B. S., M.A.; Nancy Evangelista, Ph.D.*

*Alfred University*

**Abstract.** This poster will present an exploration of training models utilized in doctoral school psychology programs, with specific emphasis on practice (practicum and field experience) and research requirements. Archival research was conducted by using program descriptions and handbooks found on the program websites from the 81 APA Accredited or NASP-Approved doctoral programs in school psychology. Variables investigated include degree offered, stated program model, number and type of practicum and externship experiences, and research requirements and experiences. From this data, overall patterns regarding popularity of training models and the corresponding research-practice balance within doctoral school psychology training can be appreciated. The practitioner-scientist model utilized at the Alfred University training program is also presented as an alternative model. Survey data gathered from students and recent graduates is presented to illustrate familiarity with the program model, reasons for choosing the program, and satisfaction with the practicum and research sequences. The impact of practicum sequence in building a solid foundation for a training experience will be highlighted. Conclusions are offered regarding the advantages and disadvantages of the practitioner-scientist model, and alignment of training experiences with program model.

**Poster #16**

Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual, Transgender, & Questioning (GLBTQ Issues Coverage in Graduate Training Programs: A Survey of Trainers

*National Association of School Psychologists Committee on Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual, Transgender, & Questioning Issues: Lisa L. Persinger, Ph.D., NCSP, Chair & G. Thomas Schanding, Jr., Ph.D., NCSP, Co-Chair*
Survey Designed and Collected by Todd Savage, Ph.D., Kathy McNamara, Ph.D., Constance Patterson, Ph.D., and Jeff Charvat, Ph.D.

Abstract. The NASP position statement on Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual, Transgender, and Questioning Youth (GLBTQ; NASP, 2006) stresses the role that school psychologists can play in affecting policies and practices in schools to address the needs of GLBTQ youth. This poster presents data gathered from Trainers of School Psychology Programs collected during the 2007-08 academic year. Responses were gathered from faculty from school psychology training programs throughout the country (N = 55). Trainers were asked to provide information as to how they train students with regards to GLBTQ issues and their perceived needs in this area for training to help support their efforts. Results indicate trainers believe GLBTQ issues should be addressed in public schools and training programs, but do not appear to have available specific resources to train to meet these competencies currently. A brief discussion and recommendations are offered.
This test helps prevent academic failure. Have you introduced it to your school psychology students?

School Motivation and Learning Strategies Inventory (SMALSI)
by Kathy Chatham Stroud, Ph.D., and Cecil R. Reynolds, Ph.D.

Prospective school psychologists need to know about the SMALSI. Here’s why:

• The SMALSI measures skills directly linked to academic performance. By doing so, it helps school psychologists identify weaknesses early and intervene proactively, rather than waiting for poor performance to document a student’s need for help.

• The skills measured by the SMALSI affect the achievement of all students (ages 8 to 18). The test can be used in every classroom to identify struggling students and modify teaching strategies accordingly.
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From the Ground up: Establishment and Operation of a University-Based Clinic in a NASP Approved Specialist Training Program

Gregory E. Everett, Brooke Ferrero-Baker, Stephen D. A. Hupp, and Jeremy D. Jewell

Southern Illinois University Edwardsville

Abstract. Graduate training in school psychology often includes involvement with a university-based clinic (UBC). As components of many graduate programs, UBCs are frequently used to provide future school psychologists with assessment, intervention, and consultation experiences separate from school-based practicum. Although exceedingly beneficial, the establishment and operation of UBCs presents a unique set of challenges for both faculty supervisors and graduate student supervisees. As such, the current article outlines the recent establishment and operation of a UBC as part of a NASP approved specialist degree program and considers benefits and challenges from both faculty and graduate student perspectives.

Graduate training in applied psychology generally, and school psychology specifically, is overseen by differing accrediting bodies who, broadly conceived, ensure that trainers provide and trainees receive specific coursework and experiences. Primary among these are practica opportunities in which trainees use, practice, and employ skills and techniques of the profession with “real-world” populations. In the United States, both the National Association of School Psychologists ([NASP], 2002b) and the American Psychological Association ([APA], 2005) explicitly mandate practica experiences for students in those programs that they oversee. One tool commonly employed by school psychology training programs to provide field-based experiences both consistent with accepted best practices and as one component of a broader practicum experience is the university-based clinic (UBC).

In order to most effectively work with children and their families, students should be exposed not only to differing professional methodologies and techniques, but to their use with varied (and often underserved) populations in differing locales of service provision. Although conceptualized by Roberts et al. (1998) within the context of doctoral level preparation, the notion that professional training moves from exposure though experience to expertise is clearly applicable to all levels of graduate psychological education. To this end, it is important that school psychology graduate students receive not only didactic instruction in assessment, intervention, and consultation, but real-world experience as well (Power, 2002; Swerdlik & French, 2000). Within this framework, UBCs are uniquely situated to
provide training in both those foundational skills of school psychology as well as emerging concepts of significant importance (e.g., data-based decision making, application of scientific methodology within data gathering and intervention development activities, Yesseldyke et al., 2006).

Although UBCs are of substantial benefit to students, trainers, and the community at large, their establishment involves the consideration of issues which have not been well outlined. As trainers of school psychologists are tasked with educating in skills far beyond the test-and-place framework of the past and as UBCs are components of training programs of differing levels (i.e., specialist vs. doctoral) it becomes important to elucidate those concerns, benefits, and challenges associated with their establishment and usage. As such, the present article provides information related to the newly formed UBC as part of the school psychology program at Southern Illinois University Edwardsville ([SIUE]; a NASP approved specialist degree program) including a general overview of issues related to UBC establishment and discussions of associated benefits and challenges from both faculty-supervisor and graduate-student-supervisee perspectives. Although broad in terms of topical coverage, the current discussion provides only a snapshot of those issues with which the authors are most intimately aware and should not be taken as complete. Rather, the current article is designed to provide those currently overseeing, considering, or working in UBCs (along with other interested parties) information which may benefit current training and practice.

**General Overview of UBC Issues**

Throughout UBC development and initial implementation myriad issues were considered. By way of background it is important to note that the currently discussed UBC began operation during the fall semester of 2007 providing services to school aged children and their families in two primary areas (i.e., comprehensive assessments for Attention Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder [ADHD] and brief home/school based consultation for the remediation of behavioral and academic concerns), although initial planning began early during Spring 2007. Throughout this approximately 6 month process those issues most pressing concerned the technical (i.e., issues related to smooth day-to-day operations of the UBC) and methodological (i.e., issues related to professional service delivery) considerations related to establishing a clinic where one previously did not exist. More specifically, technical matters including (a) support from both faculty and administrative stakeholders (Hays-Thomas et al., 2006), (b) legal compliance (Bennett et al., 2006), (c) remuneration for services, (d) staffing issues, and (e) marketing the clinic to interested parties were considered. Methodological considerations focused primarily on the development of specific UBC operating policies and clinic documents to be employed during service provision. To aid in the
following discussion, Table 1 provides a quick reference to those issues to be further outlined below.

**Technical Considerations**

As with many new ventures, UBC establishment involves a host of issues which may have little direct connection to the underlying goals of the undertaking, but are critically important nonetheless. First and foremost, when that new venture is part of an institution of higher education primary among those issues is the broad-based coordination with appropriate faculty and administrative stakeholders. That decisions of new services or offerings within a university setting should be made in collaboration with relevant persons, rather than in isolation (Hays-Thomas et al., 2006), led the UBC development team (i.e., three faculty members within the SIUE Clinical Child and School Psychology graduate program) to clearly outline our goals, needs, and priorities before faculty colleagues, departmental chairperson, and school dean. After receiving positive feedback from all levels of consideration and the “go-ahead” for UBC establishment, the focus shifted to additional matters.

Other technical issues warranting attention centered largely on the “business” aspects of the UBC and included those of legal and monetary importance. Although such topics may be unfamiliar to many psychologists and educators, they nonetheless must be considered and dealt with effectively. First, matters of legal compliance (Bennett et al., 2006) were managed through ongoing consultation between the development team, psychology department chairperson, and university counsel. Not surprisingly, those areas of primary legal importance involved areas of concern for many mental health service providers; namely informed consent and

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1</th>
<th>Quick Guide to Issues in UBC Development and Operation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Technical Considerations</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder coordination</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business-related concerns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal issues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remuneration issues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffing concerns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing issues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Methodological Considerations</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating policies and form development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informed consent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidentiality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session documentation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Record maintenance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client videotaping</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referral screening</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crisis planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client interaction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
confidentiality (Bennett et al.), each of which were managed through appropriate policy and document development and are more fully outlined below. Second, and within the context of legal compliance, were issues of remuneration for services rendered, especially as they applied to the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 (HIPAA). Although a complete discussion of HIPAA is beyond the scope of the current article, one question was crucial to current UBC development; that is, the notion of “covered entity” status. More specifically, for a service provider to be considered a “covered entity” under HIPAA they must transmit health-related information (i.e., generally meaning health care claims or inquiries to/from third party payers) *electronically* (italics added for emphasis).

As the current UBC was designed to provide low cost, high-quality psychological services within a traditionally underserved geographic area, a decision was made to forego completely issues of third party reimbursement in favor of a fee-for-service paradigm based upon a sliding-fee-schedule. In this way the current UBC was not defined as a “covered entity” and, therefore, did not have to comply with HIPPA mandated procedures or requirements (although decisions were made to comply nonetheless). As such, the current UBC may differ from other UBCs which transmit health information electronically and are, therefore, required to comply with HIPPA.

Other UBC technical matters involved staffing and marketing considerations. Given the varied and time-consuming nature of the tasks involved with daily UBC operation (e.g., client record management, appointment scheduling, resource oversight, community outreach), the necessity of dedicated clinic personnel became apparent. Although several options exist for filling such a position, both training and practica matters dictated the assignment of a graduate student assistant (GA) as the day-to-day clinic manager. That is, as the UBC operates within a NASP approved graduate training program and, more generally, under the auspices of the Department of Psychology at SIUE it was important to provide for student skill development while meeting necessary clinic functions. In addition to performing those “secretarial” tasks associated with any such undertaking, the GA (who is the current second author) was involved in many of those tasks conducted pre-opening (i.e., during summer 2007) in order to provide student perspective to the ongoing work of the faculty development team. Such an arrangement is contrasted with the appropriate, yet potentially more expensive, alternative of hiring an outside employee to fulfill such duties. Regarding marketing, pamphlets outlining clinic goals, services, and fees (among other topics) were distributed to area schools and community organizations in an attempt to increase UBC exposure. Similar to the issue of clinic staffing, marketing decisions represent one choice among differing options; in this case to publicize clinic services versus relying on more traditional word of mouth advertising.
Methodological Considerations

As previously stated, the current UBC was established to provide low cost, high quality outpatient psychological services in two main domains (i.e., comprehensive ADHD assessments and brief home/school based consultation) within a traditionally underserved geographic region. Such functions are broadly consistent with issues of social justice through both the provision of services to traditionally underserved groups (Goodman et al., 2004) and providing practicum opportunities as a vehicle for this service provision (Ali, Liu, Mahmood, & Arguello, 2008). To that end, specific policies outlining the manner in which such services would be provided and specific documents to be used within the context of direct client contact were developed. In large measure the development team adopted a layered approach to such topics, meaning that the establishment of a UBC policy overlapped with the creation of its corresponding document. Although presently conceptualized separately between issues of day-to-day clinic operation (i.e., technical) and those of service provision (i.e., methodological), there is no doubt substantial overlap between these two areas. This is most notably seen in the discussion of informed consent and confidentiality which cuts across both legal implications, a technical matter, and the development of UBC operating policies and documents, a methodological issue, to be further outlined below.

Regarding specific methodological considerations, matters of informed consent and confidentiality were of primary concern and were in large measure governed by the professional ethical principles of both NASP (2002a) and APA (2002). More specifically, steps were taken to ensure that clinic personnel were able to communicate verbally and document in written form necessary information regarding both client decisions to receive services and limits of confidentiality (Barnett, Wise, Johnson-Greene, & Bucky, 2007; Fisher, 2008). Included in such issues is the question of whether an adult has the legal authority to seek mental health services for a child (and in turn consent to other treatment related issues including the release/obtainment of mental health records). As children today often live with persons other than both a biological mother and father (e.g., whether through divorce, adoption, guardianship, extended family, or other living arrangements), such instances must be given particular attention within a UBC as it is imperative that only those legally authorized to seek mental health services actually do so.

As such, current UBC operating policies mandate that direct questions pertaining to child living arrangements and guardianship be asked, documented, and if necessary, supplemented with written documentation (e.g., divorce decree).

Other methodological considerations, although related to broader issues of consent and confidentiality, warrant additional mention. Specifically, current UBC development involved the establishment of guidelines for report writing and session
documentation procedures, the care and maintenance of client records (i.e., both in hard copy and electronic forms), and issues of videotaping client sessions. Regarding issues of report writing, session documentation, and client records, the faculty development team adopted strict guidelines mandating that all case related information be written/documented on those resources within the UBC. That is, all client reports and case notes are written and saved only to those computers and electronic storage devices (i.e., flash drives) which are property of the UBC, and may not be removed from the clinic for any reason. In practice, although such requirements may prompt a higher degree of scheduling coordination than would otherwise be necessary, this eliminates the possibility of lost or misplaced client records which could pose significant legal and ethical challenges. Specific to issues of client videotaping, current UBC procedures involve a 2-stage consent process distinguishing between consenting for videotaping solely for supervision purposes versus videotaping for supervision and educational (i.e., classroom or other) display. Although videotape consenting for educational use is completely optional, in order to receive services through the current UBC clients must agree to videotaping for supervision purposes. Finally, as this description is not meant to be exhaustive in nature, invariably other important methodological issues were considered and should be anticipated. Among them, issues regarding procedures for screening referrals for clinical appropriateness, crisis response planning, and client interaction procedures.

**UBC Benefits and Challenges: Faculty Perspectives**

In combination with those tasks related to UBC establishment and operation come associated benefits and challenges unique to faculty-supervisor (to be considered currently) and graduate-student-supervisee (to be considered below) perspectives. Although UBCs may be established to serve a variety of functions including (but not limited to) providing psychological services to those in need, serving as an environment for research application, and strengthening university – community ties; foundational among all such functions is the training of future applied psychologists. In general, although not exclusively, the majority of current faculty perceived UBC benefits and challenges center on issues related to this training, or more specifically, issues of graduate student supervision.

From a faculty perspective, supervising future school psychologists within the context of a UBC provide a number of varied, yet related, benefits. Primary among them is the ability to simultaneously supervise the diverse functions required of a professional school psychologist (e.g., assessment, intervention, consultation) as opposed to more singularly focused practica experiences. As many school psychology practica placements are thematically focused (Kaufman & Schwartz, 2003); that is they are designed to provide trainees with extensive
experience in one professional skill (e.g., an assessment practicum), UBCs allow for a more integrated training experience. This integrated approach affords students opportunities to both identify and experience the frequently touted, but oft-overlooked, assessment-intervention link crucial to the changing demands of the profession. Related to overseeing varied student activities, is the ability of UBC faculty to serve dual supervisory functions. Specifically, UBC faculty are able to combine the differing activities of field-based and university-based supervisors, whom according to Ward (2001) report differing supervisory roles. Namely, such faculty are able to both provide oversight of technical, skill-based matters (more traditionally associated with field-based supervisors) and engage in knowledge sharing and more direct, interpersonal interactions (more commonly a function of university-based supervision).

Related to these supervisory benefits, is that UBCs not only provide an environment ripe for student training, but in fostering skill acquisition via empirically derived principles. More specifically, UBCs are outlets where skills including assessment, intervention, and consultation may be taught using didactic instruction, modeling, rehearsal, and performance feedback which have been shown necessary in teaching complicated skills including those associated with parent training (e.g., Everett et al., 2007; Forehand & Long, 2002) and general consultative interactions (e.g., Watson & Robinson, 1996). Within the current UBC, the protocol necessary to complete a comprehensive ADHD assessment involves a number of differing tasks that students are introduced to according to this framework. One such task, parent interviewing, provides an illustrative example of this hierarchical training sequence in that students first read and discuss the semi-structured interview with a faculty supervisor, then watch a faculty member complete the interview, followed by their completing an interview with faculty supervision, and finally completing one independently. This progression allows for gradual skill acquisition and is consistent with best practice in student supervision (Kaufman & Schwartz, 2003). In addition, it runs contrary to practice of simply instructing a graduate-student trainee to gather necessary practice materials (e.g., a particular assessment instrument) and employ them within the context of an actual case (practices which are not unheard of according to anecdotal evidence reported to current authors).

In addition to being uniquely situated to provide supervised clinical training to future applied psychologists, UBCs afford faculty, students, and graduate training programs a number of additional benefits. First, UBCs may serve as outlets for both faculty and student-sponsored research. As research “comes with the territory” for both university faculty and school psychology graduate students, opportunities for expanded productivity should be welcomed by many. In addition, UBCs offer unique opportunities for individual persons, graduate-training programs, or universities as a whole to foster and support community ties and generally increase
the university’s (or program’s, or person’s) profile within the broader community. For example, within the first year of current UBC operation clinic personnel have been contacted unsolicited by numerous non-university based professionals (e.g., psychiatrists, social workers, private practice psychologists) inquiring about services offered. It is through these research and community-related service opportunities that school psychologists may continue their work in line with the changing face of the profession. That is, as school psychologists today serve roles far beyond assessing for and placing according to eligibility, issues such as direct student intervention and multiple forms of consultation are no longer adjuncts to graduate training, but required components. It is in such areas that UBCs excel.

Although UBCs offer a number of faculty perceived benefits (and indeed such positives far outweigh the negatives), associated challenges do exist. Here, of primary concern are matters related to multiple faculty supervisors. As initially conceptualized during start-up, current UBC organizational structure involved three co-directors (who also served as the faculty development team referenced above) who divided student supervision among themselves. Although not optimal, this structure was adopted primarily out of necessity due to the psychologist licensure status of the faculty (i.e., during the initial weeks of clinic operation only 1 of the 3 faculty were licensed psychologists, although a second became licensed during the first semester of clinic operation). Given this arrangement, it was initially necessary to have differing layers of supervision for UBC students. Although faculty made every effort to coordinate supervisory roles with students (and each other), such arrangements occasionally led to student confusion and may have blurred lines of supervisory responsibility (Alessi, Lascurettes-Alessi, & Leys, 1981). Given such concerns (and consistent with plans outlined during UBC development) current organizational format includes a singular UBC director (the current first author) who oversees all daily clinic operations and case supervision. Although initial planning called for this transition to be made, in hindsight, such changes made earlier may have been of more benefit.

Such issues speak more broadly to general concerns associated with the appropriate credentialing of supervisory personnel. In the case of the current UBC (as would be the case in most similar clinics) all responsible faculty supervisors (i.e., those with “ultimate” responsibility for all clinic- and client-related matters) were required to possess (or be working towards) state psychological licensure. As stated above, at the time of UBC outset not all supervisory faculty met this requirement, so all of the “legal” clinic requirements (e.g., signing client reports) were fulfilled by the licensed faculty. Such situations may be common across differing UBCs and are akin to circumstances in which new (or newer) faculty members may not have the required credentials to independently practice or supervise practicum students. In those situations, current experience suggests that
clearly defined roles (for both those licensed, and by default, supervisory faculty members and those new, unlicensed faculty) be outlined and communicated to all relevant parties.

Other faculty perceived challenges involve issues of a more cursory (although nonetheless important) nature. Specifically, the time required a UBC supervisor places additional demands on faculty who may already be strained with demands of teaching, research, and service. Although many UBC faculty are not afforded course release time for their clinic-related activities, such arrangements may dramatically improve the workload of such persons. Tasks such as case supervision, report proofing, and student feedback (among many others) are quite time consuming, and deserve appropriate recognition among university faculty and administration. In relation, are concerns associated with access to a seemingly shrinking pool of available university provided resources (both monetary and otherwise). Although UBCs are not immune to such occurrences, they may be better insulated as clinics offer programs, departments, and universities means to generate, rather than expend funds. As such, a self-sustaining UBC may be viewed differently than one that is not.

**UBC Benefits and Challenges: Student Perspectives**

Considered separately from those UBC benefits and challenges from a faculty-supervisor perspective are those from the standpoint of a graduate-student supervisee. As graduate students are primary of beneficiaries UBC offerings (along with the clientele served through the clinic) and in the interest of avoiding redundancy with those faulty discussed benefits and challenges, only unique perspectives are offered.

Regarding benefits, the opportunity to gain practica experience in those tasks required of professional school psychologists takes precedence above all others. Although skills of assessment, consultation, and intervention are gained through school-based practica, their application in a clinic setting is distinct. For example, child clients of UBC’s may represent a group of children that are not (for a variety of reasons) receiving adequate school-based services. Be they children who could benefit from additional reading intervention (of which the school is unwilling to provide) or those who are languishing on an overworked psychologist’s list of children “to be tested” UBCs serve an important role. In addition, as is common in the current setting (and likely across numerous UBCs), students gain valuable experience in connecting assessment results with individual interventions. That is, regularly following completion of an ADHD assessment graduate students are tasked with directly intervening in an attempt to remediate individual childhood behavioral or academic difficulties. Such practices, although possible in school settings, may be emphasized more in clinical environments. It is through these one-
to-one interactions that graduate students may obtain advanced skills in not only those professional tasks of school psychologists, but interpersonally as well.

Related to those individual experiences with child clients are interactions with the child’s parent(s). Among others, one of the recent substantive changes within school psychology is the expansion of the school-home collaborative link (Yesseldyke et al., 2006). It is in such areas that UBCs are of primary benefit. For example, current anecdotal evidence suggests that direct parental interactions occur far more frequently in UBC settings than in school-based practica. Although this makes intuitive sense in that parents (or other caregivers) of UBC child clients are tasked with bringing their children to the clinic (and are therefore present), one cannot overlook the fact that regardless of reasoning the child’s parent(s) are present. Such may not be the case in school settings where although increased parental involvement is linked with a variety of positive outcomes, not the least of which is improved academic achievement (Fan & Chen, 2001), large groups of parents continue to remain under-involved with their child’s education.

That UBCs may serve to increase both the quantity and quality of school-home communication and collaboration is important in improving the educational, emotional, and behavioral outcomes of children.

Similar to UBC faculty-based perspectives, those from graduate student points of view include not only benefits, but challenges as well. Primary among them are issues of increased responsibility, that although are welcomed can be quite daunting nonetheless. That is, tasks related to UBC establishment including clinical protocol and form development and marketing considerations are skills best learned through doing rather than watching. Although the current UBC employs a graduated training protocol as previously discussed (i.e., didactic instruction, modeling, rehearsal, and performance feedback) for use with clinical service provision, such training methodology may be less applicable to tasks of UBC establishment. For example, although it makes intuitive (and clinical) sense to gradually allow more individual responsibility related to skills such as parent interviewing, the same may not be said about form development or marketing. Rather, those issues involve skills that were learned in concert with the faculty development team in the absence of a clearly outlined procedural framework.

Other student perceived challenges involve broad issues of communication. Be it communicating with parents, other service providers, or school personnel such issues are of special importance within a UBC. As valid ADHD diagnoses includes symptoms presence in more than one setting (American Psychiatric Association, 2000), current UBC protocol involves in-class student observations. Although such practice come as no surprise to school psychologists (and indeed a lack of school observation would be inconsistent with best practice), the same cannot be said about all school personnel (e.g., principals, classroom teachers). This may be especially true in those schools who are unaccustomed to outside,
third-party involvement in their buildings and who as a result require a great deal of information (e.g., communication from a UBC faculty member) prior to allowing graduate student access. As such, clearly communicating the need to complete given clinical activities which are both necessary and in the best interests of the child is paramount.

Final Comments

School psychology graduate training includes required practica through which students gain applied experience and connect classroom learning with real world application (APA 2005; NASP, 2002b). Although primarily obtained through school-based placements, alternative training environments are also of practica benefit. One such environment, and a common component of graduate training programs, is the UBC. It was the purpose of this article to outline and elucidate some of the general matters and individually considered faculty- and student-perceived benefits and challenges associated with the recent establishment of a UBC as part of SIUE’s Clinical Child and School Psychology training program.

In conclusion, although hopefully apparent from the current discussion, it should be said that creating a UBC where one did not previously exist is a daunting task that requires an incredible amount of work from several persons. Whether considering issues of technical or methodological importance or working through unplanned challenges, each clinic day seems to be different. Although challenges may both arise quickly and must be solved immediately, the benefits of training graduate students in professional skills, tasks, and modalities found less frequently in school-based practica are unique to UBCs. As such, it is likely that many current and future school psychology graduate students will receive UBC training to supplement their entire graduate experience.
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Exploring Our Career Options: 
Introducing Graduate Students to the Professoriate through a Faculty Seminar Series


*Michigan State University*

**Abstract.** A “Faculty Seminar Series” was provided to doctoral students to introduce the culture of the professoriate as a way to address the shortage of school psychologists in academia. Seven doctoral students participated in the seminars for two years. Participating students provide their perspectives to help trainers implement a similar seminar within their programs.

There is a hidden, almost mysterious, world among faculty members of which most graduate students are unaware. This faculty culture often includes political tensions, tenure committee preparations, manuscript writing, graduate student mentoring, and a diverse set of interpersonal relationships. Oftentimes, graduate students are not cognizant of the unique culture of the professoriate and find it difficult to understand. Yet, there is often an unspoken expectation that graduate students be socialized into this culture at the point of completing their doctoral studies. Graduate students are expected to transition fluidly from a culture of dissertation writing, course work, and final exams to a postdoctoral culture with very different roles and responsibilities.

Among school psychology doctoral students, socialization into faculty culture is even more challenging, as there are a wide variety of careers available to students upon graduation. Not only can they work as school psychologists in a traditional school setting, but they can also work in juvenile detention facilities, hospitals, psychology clinics, intermediate school districts, state and federal government agencies, as well as universities. While many other psychology doctoral programs emphasize preparation for academic positions (e.g., social psychology or educational psychology programs), school psychology doctoral programs using a scientist-practitioner approach must provide both clinical and scholarly skill development.

Accordingly, how would a school psychology program prepare future leaders and trainers to be socialized into this mysterious faculty culture? Despite the demand for school psychologists in the field, there is a shortage of school psychologists in academia.
psychology graduate students seeking academic positions as well as an increasing need for school psychology faculty (Baker, et al., 2008; Demaray, Carlson, & Hodgson, 2003; Little & Akin-Little, 2004). Thus, it is crucial to develop opportunities for school psychology doctoral students to consider an academic career and to learn about the cultural and institutional contexts, as well as the responsibilities and challenges associated with faculty work. This article addresses one way in which trainers of school psychologists provided these opportunities for a group of school psychology and special education doctoral students. First, an overview of the syllabus as well as examples of seminar sessions is provided. Next, three perspectives are highlighted by doctoral students who participated in the seminar and who have different career goals (i.e., school-based practice, clinical practice, and academia). Finally, general guidelines and tips are provided for trainers interested in implementing a similar program within a school psychology doctoral program.

**Faculty Seminar Series Goals and Objectives**

Seven doctoral fellows from both the school psychology and special education programs at a state university participated in two year-long seminars entitled “Seminar on Faculty Work and the Academic Workplace Faculty Seminar Series” as part of a four-year multidisciplinary leadership training grant from the Office of Special Education. Facilitated by a Professor of Higher, Adult, and Lifelong Education as well as school psychology faculty, the purpose of this seminar was three-fold: 1) to develop an appreciation of the doctoral experience as a time of socialization for faculty roles and work, 2) to develop an understanding of the institutional contexts in which faculty work, the roles and responsibilities that faculty undertake, and the challenges confronting faculty in their work, and 3) to develop a sense of their own professional goals they wish to pursue as future faculty members.

This two-year seminar provided a way to discuss how graduate education is integral to the process of socialization to faculty work. Conducted across eight ninety-minute sessions, the first year focused on developing an understanding of faculty work and responsibilities. During each session, discussion was stimulated through assigned readings and hands-on activities (see Table 1 for sample readings and activities). For example, one session titled “Issues Affecting Higher Education and Work as a Faculty Member” required students to read pieces of two texts: *The American Faculty: The Restructuring of Academic Work and Careers* (Schuster & Finkelstein, 2006) and *Rethinking Faculty Work: Higher Education’s Strategic Imperative* (Gappa, Austin, & Trice, 2007). Facilitated by a professor, students discussed how historical changes in the United States have influenced the expectations of faculty in universities and how this has influenced the current role of faculty members. Students discussed the social, economic, and political pressures that have transformed faculty roles, such as how changes in technology have shifted faculty research and instruction in the classroom.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Title of Seminar</th>
<th>Sample of Assigned Readings and Activities</th>
<th>Synopsis of Sampled Readings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>Graduate Education as Socialization for Faculty Work</td>
<td>Austin, A. E., &amp; McDaniels, M. (2006). Preparing the professoriate of the future: Graduate student socialization for faculty roles. In J. C. Smart (Ed.), Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research. Vol. XXI, pgs 397-456. Netherlands: Springer.</td>
<td>Graduate student socialization to the professoriate is important for preparing them for faculty roles. This chapter addresses the theoretical perspectives that are present in the research related to graduate student socialization as well as the specific knowledge, skills, and abilities that students need to accumulate in preparation of those roles. Implications for socialization are also discussed in relation to competencies for future faculty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>Issues affecting Higher Education and Work as a Faculty Member</td>
<td>Schuster, J. H., &amp; Finkelstein, M. J. (2006). The American Faculty: The Restructuring of Academic Work and Careers. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, Chapters 1, pgs. 3-18.</td>
<td>Higher education is in transition nation-wide due to the rapid changes of the 21st century. The role of future faculty members is uncertain. The authors discuss four “megatrends” that play a critical role in the changing face of the academy: (1) the pace at which change is taking place, (2) the foundation and functional rules of the economy (3) the manner in which higher education is perceived and run (4) and the global relocation of many students and scholars. The authors aim to enlighten readers on the rapid changes to the academic academy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>Changes in the Professoriate Over Time</td>
<td>Rice, R. E. (Fall, 2006). From Athens and Berlin to LA: Faculty Work and the New Academy. Liberal Education, 92:4, pgs. 6-13.</td>
<td>In a discussion of the evolution of the faculty role, Rice explains the impact of previous cultures on the responsibilities of university faculty. Ancient Athens’ emphasis on the pursuit of knowledge and development of character along with an intense focus on research as scholarship from late 19th century Berlin has shaped current demands on faculty in American institutions. New faculty must be prepared to serve multicultural students in such transnational cities as present day Los Angeles, while also fulfilling more traditional commitments such as large research output. University institutions must support faculty by recognizing a new form of scholarship that emphasizes scholarship as research and service within community settings in addition to what occurs behind university walls.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Month</td>
<td>Title of Seminar</td>
<td>Sample of Assigned Readings and Activities</td>
<td>Synopsis of Sampled Readings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Activity:** Interview a faculty member about the components of his or her work and how these components are balanced and integrated. | Palmer describes teaching as an intellectual, emotional, and spiritual journey; all three are dependent on one another for wholeness and an enriching pedagogical experience. Intellectual is described as the way in which learning transforms. Emotional is described as the way the teacher and students feel as teaching and learning transpires. Finally, spiritual is described as the longing teachers feel to be connected to something larger and this feeling is what drives and animates love and work. Palmer provides a descriptive account of what makes a good teacher as stemming from the identity and integrity of the teacher, someone who is able to weave together the interrelationships of students, subjects, and themselves. |
**Activity:** List the challenges that you think you will encounter as a faculty member or the concerns you have. | There must be increased attention to the important role of graduate education in preparing future faculty members. First, the authors provide an overview of relevant socialization theories. Then they describe forces that are changing the nature and demands of academic work, as well as the abilities and skills that faculty will need to meet these demands. Next, the authors propose four areas of competence that are important for graduate students to develop: 1) understandings of their particular discipline, higher education in general, and professional identity, 2) knowledge and skills in teaching, research and service, 3) interpersonal skills appropriate for working with diverse people across a range of disciplines, and 4) professional attitudes and habits that will motivate and support their work. The authors conclude with practical strategies and specific recommendations for enhancing graduate students’ socialization to faculty roles. |
<p>| February | History of Higher Education in the US | Geiger, R. (2005). <em>The Ten Generations of American Higher Education</em>. In P. G. Altbach, R. O. Berdahl, &amp; P. J. Gumport (eds.), <em>American Higher Education in the Twenty-First Century</em>. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins, pgs. 38-70. | In this article, Gieger explores the history of American higher education from the establishment of Harvard to the current period. Specifically, he highlights the evolution of higher education through exploring ten successive generations: Reformation Beginnings; Colonial Colleges; Republican Education; The Passing of Republican Education; The Classical, Denominational Colleges; New Departures; Growth and Standardization; Hierarchical Differentiation between wars; The Academic Revolution; and Regulation, Relevance, and the Steady State. Within each of the ten successive generations, Gieger discusses what was taught, the students’ college experience, and the range of institutions offering higher education. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Title of Seminar</th>
<th>Sample of Assigned Readings and Activities</th>
<th>Synopsis of Sampled Readings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>Academic Cultures—Institutional Types, Departments, and the Profession</td>
<td>Austin, A. E. (1990). Faculty Cultures, Faculty Values. In W. G. Tierney (Ed.), Assessing Academic Climates and Cultures. New Directions for Institutional Research. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, pgs. 61-74.</td>
<td>The chapter describes four primary cultures that influence the faculty: the academic position, the discipline, the academy as an organization, and the specific type of institution. The culture of the academic profession includes disseminating knowledge and promoting autonomy and academic freedom. The culture of discipline relates to the language, traditions, and style of the respective discipline. The culture of the academy as an organization relates to the values of producing knowledge, collegiality, and the relationship of power in the organization. The culture of institution type relates to the goals of the institution, curriculum, and academic standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>Ethics of Faculty Work</td>
<td>Pelikan, (1992). “The Imperial Intellect and Its Virtues,” in The Idea of the University: A Reexamination. New Haven: Yale University Press, pgs. 44-76.</td>
<td>In today’s university, Pelikan argues there are fundamental intellectual virtues: free inquiry, intellectual honesty, trust in rationality and its process. Another key aspect of the university is establishing a community of scholars, where there is respect and trust between teacher and student, and between teacher and teacher. Collaborative scientific research, self-education, and supportive creativity are critical in a university. Finally, the university is a business. Budgets, financial support, and management are core components of the higher education institution.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Prior to one seminar discussion, students were asked to review several weeks of *The Chronicle of Higher Education* and identify some of the key issues and themes currently impacting faculty work. This activity further cultivated understanding of historical changes and current issues influencing faculty work. Topics discussed included the ethics of technology such as appropriate use of e-mail, the current financial strain on universities from decreased federal support and rising costs of insurance, and issues of hiring faculty from diverse backgrounds. This discussion was relevant to the overall goal of the seminar series to provide students with an introduction to the academic culture through understanding changes in the professoriate across time.

In another session titled “Variations in Faculty Work: Appointment Types, Roles (Teaching, Research, and Outreach)” students read four articles related to understanding various roles taken on by faculty. For
example, students learned about the four domains of scholarship—the scholarship of application, discovery, integration, and teaching—and ways that faculty members prioritize these domains to fit within their professional identity (Austin & McDaniels, 2006). In addition, students learned about the differences in appointment types (e.g., part-time, tenure-track) and the shift in the professoriate towards new faculty members choosing non-tenure track positions. Along with these discussions, students were asked to interview faculty members about their experiences in the professoriate and ways they are able to balance professional and personal life.

While the first year of the faculty seminar series focused on using text and discussions to develop an understanding of how graduate education socializes students to faculty work, the second year focused primarily on understanding the nature and process of applying for faculty positions. The second year of the seminar occurred as most of the doctoral students were beginning to think about dissertation work and to investigate internship possibilities. Thus, the second year of the seminar was provided at a timely stage of the graduate students’ academic lives, as they were making critical decisions about their future careers. The purpose of the second year of the faculty seminar series was to use the knowledge gained from the first year to develop a better understanding of what to expect when applying for an academic position. Specifically, the goals of this seminar were to 1) develop an appreciation for what to expect when giving a job talk at a university, 2) develop an understanding of the type of content and expected presentation style of the research presentation from both the perspective of the applicant and the search committee members (i.e., job talk attendees), and 3) develop a sense of the professional goals that students might wish to pursue as faculty members.

An integral part of the seminar series was requiring students to attend two job talks given by candidates applying for assistant or full faculty positions at the university. This opportunity to observe individuals presenting their research provided the doctoral students with an authentic way of learning about the process of applying for a faculty position. While observing the job talks, the students were asked to reflect on the candidates’ techniques for holding the audience’s attention during the presentation, determine the candidates’ preparedness for the talks, and observe candidates’ mannerisms and behaviors when addressing questions from the audience. In addition, the students were asked to reflect on each candidate’s potential as a scholar, colleague, and future trainer. These reflections were then discussed as a group during two meetings to determine whether there were any similarities or differences among the doctoral students’ perceptions of the talks and to consider how the students would perhaps prepare for and hold their own job talks.

In summary, this two-year-long seminar was a unique way to introduce doctoral students to faculty work and responsibilities. Throughout the seminar, doctoral students were gradually introduced to faculty culture. In the first year, readings of relevant text, hands-on activities, and student discussions provided a context for understanding the
different roles and responsibilities of faculty members. These seminars provided graduate students with the opportunity to work closely with an expert in the field of higher education to discuss their concerns and questions related to future faculty work. In the second year, students were provided with an authentic opportunity to understand the process of applying for an academic position by observing and reflecting on two candidate job talks. By critically analyzing the process of a job talk, students were further introduced to the application process and professoriate culture.

**Doctoral Student Perspectives on the Seminars**

While the purpose of the seminar was to introduce school psychology and special education doctoral students to the culture of the professoriate, the faculty leaders of the seminar recognized that not all of the seven doctoral students participating in the seminar would choose a career as a faculty member. Each student who participated in this seminar had unique career goals and sought a doctoral education for different reasons. However, all students attending the seminar had opportunities to reflect on their long-term career goals and determine whether an academic career was compatible with those goals. Students in a rigorous graduate program have a tendency to live day to day, focusing on the next task at hand. This seminar gave students the opportunity to take a step back and put their long-term career goals in perspective. No matter the student’s ultimate career goal, the seminar provided each student with a unique way to learn about the professoriate.

For the following section, the doctoral students first identified their long-term career goals (school-based practice, clinical/private practice, or academia) and contributed their opinions about the seminar series. Then, the students’ perspectives were grouped and synthesized for each of the career goals.

**Students Interested in School-based Practice**

Graduate students with a goal of practicing in a school-based setting found the seminars to be an excellent introduction to the professoriate that provided them with a way to understand faculty responsibilities. They appreciated understanding the various aspects of faculty work that are often “hidden” from students. In particular, they found it helpful to know how different faculty members (even those within the same department) have different roles and responsibilities. Students found it helpful to learn about the three main threads in academia (research, teaching and service) and how these roles are emphasized differently at various types of academic institutions.
Furthermore, the Faculty Seminar Series provided those students interested in a school-based setting with a better picture of faculty members’ daily lives. One student appreciated learning about the responsibilities that faculty members manage on a daily basis and how they are able to balance these responsibilities in their lives. Graduate students juggle many responsibilities, and while this is also true for faculty members, faculty tend to have more flexibility to set their own schedules and deadlines. As students, life in graduate school can feel overwhelming and stressful at times, and some students were concerned that they may not thrive in an academic setting and would enjoy more balance in their lives. Thus, it was helpful to interview faculty members and discuss the advantages and disadvantages of an academic career to gain a better understanding of how faculty members are able to balance their personal and professional lives. In fact, one student said she learned a great deal about the professoriate culture and would consider being an adjunct faculty member or serving as a field-based trainer, as a compromise between the academic and non-academic career. She valued the opportunity to take an objective perspective on the career options available and to determine whether she would pursue faculty work now or at some point later in her career.

**Students Interested in a Clinical or Private Practice**

Graduate students interested in working in a clinical setting had similar perspectives to those students interested in working in a school-based setting. Attending and participating in the Faculty Seminar Series provided various opportunities to consider the type of career they wanted to pursue. When entering graduate school, many graduate students already have an idea of what kind of training they need to pursue a particular career. Those students interested in pursuing a clinical career found that the seminar series helped them understand what it meant to be a faculty member. They learned a great deal about the various roles that faculty members play, which helped them determine whether an academic career suited their professional goals. While students may not have changed their ultimate career goals, the seminars allowed them to appreciate academia as a career option.

Since participating in the seminar series, several graduate students have modified their goals to include an adjunct position at a university. There are many practitioners in school psychology and special education who are able to teach and conduct research at universities while having a private clinical practice. The Faculty Seminar Series provided students with opportunities to discuss the challenges of this multidisciplinary role and the types of commitments this role entails.

Some students interested in clinical practice commented that the seminar was beneficial in helping solidify their future career goals of wanting to practice in the field. They commented that the assigned readings, seminar discussions and hands-on activities helped them determine that academia was not the right path to further their personal career goals. The seminar helped them realize that as faculty members they might not
be working directly with children and families. Thus, these students felt that by better understanding faculty roles and responsibilities, they were able to determine that their career goals aligned more closely with a clinical rather than an academic setting.

**Students Interested in Academic Positions**

For students interested in pursuing an academic position upon graduation, participating in the Faculty Seminar Series enabled them to better understand the specific roles of teaching, service, and scholarship. While graduate students often catch a glimpse of faculty professional life by working directly with their advisors, this glimpse provides only a snapshot. Students enjoyed learning how the roles of teaching, research and service are emphasized differently at various types of institutions, as well as the advantages and disadvantages of a tenure-track position in comparison to a non-tenure-track position.

For students interested in pursuing an academic career, the seminar allowed them to consider the type of institution that would be most compatible with their future goals. Discussions about the purposes of different types of institutions (i.e., liberal arts colleges, “Research 1” universities, community colleges) offered an opportunity for students to reflect on the kind of roles they would enjoy as faculty members. For example, one student who had been interested in working at a liberal arts college debated whether that kind of institution would be an appropriate fit for her. Reading articles on and interviewing early-career faculty members about the culture of Research 1 universities versus other types of institutions shed light on the variety of roles faculty members play. In addition, another student remarked that she appreciated learning how personal characteristics and habits help people succeed in an academic career; the group discussed the importance of time-management skills, developing priorities of tasks, and finding time to work on research every day.

**Guidelines and Tips for Trainers**

The Faculty Seminar Series was well received by all of the graduate students who attended the sessions, regardless of their future career goals. Graduate students at other school psychology programs might also benefit from exposure to the professoriate culture. With the shortage of doctoral students entering academia and the increasing number of open school psychology faculty positions, it is important that trainers provide graduate students with opportunities to learn about the various responsibilities and roles of faculty members. Thus, trainers may be interested in implementing a similar seminar program to promote the consideration of academic careers among school psychology doctoral students.
The following guidelines and advice are based on reflections gathered throughout the Faculty Seminar Series from graduate student attendees.

1. Develop a list of specific goals for the program in conjunction with graduate students. A seminar series should be developed with specific goals in mind. What do graduate students wish to learn about the professoriate (e.g., salary levels, tenure- vs. non-tenure-track positions)? What are some aspects that are important to understand prior to entering the professoriate of which students may not be aware (e.g., job-talks, research-development)? What are some less interesting yet relevant aspects of faculty culture that should still be discussed (e.g., history of the professoriate)?

2. Discuss time-commitments. It is important that trainers are cognizant of graduate students’ commitments, such as other courses, practicum activities, and research. It is critical that there is an open discussion about the amount of time students can commit to such a program so that they feel that the seminar is worthwhile to attend. It is important to note that because the attendees of this seminar were part of a leadership training grant, they were provided a quarter-time assistantship to cover the time and other costs of attending the seminars.

3. Create a syllabus. The syllabus should clearly outline the goals of the seminar as well as describe the topics and assigned readings. If students are expected to complete coursework outside of the sessions, clearly outline expectations for those assignments. Present drafts of the syllabus to potential attendees for feedback.

4. Provide engaging, hands-on activities. It is important that trainers design engaging activities throughout the seminar. Because this seminar is not likely to be included in a training program’s regular coursework, graduate students want to be actively engaged with the material. Too many assigned readings, lectures or homework assignments may deter students from attending the seminar. Again, it is important to note that for the seminar described here the doctoral students were expected to attend all sessions as part of their leadership grant responsibilities.

5. Keep student diversity in mind. Each student has a unique background, set of interests and career goals. Encourage a diverse range of perspectives and concerns to be brought forth within discussion. Cover
a broad range of topics and encourage students to talk openly about their concerns. While the purpose of the seminar may be to encourage students to consider a faculty career, recognize that an academic career may not be the best path for each graduate student. Encourage each student to consider his or her unique strengths and preferences when exploring career opportunities.

6. **Conduct frequent evaluations.** Offer graduate students opportunities to provide feedback throughout the seminar in order to guide the tone of the seminar and to inform the trainer about potential modifications. This formative feedback ensures that students are benefiting from the series and obtaining the information outlined in the syllabus. It also provides the trainer with helpful information on activities and teaching methods that help engage and motivate graduate student attendees.

**Conclusion**

During their doctoral training, graduate students have few opportunities to explore the culture of the professoriate. Therefore, the Faculty Seminar Series was an engaging, helpful way to increase students’ knowledge of faculty life. The two-year-long seminar series helped students develop an appreciation of the doctoral experience as a time of socialization into faculty work. Through discussions, activities, and participation in faculty job talks, doctoral students were introduced to the culture of the professoriate. They were introduced to the differences in roles and responsibilities depending on the type of institution, university foci (e.g., importance of research versus teaching), and institutional context. Interviewing faculty members, reading relevant texts on the history of the professoriate, and reflecting on professional goals granted students a glimpse of this culture.

Additionally, one of the clear advantages of the seminar was providing graduate students with opportunities to develop a sense of their own professional goals. Doctoral students who participated in the seminar series had various goals when entering the fields of school psychology and special education: some hoped to pursue a traditional school-based practice, some hoped to establish a private clinical practice, and others hoped to enter academia. Regardless of their ultimate career goals, the Faculty Seminar Series allowed all attendees to reflect on their personal characteristics, skills, and life goals. The series shed light on academia as a potential career option for doctoral students in school psychology and special education.
The purpose of the seminar was not to change students’ career goals; rather, the purpose was to provide a space to introduce the professoriate as a viable career option for school psychology and special education students. Other school psychology trainers may be interested in implementing a similar program for their graduate students; with the shortage of school psychology students entering academia, there is great value to providing them such an opportunity. When implementing a seminar series, it is critical to develop a list of specific goals for the program in conjunction with graduate students, discuss the amount of time students can commit to the seminars, create a clear syllabus outlining the readings and hands-on activities, keep in mind the students’ diverse career goals, and conduct frequent evaluations during and at the end of the seminar series.
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Table 2
Sample assignment for the Faculty Seminar Series Year 2: Understanding the Nature and Expectations of a Faculty Job Talk

Reading:


Questions to ask yourself as you observe the job talk:

A. What indicators from the job talk are there, either negative or positive, about this presenter’s potential as a Scholar? A Potential Colleague? A Future Trainer and Teacher?

B. How does this job talk differ from the research presentations you have been an audience member at NASP, APA, ABA?

C. Does this presenter do or say anything that indicates that they want to be a part of this university or that they wish to be a colleague with those faculty in the audience?

D. How well did the presenter adhere to time guidelines? How well did they pace the different parts of the research study presentation?

E. What first impressions do you have of the presenter from the audience perspective? Of the audience from the perspective of the presenter?

F. Were the visuals (overheads/PowerPoint slides) efficient and effective? What made them easy to understand and follow? What might have improved them?

G. How might the presenter have disappointed the audience? How might the audience have disappointed the presenter?