

## Dr. Douglas Della Toffalo Named ASPP's School Psychologist of the Year

—Marissa L. Beveridge & Elizabeth A. Larcher



The Association of School Psychologists of Pennsylvania (ASPP) honored Douglas Della Toffalo with the 2013 School Psychologist of The Year

(SPOTY) Award at their annual fall conference this October in State College, Pennsylvania. The SPOTY is awarded to an ASPP member who “provides a full range of services, performs the job in an exemplary manner, is well respected by colleagues, students, and parents, is well informed about the goals and standards of the state professional organization, and represents school psychology well.”

Dr. Della Toffalo is a Nationally Certified School Psychologist employed by the Cranberry Area School District. He has implemented components of Response to Instruction and Intervention and School-Wide Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports within his district and provides supports for the elementary and high school’s established pre-referral intervention process. When speaking about Dr. Della Toffalo’s work, Jodie Chittester, Director of Special Programs in the Cranberry Area School District, remarked that “because Dr. Della Toffalo is so involved in the field, he brings a wealth of information that most school psychologists do not have. He is extremely knowledgeable and, for that reason, has made the system we have at Cranberry successful.” Julie Kosker, a guidance counselor in the Cranberry Area School District, describes Dr. Della Toffalo as passionate in helping students and their families. Ms. Kosker stated, “He is always willing to meet with parents and help them address their concerns and resolve their problems.” Clearly, Dr. Della Toffalo’s colleagues value his expertise and commitment to providing high-quality services and supports to students, families, staff, and administrators.

In addition to his work in the district, Dr. Della Toffalo is a presenter and consultant for Brain STEPS, a child and adolescent post-brain injury school re-entry program, endorsed by the Pennsylvania Department of Education as a licensed psychologist. Dr. Della Toffalo also maintains a robust private practice across western

Pennsylvania working with children and families providing psychoeducational, vocational, neuropsychological, and forensic evaluations. A rapidly growing aspect of his private practice is conducting Independent Educational Evaluations (IEEs) and consulting with schools, parents, and special education attorneys in situations involving Due Process and related legal proceedings.

Dr. Della Toffalo is an active member of ASPP and serves on the Executive Board as its North Western Delegate. Additionally, he is a member of the National Association of School Psychologists (NASP) and is a diplomat of the American Board of School Neuropsychology (ABSNP). He co-authored the book *Integrating RTI with Cognitive Neuropsychology: A Scientific Approach to Reading*. As well, he has authored multiple book chapters, published multiple research articles in peer-reviewed journals, and written multiple test and book reviews for a variety of peer-reviewed journals and trade publications. Over his 15-year-career as a school psychologist, he has also conducted over 50 presentations for local, state, and national organizations.

In his candidate statement, Dr. Della Toffalo urged school psychologists to come together and share each other’s expertise stating that while “each individual is a leader in their own right but together, the collection of expertise, experience, and insight within ASPP is staggering.”

He stressed that while school psychologists are often forced to try to be all things to all people and “jacks

*continued on page 19*

### In This Issue...

2013 ASPP/PSU Review .....	2
ASPP/PSU Conference Photos .....	6
It’s As Easy As 1-2-3! .....	8
When Students Sext: What School Psychologists Need To Know .....	9
The Challenges of Emotional Disturbance classification .....	11
President’s Message.....	15
An Introduction To The ASPP Student Committee .....	15
Advocacy Update .....	16
PSEA Liason Report.....	16
ASPP Fall 2013 Election Results .....	17
ASPP Editorial .....	18
ASPP Executive Board Review .....	20

## 2013 ASPP / PSU Fall Conference Review

— Julie Vandervort, Latitia Lattanzio, Kathleen Policastro, Andrea Schachner, Isaac Tarbell, Rachel Tomon, Hillary Turner, & Shirley Woika

The fall 2013 Association of School Psychologists of Pennsylvania (ASPP) / Pennsylvania State University conference Bernreuter Lecture was presented by Dr. Dewey Cornell, clinical psychologist and Professor of Education in the Curry School of Education at the University of Virginia. Dr. Cornell addressed, "Student Threat Assessment as a Violence Prevention Strategy."

Are schools safe? The media seems to over exaggerate the severity of violence in the schools and in a way that makes people afraid of schools. Recently, people have begun wondering why school shootings and school violence are getting worse, or are increasingly on the rise. In actuality, statistics do not show a significant increase in school violence, instead it is the media's portrayal and fixation on school violence that has intensified. Dr. Cornell described the Sandy Hook tragedy as a national problem with gun violence, not school violence. As a country, the United States has some of the highest reported firearm deaths and homicides of children ages 5-18. Furthermore, said firearm deaths are significantly more likely to occur outside of school than at school. Dr. Cornell pointed out there are more shootings in restaurants than in schools, though you rarely hear the media reporting on restaurant violence. Currently, the thought of placing armed guards in schools to keep students safe is on the rise, while there are no calls for putting armed guards in shopping centers or in movie theaters where other recent mass shootings have taken place. Statistically speaking, given the number of schools in the United States and average number of student homicide cases in schools, the likelihood of a homicide occurring at a school is once every 12,796 years.

Contrary to common belief, crisis

response is not prevention and prevention does not require prediction. Dr. Cornell advocated for a three-tiered model of prevention, with school-wide prevention programs, focused interventions on at-risk students, and intensive interventions and supports for those with severe behavioral and mental health challenges. Dr. Cornell observed that traditional behavioral profiling does not work and leads to stereotypes and false predictions. Instead, understanding common contributing factors such as bullying, mental illness, peer influences, and access to guns can lead to prevention opportunities. Dr. Cornell indicated that threat assessment should include identification of threats made by students, evaluation of the severity of the threat, intervention to reduce the risk of violence, and a follow-up to assess the effectiveness of the intervention. To that end, Dr. Cornell outlined a seven-step process to evaluate, assess, and respond to threats.

Understanding the impact of bullying and the importance of mental health assessment are also imperative to preventing school violence, according to Dr. Cornell. Threat assessment is a problem-solving approach that helps to identify, evaluate, and respond to threats made by students to help prevent school violence. Dr. Cornell's threat assessment includes step-by-step guidelines, which are research-based and field-tested covering K-12 general and special education. Threat assessment is designed to prevent school-based violence, not to predict violence, and students' threats are dealt with through a problem-solving approach by a team of professionals considering the student, situation, setting, and target.

The full-day keynote addressed offered by Dr. Cornell was thorough, enlightening, and extremely well-received. Not only was his workshop timely, but it also provided much-needed actionable steps school psychologists can employ in their work environments.

### **Mentally Gifted**

Dennis Seaman, Rebecca Ziegler, and Steven Guiles, from Kutztown Area School District, facilitated the roundtable discussion of the identification and services for mentally gifted students. The presentation began with an overview of Chapter 16 guidelines and differences between bright students and gifted learners. While there are definitions and multiple criteria to classify gifted students, each school district must establish its own set of procedures to determine whether a child is mentally gifted. Many school districts' procedures vary widely ranging from giving the entire Woodcock-Johnson III Tests of Cognitive Abilities battery to giving only some subtests from the Wechsler Individual Achievement Test – Third Edition.

A multidisciplinary team conducts an evaluation to determine if a student is mentally gifted. This gifted multidisciplinary evaluation (GMDE) should involve a systematic process that assesses aptitude, achievement, and other factors, utilizes more than one test and more than one type of test, and the instruments used must be reliable, valid, and culturally fair. While there are multiple criteria for establishing mentally giftedness, the general summary includes an IQ of 130 or higher and multiple criteria indicating mentally giftedness. Assessment of global intelligence should not be adversely suppressed by intra-individual memory or processing speed deficits. As discussed in the session, students who are mentally gifted may have slower processing speeds because they may take their time and focus on getting items perfect and precise; therefore, processing speed and working memory should not be used in the determination of mentally gifted eligibility.

The GMDE results in a gifted written report. While a student must meet criteria to be considered mentally gifted, a student could meet the criteria for mental giftedness and not be in need of specially designed instruction. This is similar to a Response to Instruction and

Intervention (RtII) model for advanced and gifted students. Otherwise, if it is concluded that the student is mentally gifted and in need of specially designed instruction, a gifted individualized education plan GIEP is developed.

The presenters then discussed their school district's method, explaining how Kutztown Area School District operationalizes Chapter 16 eligibility criteria. An overview of services provided to gifted students was also discussed such as push-in or pullout services as well as enrichment programs and acceleration for gifted students. The presentation concluded with a review of many myths and misconceptions of gifted students and gifted programs. As the presenters stressed, it is important to understand the legal guidelines for mentally gifted eligibility as well as understanding each student's individualized needs..

### Assessment

Timothy Runge, associate professor in the Department of Educational and School Psychology at Indiana University of Pennsylvania, held a workshop for successfully implementing curriculum-based measurement in written expression (CBM-WE). The presentation defined the major tenets of CBM-WE, and attendees were given an overview, instruction, and practice with the techniques for administration, scoring, and interpretation of these measures.

The workshop began with background information. As indicated by Dr. Runge, materials for these procedures include lined paper and "story starters." Further, CBM-WE can be administered individually or to a group. Simply, the students are presented with a prompt and then given "think time" to gather their thoughts. The amount of time that is allotted to the students is dependent upon their grade level. The students are also given time constraints for composition, which is reliant on age and ability.

Procedural decisions were then discussed. Some freedoms exist for CBM-WE, including time for editing and the mode of writing. Thus, the administrator may decide upon the type of prompt that is presented: narrative prompts evoke writings that are typical stories or series of events; expository prompts

encourage the individual to share information or state facts; opinions and support for those opinions are induced by persuasive prompts; and, descriptive prompts encourage the writer to paint a picture with words. Dr. Runge presented research that supports the use of particular prompts with different age groups. He advised, though, that the directions must be standardized from one administration to the next.

Scoring metrics were introduced and thoroughly reviewed with the attendees. Dr. Runge presented common problems with scoring and the best practices for addressing particular issues. He also offered suggestions such as making copies of the students' work, which would enable the scorer to mark-up the sample, and to use color coding to ease the scoring process. At this point, writing samples were distributed, and everyone had the opportunity to practice scoring.

In the end, recent research was provided and explained. Although Dr. Runge referenced publications and research conducted on CBM-WE, he warned that the literature about CBM-WE is seemingly lacking. References were provided at the end of the documents for further investigation into this topic. Dr. Runge concluded the presentation by fielding questions for the attendants regarding CBM-WE.

### Special Considerations for Children from Military Families

Cristin Hall and Erica Culler, researchers and school psychologists at The Pennsylvania State University CARE4 Military Families, along with Jeremy Moeller, researcher at CARE4 Military Families, promoted awareness toward critical information regarding military life and provided appropriate resources in order to establish a more supportive and trusting educational environment for families in the United States Armed Forces. The session provided general information pertaining to military culture, difficulties which face both active and reserve duty families, the social, emotional and academic behaviors related to stages of deployment in students, and services which school psychologists can provide to mil-

itary children.

Public schools within the United States provide the majority of educational services to military children. Due to the increase of active and reserve military in the past years, there is an increased need of awareness and support to be provided by the local education agency (LEA). Military service members and their families share a unique culture and lifestyle which is highly foreign to the civilian population. The ongoing impact of frequent moves and separation from loved ones barely encompass the stressors these families face. Military children are all too familiar with transitioning to a different home and school environment, being assessed through a different curriculum, and making new friends while one or both parents are deployed. These ongoing factors create a lack of dependency on others which impedes implementation of proper support interventions.

Before, during, and after deployment, family dynamics shift due to the absence of one or more parents. Thus, new routines and roles are established. A key point to ensure is consistency of a student's daily routine. Support sources should be identified before parent departure. These sources could be other family members if they are in close proximity, as well as extend to the school and community. School psychologists should also be aware of pre-existing mental health concerns as these students will be more susceptible to negative impacts regarding deployment. A common fallacy related to military parents returning home is that everything will be "back to normal" and the need of supports will no longer be necessary. A key point within the session focused on family changes which occur when the deployed parent returns. This is a stressful time for the family to re-adapt a dynamic with one or both parents. While we see high media exposure to military members returning from duty, the least amount of publicity is best during this transition stage.

How school psychologists can better support this population is through promoting awareness within the LEA. School psychologists should be familiar



with the Interstate Compact which ensures smooth transitions from previous to current academic settings between 45 states. Every branch of the military provides School Liaison Officers who offer support based on student and family need. School psychologists can work closely with teachers and other service providers to identify and keep in contact with military families within the school. This pertains to reserve duty families as well who may be harder to identify. School psychologists should work closely with families before, during and after parent(s) are deployed to ensure support systems are put into place and services, such as counseling, are being provided appropriately. School psychologists should also communicate consistently with the student's teacher to monitor behavioral or academic changes as well. Further helpful evidence-based resources can be obtained through The Pennsylvania State University Clearinghouse of Military Family Readiness.

### **School-wide Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) and Response to Instruction and Intervention (RtII)**

Jason Pedersen, school psychologist for Derry Township School District, Michael Bonesheski, Perri Rosen, and Elizabeth Van Oss, school psychologist interns at Derry Township School District, presented a workshop on their unique approach to PBIS and RtII within their district. The major components of this workshop addressed the key aspects of using RtII for addressing behavior concerns, how to utilize data streams for collection and analysis purposes, tools for tiered intervention, and implementation strategies.

Dr. Pedersen emphasized that staff and administrative buy-in is the crucial first step of implementation of any PBIS or RtII plan. First, he looked at the district's mission, vision, and beliefs and was able to identify what they already committed to and how to merge the PBIS plan into this schema. Dr. Pedersen pointed out that the key to selling or branding one's plan is to use language that is already established by

the district. There also had to be a paradigm shift throughout the entire community. The language they used to convey the behavioral expectations of this program were modeled and used in the classroom as well as community wide; on the buses, in the library, by the parents.

The next step of implementation addressed was data collection. Data collection is imperative to capturing information about the school, grade level, and class trends. This allows for the identification of students who require more intensive support. The Derry Township team found that a variety of methods can be used for such data collection. These include office-based referrals, various behavior screeners including the Behavioral Assessment System for Children-2 Behavioral and Emotional Screening System-Teacher, observations, and School Wide Information System. Dr. Pedersen and his team are currently working on utilizing Tracking Referrals, Encouragements, Notifications, Discipline, Safety for data management. This tool is extremely user friendly, iPad- and computer-accessible, and provides instantaneous reporting. Once data collection is established and ongoing, the process of employing the Data Analysis Team can begin. This team meets regularly to review data and create interventions for all students.

Dr. Pedersen left the attendees with two final thoughts. First, what can we do in the environment, by empowering the staff, before we blame the individual? Second, the data process is not a blame game. Instead, ask, "How can we help and support you to be a more effective teacher?" More information can be found at [www.pbis.org](http://www.pbis.org).

### **Due Process**

Douglas Della Toffalo, licensed psychologist and school psychologist for Cranberry Area School District, gave useful advice on how to prepare for due process hearings. Dr. Della Toffalo presented various cases in which he has been involved to drive home the point that no matter how well you think you have dotted your I's or crossed your T's the majority of times things are just out

of your control. In many of these cases, even when the district felt it was certain they would win, the hearing officer ruled in favor of the family.

Dr. Della Toffalo heeded the audience that everything you do could come back later in a due process hearing. Due process hearings take valuable and extraordinary amounts of time, money, and risk. Therefore, be clear in your writing and decisions. All the little things can and will add up in the end toward your credibility. Make sure in your evaluations that you are using correct names, appropriate grammar; he/she, precision wording; denied instead of reported no, and correct spelling. When an evaluation includes reports from several different specialists, make sure that the language is consistent and that the end goal is the same. Recognize that procedural errors always lead to due process. These include wrong scores, wrong conclusions, and not following timelines. Also, it is important to understand the concept of "You knew or you should have known." Anytime a parent or staff member comes to you with a concern, document and act on it. If you knew about it or should have known about it then the hearing officer will want to know why you did not take steps toward that goal. Dr. Della Toffalo highly recommends always using a social emotional assessment such as the Behavior Assessment System for Children even if it is just to prove a rule out.

In the case that you do end up having to go to due process there are several things one can do to mitigate the damage and prepare oneself for the trial. The first step is preparing for the case. Carve out plenty of time in your schedule, even arrange for coverage of your normal duties while this occurs. Do a complete file review and then copy and organize all related documents and files. Prepare with the attorney; establish a game plan, cues, and expectations. Find out what to expect and create a plan of action based on the opposing attorney. To help you gain a firmer idea of the attorney's tactics, request and review hearing transcripts. Most importantly do not take anything

personally. Answer what is asked and nothing more; semantics are crucial. Finally, dress and demeanor are of utmost importance. Dress professionally, but not ostentatiously. Be aware of your nervous habits and do what you need to stay calm.

### Section 504

Shirley Woika, associate professor in the Department of School Psychology at The Pennsylvania State University, presented “Section 504 Overview: Legal Requirements, Implementation, and Practical Suggestions.” Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act and the Americans with Disabilities Act specifies that no one with a disability can be excluded from participating in federally-funded programs or activities, including elementary, secondary or postsecondary schooling. A person is considered to have a disability if there exists a physical or mental impairment which substantially limits one or more of such person’s major life activities.

The Americans with Disabilities Act Amendments Act (ADAAA) of 2009 amended the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990. The ADAAA includes previous 504 regulations with newly-included nondiscrimination regulatory provisions, a broadened interpretation of disability and class of persons protected with a greater focus on school districts’ actions, employment, an eligibility expansion of K-12 students, and obligations to ensure equal educational opportunities. The expansion of major life activities in the ADAAA need not be prevented or severely restricted in the presence of an impairment. Furthermore, plan coverage is not limited to impairments concerned strictly with learning.

A 504 plan, with specific requirements, evaluates students believed to have a disability. The 504 plan requires teachers to provide an education to students in their Least Restricted Environment. The plan also provides equal access to nonacademic services for students with disabilities. During disciplinary proceedings, a 504 plan ensures that any behavior in question is not a manifestation of a student’s disability. School districts must pro-

vide a free appropriate public education to each qualified student with a disability, regardless of severity. Furthermore, the 504 plan is required to follow procedural safeguards, including but not limited to, allowing parents to examine their child’s records, be provided with a review procedure, and afforded an impartial hearing with opportunity for representation by counsel if necessary.

In terms of legal representation, Section 504 speaks to controversial student scenarios with differing regulations. For example, a medical diagnosis or prescription does not suffice for an evaluation under Section 504 unless the condition substantially limits a major life activity, and a district warrants it is necessary to determine if the student has a disability. Under a disciplinary scenario, Section 504 protects students with disabilities from being improperly removed from school for misconduct that is disability-related. If misconduct is proven a manifestation of a disability, action constituting a significant change in educational or disciplinary placement will not be implemented. When the law does remove a student from his or her current educational placement due to disciplinary measures, Section 504 does not require a district to provide educational services for the time period of removal. Furthermore, Section 504 can be implemented for a student recovering from substance abuse as drug addiction may be seen as a handicap capable of severely limiting major life activities.

Dr. Woika’s presentation surrounding legal requirements and implementation appropriately examined newly updated regulatory provisions, educational amendments, and disciplinary litigation within the action plan. A final discussion note suggested actions within the educational and legal system including federal agencies to revise dated Section 504 policies that ensure continuous updates and to provide Section 504 training at the district- and building-level to include administrators, guidance counselors, and other staff members.

### Web-based Tools

Shawn Gilroy and Jessica Dodge, doctoral students at Temple University, discussed classroom consultation and academic intervention as an increasing focus in the role of a school psychologist. School psychology training has not yet integrated training in the specialized statistical and methodological procedures inherent in single case research. This workshop focused on transferring skills to researchers and practitioners on how to use technology, select and apply appropriate mathematical analyses, and use the results for data-based decision-making. Instruction and training on these types of measures hold benefit for researchers (e.g., program evaluation, single case outcome, treatment evaluation) and for practitioners (e.g., intervention planning, RtII decision-making). These types of calculations can now be obtained via free web tools.

### Ethics

Drs. Marolyn Morford and Shirley Woika presented an ethics workshop entitled “From Start to Finish: Ethics, Procedures and Perplexities of Working with Children.” They provided an ethical problem solving model than compared and contrasted ethical practices for psychologists in private practice versus those in school settings. Topics included consent, record keeping, confidentiality, releasing test materials/protocols, and maintenance of records. The piece of information that generated the most discussion was related to retention of records for a period of six years in school settings. Many participants reported that their districts maintain records for 100 years. Although Category A records must be maintained for at least 100 years, special education records are not included in Category A. A Penn\*Link dated November 9, 2009 and authored by John Tommasini, Director of the Bureau of Special Education, clarifies this issue by stating “The Pennsylvania Department of Education, Bureau of Special Education, requires that educational records for special education students be maintained for six years.” For additional information, check out the Penn\*Link.

## FALL CONFERENCE REVIEW

### Interview Tips and Hints

Nikole Hollins and Wendy Masson, school psychologists for Harrisburg School District addressed interview etiquette and process within the field of school psychology. These presenters brought experience from both sides of the interview process. The presentation clarified the different procedures for the completion and submission of resume/curriculum vitae, sample reports, letters of recommendation, transcripts, and clearances. The main emphasis of this presentation was the contrasting processes across potential employers and the importance to adhering to their specific protocols and guidelines. The use of application portals, electronic portfolios, and organization of materials will differ among potential employers. Being aware of these differences and catering applications and interviews to the target audience

can make the difference in consideration for hiring.

The concluding activity in this presentation was an interactive mock interviewing activity. The presenters split the attending participants into intimate groups and presented interview questions they had both been asked during interviews and of which they had asked in interviews. The interviewers then critiqued responses and introduced how some scoring techniques are utilized in the interview process. The final idea emphasized in the presentation was the concept of the interactive interview. Potential candidates should also take some initiative in interviewing during the interview. This interaction clarifies wellness of fit in the position for which they are being interviewed. Preparing these questions prior to the interview can also make the difference in the presentation of a well-prepared interviewee.

### Social Media

Kevin Kelly, school psychologist for Quakertown Community School District and adjunct professor at Lehigh University, and Rebecca Kelly, high school librarian at Quakertown Community School District, presented an interactive training in the use of social media within the field of School Psychology. As the technology progresses, the availability of online learning communities has increased. The promotion of these materials and resources are becoming integrated through the use of social media. Tools such as Twitter, Facebook, Instagram, and LinkedIn provide a medium for distribution and awareness of current research, trends, and best practices within professional fields. Professionals can share professional development opportunities, experiences with effective strategies, and current issues for advocacy. Social

## Scenes from the 2013 ASPP/PSU Fall Conference





media is currently creating stronger communication and cohesion within professional contexts.

The presentation consisted of instruction of the social media tools such as Twitter, Facebook, Instagram, and LinkedIn. The facilitators linked the participants to current resources available through social media tools, and also hosted an online learning environment using Twitter. Through the Twitter online learning thread, school psychologists, school counselors, and teachers posted useful resources and shared experiences. This form of communication fosters reflection and development within professional practices. The use of social media in professional development can assist in affordable provision of development within the field of school psychology.

Additional highlights of the conference included the awarding of the 2013 School Psychologist of the Year

(SPOTY) to Dr. Della Toffalo. (See review of his accolades in this issue of *InSight*). Congratulations to Dr. Della Toffalo for his much-deserved award! Elizabeth Mason, secretary of ASPP and professor at California University of Pennsylvania, also received the annual Service Award for her nearly 30 years of active participation on the ASPP Executive Board. Thank you, Dr. Mason, for your continued dedication to ASPP and the field of school psychology.

ASPP thanks those who committed their time to present their work and to those who attended the conference. We look forward to seeing even more presenters and attendees at the fall 2014 ASPP/PSU Conference in October, with dates to be determined soon, at the Ramada Inn in State College. Lastly, thank you to all who contributed to this comprehensive conference review.

**Julie Vandervort, MEd**, is a second-year student in the Post-Master's Certification in School Psychology program at Indiana University of Pennsylvania.

**Latitia Lattanzio, MEd**, is a second-year student in the Doctorate of Education in School Psychology program at Indiana University of Pennsylvania.

**Kathleen Policastro, BA**, first-year student in the Master's of Science in School Psychology program at Eastern University.

**Andrea Schachner, MAT**, is a doctoral student in the School Psychology program at Duquesne University.

**Isaac Tarbell, MEd**, is a second-year student in the Post-Master's Certification in School Psychology program at Indiana University of Pennsylvania.

**Rachel Tomon, MEd**, is a doctoral student in the School Psychology program at Duquesne University.

**Hillary Turner, MEd**, is a third-year doctoral student in the School Psychology program at Duquesne University.

**Shirley Woika, PhD**, is a licensed psychologist, certified school psychologist, and associate professor at The Pennsylvania State University.



Special thanks to Clarence Anderson for submitting these photos.

## It's As Easy As 1, 2, 3!



—Neal Hemmelstein

Taking good care of yourself is simple. Though simple, not easy. Though difficult, well worth the trouble.

I have observed, practiced, and combined

below a set of principles that guide us in our quest for improved self-care. Notice, I did not make claim to these principles/ideas. You will notice that 1-2-3<sup>2</sup> includes nothing new. I have never had an original thought, but I know good ones when I hear them. My favorite expression is “to enjoy my (or) oneself.” 1-2-3<sup>2</sup> provides a parsimonious map toward just that.

Notice 3<sub>1</sub> below: “We have three basic needs. We need to feel respected, recognized, and appreciated.” Consider this as a possible working definition for the term “to love.” And consider the expression, “One can’t love another until one loves oneself.” Now consider this:

Love is learned. Our ability to love another is limited only by our ability to love ourselves. We learn to love by the model our parents provided in their love of us. We apply that model to loving ourselves, upon which time we can love another. Only when we respect, recognize, and appreciate ourselves can we receive or provide another’s respect, recognition, and appreciation.

All of us have these less-than-perfect models (our parents’ love of us) because our parents are humans and had parents who were limited by the level of love they had for themselves and on and on through the generations. That is not to say that children cannot come to love themselves more than their parents loved themselves; it is just a slow, if any, improvement across the generations. “They” say it takes three generations of the absence of physical (or sexual) abuse to remove it from a family system. So, our parents’ self-love (or absence of) is not a limit to our self-love, it is simply a very strong influence. I have always claimed it would be much easier to be a parent if we were not human; howev-

er, if we were not human we could not provide a model of being human for our children.

1-2-3<sup>2</sup> is the framework within which I work with my clients. 1-2-3<sup>2</sup> is the framework within which I work on myself. I have referred above to 1-2-3<sup>2</sup> as a set of principles that guide us in our quest for improved self-care. I hold the belief that virtually all human actions/behaviors are simply skills (or skill sets). Think of 1-2-3<sup>2</sup> as not only a set of principles, but also a set of skills. And all skills improve with practice.

Take my word that practicing 1-2-3<sup>2</sup> is worth the trouble to check out for yourself. You will then see/experience for yourself the pay-offs quickly, thus reinforcing this practice and encouraging you to continue. Everything we do is for the pay-offs. We base whether or not something is “worth the trouble” on our assessment, observation, and experience of the pay-offs associated with a given set of behaviors/actions. 1-2-3<sup>2</sup> is “worth the trouble.” You’ll see.

### 1-2-3<sup>2</sup>!

- 1) GOAL: To improve self-care (also known as “taking good care of ourselves”). Defined as:
  - a) having a good time (“to enjoy myself” is my favorite action)
  - b) improving our understanding of how our feelings affect our actions
  - c) improving our understanding of how our feelings and actions affect another
  - d) improving our understanding of how another’s feelings and actions affect us
  - e) identifying and sharing how we feel with those that care about us
- 2) We have two primary sources of power (to have things the way we want):
  - a) knowing how good we are
  - b) keeping agreements with our selves and with others
- 3) 3<sub>1</sub>: We have three basic needs. We need to feel respected, recognized, and appreciated.

*Respect*- the acknowledgement of (I am)

*Recognition*- the identification of (I am Neal)

*Appreciation*- the valuation of (I am Neal. He is good.)

3<sub>2</sub> Improve my ability to notice, remember and repeat my own good work. What we notice, we can remember. What we remember, we can repeat. Developing an understanding and awareness of our basic needs will contribute to developing and tapping our two primary sources of power (to have things the way we want) that will result in improved self-care.

3<sub>3</sub> Rules:

- a) Treat others as I wish them to treat me, but I am not holding my breath. (Golden Rule)
- b) Treat myself as I wish others to treat me. (Platinum Rule) [Or: I deserve to be treated well. That includes how I treat myself!]
- c) Be true to myself.

Only when I do unto others, as I want them to do unto me can I ask them to do unto me in the same fashion. However, while I can ask, I cannot expect. That is what I mean by “not holding my breath.” And the better I get at following the first two rules, the better I will understand what it means to be true to myself.

Think of “1” as the seat on a three-legged stool. Think of the 3<sup>2</sup> (3x3) as the three legs of the stool.

We support ourselves as our respect, recognition and appreciation for ourselves grow.

We support ourselves by noticing, remembering and repeating our good work.

We support ourselves through the practice of the Golden Rule, the Platinum Rule, and being true to ourselves.

*Neal Hemmelstein is a certified school psychologist and licensed psychologist in State College, PA. He serves as the Chair of ASPP’s Professional Practice Committee.*



# When Students Sext: What School Psychologists Need to Know



– Joshua M.  
Boden

It was the weekend before her sophomore year of high school, and Audrie had been invited to a party.

Older kids would be there, and there would likely be a lot of drinking, but no way would she miss it.

What exactly happened at the party remains somewhat unclear, but dozens of cell phone pictures and videos tell most of the story. At some point, Audrie was led upstairs and, nearly unconscious from the alcohol, undressed and photographed by three male classmates. She spent the next couple of days frantically text messaging friends – including the boys at the party – to piece together what happened and desperately demand the pictures be deleted. They weren't; instead, they were sent around. After a week of nasty text messages and smirks from peers and strangers, the humiliation proved too much. Fifteen-year old Audrie left school early, locked herself in her room, and hung herself.

What makes this tragic story even more terrible, besides the fact that it is entirely true, is that it is increasingly familiar (Burleigh, 2013). Stories like this have emerged all over the world, including several high profile incidents in Pennsylvania (Calvert, 2009). These expose an unprecedented problem not only for adolescents but also for parents, educators, police, criminal courts, and legislators. Although technological innovation has promoted advancement in communication and education, there is a dark side to all of this rapid growth that must not be ignored.

Anyone who knows a teenager can recognize that a cell phone is not merely an accessory to an adolescent's world, but a social centerpiece in nearly all areas of life (Judge, 2012).

Texting, in particular, is a phenomenon widely observed, but poorly understood. How teens text and use mobile technologies are not just trends of a passing fad, so we must consider how much of this generation's development occurs in significant relation to these technologies (O'Keeffe & Clarke-Pearson, 2011).

## What It Is

For those whose only exposure to sexting comes from the scandalous exploits of politicians, perhaps a proper introduction is in order. Although several definitions have been proposed for the identification and study of sexting as a behavior, the emotional, social, individual, and even legal complexities of the behavior are significant. Broadly defined, sexting is the "sending of sexually explicit messages or images by cell phone" (Merriam-Webster, 2013, para. 1).

Sexting is commonly understood in the media and even by advocacy groups as an adolescent activity, yet distinct from child pornography in that the images are produced and transmitted by the identified victims themselves (Collins, 2012). This definition fails to account for the fact that sexting can be either voluntary or coercive, especially among youth. Perhaps the best conceptualization of sexting is "youth-produced sexual images" (p. 1) that are transmitted through any digital medium to anyone, minor or adult (Wolak & Finkelhor, 2011).

The question of prevalence is a tremendously difficult one to answer. Not only must we rely on self-report for estimations of this illicit behavior, but with the rapid expansion of digital access among teens, figures are constantly changing. Early and oft-cited reports that up to 20% of teens engage in sexting have been replaced by a more modest estimate in the single digits (Mitchell, Finkelhor, Jones, & Wolak, 2012). This has led some

researchers to suggest that concerns about teenage sexting behavior may be exaggerated (Lounsbury, Mitchell, & Finkelhor, 2011). Yet the same researchers noted that 7% of teenagers report receiving a nude or semi-nude image of another teenager; other studies report that 15% have received such an image (Lenhart, 2009). Even if rates of participation are lower than previously thought, it is important that educators recognize that it only takes one text, one leaked image or video to the internet's eternal library to destroy a child's reputation or entire life.

## Why It Matters

Nothing that ever hurts or traumatizes a student is welcome by a school or its staff. Yet several high-profile suicides and criminal cases have shown how devastating sexting can be to students, families, and entire school systems. A primary reason for this is the permanence of digital media. A digital image, no matter how it is produced, is virtually impossible to destroy once it has been shared or posted. This basic fact of the digital age is one that few truly grasp until it is too late, until students have been abused and schools and support staff are embroiled in lengthy and grim legal proceedings. There are no winners here.

An understanding of the clinical and developmental significance of sexting behavior and its correlates is imperative; essentially, why do teenagers sext? The answers to this are beyond the scope of this article, but are well worth exploring (see Calvert, 2009; Chalfen, 2010; Judge, 2012; Palfrey & Gasser, 2008). Yet we should understand the complexity of sexting behavior and how its consequences may be felt both by victims and perpetrators. It is recognized that although sexting may begin in the throes of amorous experimentation, the "vicissitudes of adolescent rela-

tionships” combined with the speed of digital transmission can rapidly transform the behavior into something dangerous and even malicious (Judge, 2012, p. 89).

In the event that sexting is associated with abuse and results in tragedy, school staff may find themselves in the middle of public controversy and even legal action. Such is the case in the story mentioned earlier, at a large public high school in California. The school is being sued for not responding to the harassment claims, and administrators are scrambling to quell the tumult and divisions among the student body (Burleigh, 2013).

### What We Can Do

So what can school professionals do to help prevent such situations? Since awareness of the issue is often lacking until it is too late, I propose education for students, parents, and school professionals. However, it is important that we do not vilify technology itself. More teens die every year from automobile accidents than any other cause, but we do not blame cars for that problem (Hinduja & Patchin, 2011). Instead, we have instituted guidelines and appropriate laws for youth in order to protect them. Mobile technologies are incredibly powerful tools, yet far too often we thrust them into the hands of young people and are mystified when tragedy strikes.

Even so, professionals must realize that responsibility is the norm. An oft-cited survey reported that 7% of adolescents have sent a nude or semi-nude image of themselves to someone else. This obviously, and importantly, means that the vast majority of teenagers, 93%, have never engaged in this sort of behavior (Hinduja & Patchin, 2011). This does not mean, however, that adolescents are completely safe, or that they have not been involved in the transmission of explicit and damaging material.

For these reasons, it is imperative that education is conducted three-fold: for students, for parents, and for school professionals. Students must be taught that although the internet is

wonderful, it can quickly turn dangerous. They must understand the permanence of digital images and the serious consequences – emotionally, socially, academically, and even legally – of sharing explicit material online. Others have written extensively on the evolving legal ramifications of exploitative sexting (see Judge, 2012; Ostrager, 2010).

In many of the most devastating cases, parents of teenage victims or perpetrators are the last ones to find out what has happened. Wherever we can, it is important that we help to educate parents about how their kids are using technology so they understand that the lines between what happens at school and what happens at home – and what happened at that house party on Friday – are virtually erased.

Finally, as school professionals we must educate ourselves and our colleagues about the prevalence of this problem and the devastation it can cause for students, families, and entire communities. We must be prepared for the day that a 7th grade girl refuses to come to school because a topless picture circulated amongst the entire grade overnight; we must plan for the morning after a group of senior athletes abuse a female freshman and send the video to all their teammates. Certainly we cannot control such behavior or its outcomes, but our preparation can save a student’s reputation at school, and maybe even his or her life.

As school psychologists, our ability to appropriately respond to such crises may seem limited, but our responsibility to understand the risk of exploitative sexting and prepare for its eventuality is significant. Mobile technologies are here to stay, along with all of the promise and danger they bring. Our best hope to prevent tragedy is to educate ourselves, our colleagues, and our communities and to prepare for the worst even as we encourage the best in our students.

*Joshua M. Boden, MEd, is a second-year doctoral student in the School Psychology program at Temple University.*

### References

- Burleigh, N. (2013). Sexting, shame and suicide. *Rolling Stone*, (1192), 48-55. Retrieved from <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=aph&AN=90265468&site=ehost-live&scope=site>
- Calvert, C. (2009). Sex, cell phones, privacy, and the first amendment: When children become child pornographers and the lolita effect undermines the law. *CommLaw Conspectus*, 18(1), 1-65.
- Chalfen, R. (2010). Commentary: Sexting as adolescent social communication. *Journal of Children & Media*, 4(3), 350-354. doi:10.1080/17482798.2010.486144
- Collins, M. (2012, February 15). *Federal child pornography offenses*. Testimony before the U.S. Sentencing Commission. Retrieved from <http://www.missingkids.com/Testimony/02-15-12>
- Hinduja, S., & Patchin, J. W. (2012). *School climate 2.0: Preventing cyberbullying and sexting one classroom at a time*. Thousand Oaks, CA US: Corwin Press.
- Judge, A. M. (2012). 'Sexting' among U.S. adolescents: Psychological and legal perspectives. *Harvard Review of Psychiatry*, 20, 86-96. doi:10.3109/10673229.2012.677360
- Lenhart, A. (2009, December). *Teens and sexting: How and why minor teens are sending sexually suggestive nude or nearly nude images via text messaging*. Retrieved from <http://www.pewinternet.org/Reports/2009/Teen-s-and-Sexting.aspx>
- Lounsbury, K., Mitchell, K. J., & Finkelhor, D. (2011). *The true prevalence of "sexting"*. Retrieved from <http://cola.unh.edu/ccrc/true-prevalence-sexting%E2%80%9D>
- Merriam-Webster (2013). Sexting. Retrieved from <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/sexting>
- Mitchell, K. J., Finkelhor, D., Jones, L. M., & Wolak, J. (2012). Prevalence and characteristics of youth sexting: A national study. *Pediatrics*, 129, 13-20. doi:10.1542/peds.2011-1730
- O’Keeffe, G., & Clarke-Pearson, K. (2011). Clinical report—The impact of social media on children, adolescents, and families. *Pediatrics*, 127, 800-804. doi:10.1542/pecls.2011-0054
- Ostrager, B. (2010). SMS. OMG! LOL! TTYL: Translating the law to accommodate today’s teens and the evolution from texting to sexting. *Family Court Review*, 48, 712-726. doi:10.1111/j.1744-1617.2010.01345.x
- Palfrey, J., & Gasser, U. (2008). *Born digital: Understanding the first generation of digital natives*. New York, NY: Basic.
- Wolak, J., & Finkelhor, D. (2011). *Sexting: A typology*. Retrieved from <http://cola.unh.edu/ccrc/sexting-typology>

# The Challenges of Emotional Disturbance Classification



– Jennifer G. David & Timothy J. Runge

School psychologists' evaluation reports and eligibility determinations are increasingly scrutinized by parents, advocates, and lawyers seeking compensatory education for perceived failures in programming. This increase in litigation and our basic tenet of advocating for all students should make school psychologists even more vigilant in their assessment practices and eligibility determinations. While many disabilities identified in the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act (IDEIA) have clear and definitive criteria for making sound eligibility determinations, the lack of clarity regarding an emotional disturbance classification remains. It is likely that the imprecise criteria coupled with questionable assessment methods make this one of the most challenging eligibility determinations considered by school psychologists. As defined by federal regulation, an emotional disturbance (ED) is:

- (i) a condition exhibiting one or more of the following characteristics over a long period of time and to a marked degree that adversely affects a child's educational performance: A) An inability to learn that cannot be explained by intellectual, sensory or health factors. B) An inability to build or maintain satisfactory interpersonal relationships with peers and teachers. C) Inappropriate types of feelings under normal circumstances. D) A general pervasive mood of unhappiness or depression. E) A tendency to develop physical symptoms or fears associated with personal or school problems.
- (ii) The term includes schizophrenia.

The term does not apply to children who are socially maladjusted, unless it is determined that they have an emotional disturbance (IDEIA, 2004; 34 C.R.F. 300.8).

Furthering the debate regarding how to operationalize ED is a statement by the 8th U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals in the case *Independent School District No. 284 v. A.C. by C.C.*, 35 IDELR 59. The court noted in its opinion, "read naturally and as a whole, the law and the regulations identify a class of children who are disabled only in the sense that their abnormal emotional conditions prevent them from choosing normal responses to normal situations" (8th Cir. 2001). So the question remains: what constitutes "abnormal emotional conditions" that must be evidenced under "normal situations" for an ED classification to be rendered?

As many researchers and school psychologists have pondered for decades, the vague definition of ED does not easily lend itself to the research-based measures and practices on which we must ethically rely for eligibility determinations. Duration of condition, magnitude of impact on educational performance, and what constitutes educational performance, though referenced in the regulations, are not operationally defined. In addition to these ambiguous constructs, five features are also presented. Though only one is required for eligibility determination, each is equally veiled in confusion.

Practicing school psychologists are left with the ever-present and daunting task of interpreting these regulations and using assessment methods to support or rule out this eligibility classification. The remainder of this article will focus on various dimensions of the federal definition and a general review of assessment tools and procedures within our repertoire that can be used to operationalize these criteria. A brief literature review will be embedded throughout to discuss school psychologists' assessment practices, challenges associated

with defending this disability classification, and recommendations to remediate assessment challenges.

The first unclear construct within the federal definition, "An inability to learn not explained by intellectual, sensory or health factors," or the "inability to build or maintain satisfactory relationships with peers and teachers" both suggest that learning, relationship building, or relationship maintenance are deficient (Individuals with Disabilities Education Act [IDEA], 2004). One could argue that mental health disorders are health factors, and as such, completely contradict the frontloaded criteria of this definition. From a problem-solving perspective, the initial eligibility statement is confusing and sets a highly negative tone for the student, special education programming, and outcome expectations.

Moving beyond inability in learning and social skills, the federal definition also presents concerns with "inappropriate types of feeling under normal circumstances," and a "general pervasive mood of unhappiness or depression" (IDEA, 2004). While the presence of these conditions is quite real and concerning, Barnett (2012) opined "the existing criteria (for emotional disturbance) are based on research conducted over five decades ago, on children that had limited exposure to violence, trauma, substance abuse, and other societal factors that pose challenges to practitioners in contemporary educational settings" (p. 26). What may have been considered normal circumstances decades ago is clearly not the reality of today's world, and students' feelings about their current conditions may promote a pervasive mood of unhappiness or depression. Moreover, case law indicates that a student does not need to exhibit psychosis, delusional thoughts, or bizarre or dangerous behavior (*Torrance Unified School District v. E.M.*). What appears most important in judging if this criterion is met is whether the child's reaction to everyday events (e.g., bullying, public chastisement) would be considered typical compared to the



reactions of peers under similar circumstances. If a student reacts substantially different, whether in terms of intensity, topography, etc., than what peers would likely exhibit, then this criterion has likely been met. Minimally, school psychologists must be cautious when attempting to measure what is normal and the appropriateness of such feelings and emotions within the current social and global climate.

Of all five features within the ED classification, "A tendency to develop physical symptoms or fears associated with personal or school problems" is perhaps the most operationally defined (IDEA, 2004). Somatization is an area included within many standardized behavior rating scales and can be quantitatively measured. Other modes of assessment, including observations, historic health records, and interviews combine to yield good evidence to support the presence or absence of this condition. Current best practices appear to assist school psychologists in determining whether this criterion has been met.

Regarding mental health classifications, "Emotional disturbance includes schizophrenia" (IDEA, 2004). Though this inclusion is obvious, interestingly, no other mental health diagnosis is noted. Mental health diagnoses and their categorical criteria under the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM-5) make determining the presence of the disorder more clear. It is curious that this one disorder is named within the federal definition whereas others such as depression and anxiety and merely alluded to in the definition. A more definitive classification criteria may be warranted for eligibility in this case.

Finally, no regulation review of emotional disturbance criteria would be complete without pointing out the highly debated and ill-defined social maladjustment exclusionary clause. As written, "the term does not apply to children who are socially maladjusted, unless it is determined that they have an emotional disturbance" (IDEA, 2004). While the controversy continues, this area has been extensively reviewed in the literature. Attempts to define social maladjustment are geared toward purposeful or goal-oriented behavior (Kelly, 1989; Merrell & Walker, 2004; Olympia et al., 2004). Within their review of the prob-

lems associated with differentiation between the two poorly or ill-defined constructs of ED and social maladjustment, Merrell and Walker (2004) indicated that the "fatal flaw" or "Achilles' heel" of this task is in the comorbidity and co-occurrences of common features between externalizing conduct problems and a variety of other behavior and emotional disorders. Not surprisingly, the Education Department refused requests in the comment period of the 2006 IDEA Part B regulations to add a definition of social maladjustment, concluding there was no consensus on the definition (Federal Register 46550, 2006).

Considerable research and guidance are needed given the lack of specificity in the federal definition of emotional disturbance. Della Toffalo and Pedersen (2005) investigated the effects of psychiatric diagnosis on school psychologists' eligibility decisions regarding emotional disturbance. Using hypothetical referral forms and related vignettes, the 215 Pennsylvania school psychologist participants were asked to consider presented information and rate the perceived likelihood of concluding the child should be considered eligible or ineligible for special education services under the classification of ED. Results of this study suggested that when a psychiatric diagnosis was available as part of the referral information, the students were more likely to be considered eligible as ED. Further, presence of a psychiatric diagnosis even when the student did not meet the federal eligibility criteria for ED resulted in equivalent determinations of eligibility as when the child met the criteria under the federal definition but did not have a mental health diagnosis. Conclusions, therefore, suggest that school psychologists may inappropriately value externally-provided psychiatric diagnoses as an acceptable replacement for eligibility criteria required under the federal definition. Therefore, school psychologists need a system of best practices to guide ethically-responsible ED eligibility determinations.

As discussed in the literature, there are best practices to aid school psychologists and multidisciplinary teams in determining whether a student is eligible under the classification of emotional disturbance. McConaughy and Ritter (2008) outlined these practices through

a multi-method assessment approach which considers a comprehensive assessment of the nature, duration, severity, and patterning of the student's problems, as well as the environmental circumstances and other factors that may precipitate or maintain the problems. These assessments include standardized behavior rating scales, interviews, observations, and comprehensive record reviews which consider environmental factors, behavior and emotional problems, social functioning, and school functioning.

Standardized behavior rating scales, including self-reports, are perhaps the most widely used and defensible instruments within the battery of a multi-method evaluation for an emotional disturbance. Examples of such measures include, but are not limited to the Emotional Disturbance Decision Tree (EDDT; Euler, 2007), the Behavior Assessment System for Children-Second Edition (BASC-2; Reynolds & Kamphaus, 2004), the Achenbach System of Empirically Based Assessment (ASEBA; Achenbach & Rescorla, 2001), the Scale for Assessing Emotional Disturbance – 2nd Edition (SAED-2; Epstein & Cullinan, 2010), and the Adjustment Scales for Children and Adolescents (ASCA; McDermott, Marston, & Stott, 1993). These instruments can be administered to multiple raters in different environments to gather perspectives of a student within the context of alternate settings. Benefits of these measures include evidentiary psychometric values, quantifiable information, and standards of comparison that can aid in the identification of atypical behavior. Additionally, actuarial (i.e., statistical) procedures can be applied to the data which provide for more reliable and valid interpretation of syndromes. Such is the case, for example, with the ASCA (see <http://edpsychassociates.com/Watkins5.html> for more details). While standardized behavior rating scales are the most psychometrically-sound features of a multi-method assessment for emotional disturbance, they are also limited in that they identify the presence of problematic behavior but do not provide evidence to the cause. Further, ratings provided by caregivers can be somewhat subjective given they are based on the percep-

tions of the respondent. In addition to the recognition of the data source, school psychologists are encouraged to become expertly familiar with behavior rating scales to know the strengths and weaknesses of their assessment tools, to assure they are an appropriate match for the student being assessed, and that they are valid and reliable measures that can hold up to scrutiny. Not all rating scales are created equal, so be extremely familiar with the normative sample and standardization procedure. Actually read the technical manual – you will learn quite a bit about the merits of an assessment instrument.

Perhaps the most informative, and yet the least utilized, method of gathering additional information about a child's suspected ED is the parent interview. While parent input forms are often utilized to gain a general perspective of the student, they are frequently reported to not be followed by any direct contact with the parent to gain additional information. The Child and Family Interview Form (McConaughy, 2005) and the BASC-2 Structured Developmental History (Reynolds & Kamphaus, 2004) are recommended to make this process efficient yet comprehensive. These interviews can provide the basic family information related to demographics, medical and developmental history, mental health issues, and behavior. More clinically-based, structured interview measures, which align to DSM-5 classification criteria, can also be used if considering a particular diagnosis which may require a referral to outside mental health agencies. Sattler (1998) and McConaughy and Ritter (2008) provide an excellent listing of available structured interviews specific to presenting referral questions.

Teacher interview data are essential in determining the impact of emotional and behavioral problems on the student's school performance. Given the amount of time spent within the classroom settings, teacher perspectives related to student performance provide critical information when seeking to identify the presence or absence of an ED. As with all information gathered through interview processes, school psychologists should again consider

the information within the context of a global view, to determine if reports are consistent with other sources and what adjustments could be recommended within the classroom setting to promote student success.

While interview information and perspectives of behavior through standardized behavior rating scales are helpful indirect measures of behavior, direct observations are another assessment tool that can provide data to consider when determining eligibility under the classification of ED. Though less standardized, anecdotal observations and moment-in-time narrative information can be gathered related to setting events. This information can then be used to operationally define behaviors for which more structured systematic direct observations can be conducted. These standardized observational data collection procedures will provide quantifiable data for decision-making and program development. This data set also provides reasonable evidence to support eligibility determinations.

While the previously referenced multi-method assessment strategy is the recommended best practice for gathering evidence to classify a student under the disability of ED, the use of these methods in real practice has been questioned. Hanchon and Allen (2013) studied the assessment practices of school psychologists when determining eligibility for emotional disturbance and their perceptions of the language contained within the federal definition. The study participants consisted of 214 National Association of School Psychologists members who were surveyed on their evaluation procedures related to ED classification, the frequency and perceived value of the various assessment tools used, their opinions of the federal definition, and their overall understanding and comfort with the guidelines used to identify students under this classification. Findings indicated that although school psychologists recognize a need for a multi-method, multisource assessment protocol, in many instances their actual assessments are missing these commonly recommended data sources. The researchers further postulated that factors such as guidelines and requirements across states, individual prefer-

ences for certain tools and data collection methods, and unclear understanding of the federal definition of ED hinder appropriate or consistent eligibility determinations. Though this study considered best and actual practice for eligibility determination under the classification of ED, these researchers found that many school psychologists perceived that they generally understood the guidelines for eligibility determination and had higher levels of comfort when making emotional disturbance classification as years of experience increased. This finding is concerning given the ill-defined regulations noted earlier and the faulty assumption that increased experience results in more valid conclusions regarding students' eligibility as ED (Dunning, Heaht, & Suls, 2004; Levenson, Golden-Scadutoa, Aiosa-Karpas, & Ward, 1988).

In an effort to resolve the confusion in federal definition, Forness and Knitzer (1992) led the National Mental Health and Special Education Coalition to develop a new definition and classification title. The new title they proposed was:

- i. a disability characterized by behavioral or emotional responses in school, so different from appropriate, age, culture, or ethnic norms that they adversely affect educational performance. Educational performance includes academic, social, vocational and personal skills. Such a disability:
  - a) is more than a temporary, expected response to stressful events in the environment;
  - b) is consistently exhibited in two different settings at least one of which is school related;
  - c) is unresponsive to direct intervention in general education, or the child's condition is such that general interventions would be insufficient.
- ii. Emotional and Behavior Disorders can co-exist with other disabilities, and
- iii. This category may include children or youth with schizophrenic disorders, affective disorders, anxiety disorders, or other sustained disturbances of conduct or adjustment when they adversely affect educational performance in accordance with section i (p. 13).

This definition has not been adopted in regulatory reauthorizations, thus little

research has been conducted on establishing whether this proposed definition increases the reliability and validity of ED classifications above the current IDEA definition. It is the opinion of these authors that the proposed definition, while still containing some vague language, is an improvement over the current federal definition. Despite the fact that this definition is not adopted in federal or state regulations, it may be a useful set of criteria for practicing school psychologists and researchers to consider as they wade through the difficulties associated with the present definition.

Of several challenges that continue to face special education regarding children with emotional and behavioral disorders, the problem of eligibility is the most pressing (Forness & Kavale, 2000). Our charge as school psychologists is to advocate for the success of our students through comprehensive strengths and needs assessments, development of appropriate intervention recommendations, and progress monitoring of student performance. Assessment of ED continues to be a challenging task within the context of IDEA regulations due to the lack of definitive evidentiary eligibility criteria. While the recommended best practice in the field of school psychology does attempt to reduce these challenges through a framework of multi-method assessment, it is clear that many practicing school psychologists do not completely follow this framework and occasionally rely on other extraneous information to make ED classifications. Further, it is no surprise that common practices in assessment and identification of ED are not yet established nor employed. As such, future implications would warrant a modernized and more clearly-defined federal criteria for eligibility under the classification of ED, as offered above. A strong set of definitional criteria is one that would operationally define constructs using a common assessment structure and provide an explanation of the standards to determine if a student is in need of specially-designed instruction. Only then can school psychologists confidently identify students under the ED category.

## References

- Achenbach, T. M., & Rescorla, L. (2001). *Manual for the ASEBA school age forms and profiles*. Burlington, VT: University of Vermont, Research Center for Children, Youth and Families.
- Barnett, D. (2012). A grounded theory for identifying students with emotional disturbance: promising practices for assessment, intervention, and service delivery. *Contemporary School Psychology, 16*, 21-31.
- Della Toffalo, D. A., & Pedersen, J. A. (2005). The effect of a psychiatric diagnosis on school psychologists' special education eligibility decisions regarding emotional disturbance. *Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Disorders, 13*(1), 53-60.
- Dunning, D., Hecht, C., & Suls, J. M. (2004). Flawed self-assessment: Implications for health, education, and the workplace. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest, 5*, 69-106.
- Epstein, M. H., & Cullinan, D. (2010). *Scale for assessing emotional disturbance – 2nd edition*. Austin, TX: Pro-Ed.
- Euler, B. L. (2007). *Emotional disturbance decision tree*. Lutz, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.
- Forness, S., & Kavale, K. (2000). Emotional behavior disorders: Background and current status of E/BD terminology and definition. *Behavioral Disorders, 25*, 264-269.
- Forness, S., & Knitzer, J. (1992). A new proposed definition and terminology to replace "serious emotional disturbance" in the individuals with disabilities act. *School Psychology Review, 21*, 12-20.
- Hanchon, T. A., & Allen, R.A. (2013). Identifying students with emotional disturbance: School psychologists' practices and perceptions. *Psychology in Schools, 50*, 193-208.
- Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (2004) Part 300 A, § 300.8. Retrieved from <http://idea.ed.gov/explore/view/p/%2Croot%2Cregs%2C300%2CA%2C300%252E8%2C>
- Independent School District No. 284 v. A.C. (U.S. Court of Appeals, Eighth Circuit, August 3, 2001). 35 IDELR 59.
- Kelly, E. J. (1989). *Clarifications of federal eligibility criteria for students identified as "seriously emotionally disturbed" versus exclusion for the "social maladjustment" from C.F.R. part 300.5 (i) (A-E) and (ii)*. Nevada Clarifications, Las Vegas, NV: University of Nevada, Department of Special Education.
- Levenson, R., Golden-Scaduto, C., Aiosa-Karpas, C., & Ward, A. (1988). Effects of examiners' education and sex on presence and type of clerical errors made on WISC-R protocols. *Psychological Reports, 62*, 659-664.
- McConaughy, S. H. (2005). *Clinical interviews for children and adolescents: Assessment to intervention*. New York, NY: Guilford.
- McConaughy, S. H., & Ritter, D. R. (2008). Best practices in multimethod assessment of emotional and behavior disorders. In A. Thomas & J. Grimes (Eds.), *Best practices in school psychology V*, 697-713. Bethesda, MD: National Association of School Psychologists.
- McDermott, P. A., Marston, N. C., & Stott, D. H. (1993). *Adjustment scales for children and adolescents*. Philadelphia, PA: Edumatic and Clinical Science.
- Merrell, K. W., & Walker, H. M. (2004). Deconstructing a definition: Social maladjustment versus emotional disturbance and moving the EBD field forward. *Psychology In The Schools, 41*, 899-910. doi:10.1002/pits.20046
- Olympia, D., Farley, M., Christiansen, E., Pettersson, H., Jenson, W., & Clark, E. (2004). Social maladjustment and students with behavioral and emotional disorders: Revisiting basic assumptions and assessment issues. *Psychology in the Schools, 41*, 835-847.
- Reynolds, C. R., & Kamphaus, R. W. (2004). *Behavior assessment system for children – second edition*. Circle Pines, MN: American Guidance Services.
- Sattler, J. M. (1998). *Clinical and forensic interviewing of children and families: Guidelines for the mental health, education, pediatric, and child maltreatment fields*. San Diego, CA: Author.
- Singer, J. D., Palfrey, J. S., Butler, J. A., & Walker, D. K. (1989). Variation in special education classification across school districts: How does where you live affect what you are labeled? *American Educational Research Journal, 26*, 261-281.

**Jennifer G. David, MA, BCBA**, is a certified school psychologist working in the Western Wayne School District and is a doctoral student in school psychology at Indiana University of Pennsylvania.

**Timothy J. Runge, PhD, NCSP**, is an associate professor in the Educational and School Psychology Department at Indiana University of Pennsylvania.



## President's Message



– Julia Szarko

What an absolute pleasure it was to see many of you in October at the annual Association of School Psychologists of Pennsylvania (ASPP) / Pennsylvania State University (PSU) conference! I know that I personally found the conference to be packed with great information, sharing, and opportunities to interact with colleagues. Thank you to all of those who presented, volunteered, and organized the conference, especially Dave Lillenstein and Jim Glynn. Thank you also to those of you who attended and demonstrated your dedication to the field of school psychology. For those of you who could not make it – please join us next October in State College. It is truly an extraordinary conference with the best and the brightest in Pennsylvania.

Following the ASPP conference, I attended the National Association of School Psychologists (NASP) North East Leadership Meeting with Dick Hall (NASP Delegate), Caitlin Flinn (Executive Board Member), and Neal Hemmelstein

(Executive Board Member). At that annual meeting, the regional State Presidents and NASP delegates gather with NASP leadership to discuss issues including advocacy, membership, strategic planning, and organizational planning amongst specific training agenda items. During the weekend, we had the opportunity to hear from three school psychologists from Connecticut who work in the Newtown School District. They were gracious enough to share with our whole group reflections from the past year and suggestions for crisis planning. We were all deeply moved and deeply appreciative to hear their insight. My “take away” from the experience is that Newtown would like for us to remember Sandy Hook this year simply by paying forward – do something nice for someone in your life; have students do something nice for each other. Also, when a crisis of that extent arises, planning certainly helps without question, but one needs to be ready for anything. Use common sense and follow the direction of whoever is in charge at that point in time, as it will change depending on what level of security has arrived to trump the previous one in place.

In addition, on the first night of the regional meeting, each state presented a Positivity Portfolio. Some states made movies and PowerPoints that highlighted

the assets of their state organization. ASPP took a “no-tech” approach and presented a “Bucket Filler” Board based on the book, *Have You Filled a Bucket Today?* by Carol McCloud. The premise is that your ASPP Executive Board, all volunteers, is a bucket-filling team. Some examples of our ASPP bucket fillers include:

- Shirley Woika for arranging all of our student volunteers and working tirelessly at our Act 48 credit hours.
- Dave Lillenstein for keeping our relationship with Pennsylvania Psychological Association so positive.
- Matt Ferchalk and Caitlin Flinn for making our website, Facebook, etc. awesome! And for becoming Public Policy Institute (PPI) groupies.
- Perri Rosen, Jessie Kessler, Emily Stephenson, and Sierra Brown for executing the ASPP student committee into a reality with great success!
- Tim Runge for making *InSight* a leading newsletter and always staying on top of us to submit articles!

There was one for each of our Board Members and I was extremely proud to share them with the North East Leadership. Thank you to all of you, as well, for your ASPP membership and dedication to the field of school psychology. Keep filling buckets every day!

## An Introduction to the ASPP Student Committee

– Perri Rosen



The Association of School Psychologists of Pennsylvania (ASPP) Student Committee, otherwise known as GAASPP (Graduate Affiliates of the Association of School

Psychologists of Pennsylvania), is pleased to announce its inception! The mission of GAASPP, which is aligned with the broader ASPP mission, is as follows:

- To provide opportunities for student leadership and advocacy
- To promote relationships between ASPP and graduate school psychology programs
- To increase recruitment of graduate-level school psychology students to ASPP

Our newly formed committee includes a Board composed of four student members: Sierra Brown (Duquesne University), Emily Stephenson (Duquesne University), Jessie Kessler (Philadelphia College of Osteopathic Medicine [PCOM]), and Perri Rosen (Temple

University). These students serve as liaisons between the ASPP board and recently-appointed Program Representatives. Program Representatives were nominated by a faculty member from each school psychology training program throughout the state. GAASPP currently has Program Representatives nominated from nine programs – Bryn Mawr College, California University of Pennsylvania, Duquesne University, Eastern University, Edinboro University, Indiana University of Pennsylvania, Lehigh University, PCOM, and Temple University. Our goal is to connect with each program to facilitate greater connections among our student members statewide.

GAASPP’s first official meeting took place at the ASPP Conference in State College, PA on October 23, 2013. The Board and Program Representatives who attended the conference brainstormed a variety of projects aligned with our mission. The first project is an Internship Database that will provide information to masters and doctoral-level internship applicants (e.g., contact information, site specifics, application requirements, timeline) about sites throughout the commonwealth of Pennsylvania. At the meeting, we discussed the need for a more streamlined

resource that we can access easily, especially for those who are interested in relocating. Our first steps in this process involve reviewing and compiling our different program requirements, so we can make sure we are gathering the appropriate information. Another big focus for GAASPP is connecting with graduate students through social networks. We are currently in the process of developing some boards on Pinterest as a convenient way to share ideas and resources!

We want to extend our thanks to current ASPP board members for their encouragement in this process. This is truly an exciting time for the student members of ASPP because GAASPP is focused on several projects and activities that can improve student access to various opportunities and supports. Stay tuned for more information from GAASPP as we get our projects underway!

To offer suggestions or ideas, or to nominate a Program Representative, please contact Perri Rosen at [rosenp@temple.edu](mailto:rosenp@temple.edu).

*Perri Rosen, MEd, is a doctoral candidate in school psychology at Temple University and is presently completing her internship at Dery Township School District.*

## Advocacy Update



– Robert Rosenthal

There is a lot going on (as usual) in the world of public policy and advocacy when it comes to what impacts school psychologists. Locally, our governor has proclaimed that November 11-15 is now School Psychology Week. Being formally acknowledged by the highest lawmaker in our state is pretty awesome, and he deserves many kudos for that! I hope your own schools/districts/settings were able to do something fun for you that week.

The biggest legislative issue at the moment, that may affect us all, is that Congress must come to a budget agreement before January 15, 2014. Otherwise, our country will continue operating under a Continuing Resolution and the sequester will continue to have negative effects on our

public education system. Over the past two years, education programs have been cut by approximately \$4 billion dollars. These cuts have come at a time when K-12 enrollments have increased and state and local budgets have been deeply cut. Thus far, the sequester has been harmful to all students, but especially our most vulnerable. While there is certainly a need to address our federal deficit, across the board cuts are not the answer.

While congress has been unable to reauthorize the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, also known as No Child Left Behind, it is never a bad time to remind your legislators that you, as a school psychologist, support the inclusion of comprehensive psychological services and learning supports as part of the legislation. This same message can and should be made to our local representatives. At the state level, many of us are stressing the need for the comprehensive approach of multi-tiered systems of support with our state representatives. If enough of us meet with our

representatives and share our own stories of how effective this approach is, perhaps the pressure will result in actual legislation.

Finally, on February 18, 2014, at the annual convention in Washington D.C., the National Association of School Psychologists (NASP) is coordinating a NASP Hill Day. This is a day of training in the morning followed by meetings with your own representatives on Capitol Hill in the afternoon. If you are interested in participating in this, please contact me (rjrpsych@gmail.com). ANYONE can join in. It will be a very exciting opportunity for anyone interested in getting involved in advocacy. Even if you cannot make it, I cannot urge everyone enough to please go on the nasponline.org website and click on the Advocacy/Public Policy tab. There is a lot of great information you can see before you meet with a legislator. You can also easily write a letter to your legislator from that website. There is nothing more American than voicing your opinion to our elected officials.

## PSEA Liaison Report



– Ginny Kelbish

At the Pennsylvania State Education Association's (PSEA) Department of Pupil Services (DPS) Executive

Board Meeting held in early October at the PSEA headquarters in Harrisburg, the focus was on reviewing the positive feedback about the August 2013 conference and preparing for the 2014 conference to be held at The Penn Stater on August 6 and 7. Save the date!

Dennis Seaman, the former PSEA liaison for the Association of School Psychologists of Pennsylvania Executive Board, will act as conference coordinator.

Board discussion of interest to school psychologists included PSEA support of House Bill 1559 that mandates four hours of suicide prevention education every five years for educators in grades 6-12. Look on the PSEA website for the online DPS newsletter, *Impact*, and take a look at the Partners for Education website, [www.partnersforpubliced.org](http://www.partnersforpubliced.org). The website encourages connections between parents, educators, and their community.

## Save the Date!...

### PSEA Annual Conference at The Penn Stater (Aug. 6 & 7, 2014)

More details will follow so please check the ASPP website leading up to the convention.

*We look forward to seeing you!*

# ASPP Fall 2013 Election Results

The fall 2013 election results for Association of School Psychologists of Pennsylvania (ASPP) Executive Board have been finalized.



Congratulations to Julia Szarko who was re-elected as President for 2014-2015. Dr. Szarko is the current ASPP President and a nationally certified

school psychologist employed at Bridge Valley Elementary in Central Bucks School District, Doylestown, PA. This is her ninth year in the district. Dr. Szarko completed her undergraduate degree in psychology at the University of Richmond. Her MS and PhD degrees were completed at the Pennsylvania State University.

Dr. Szarko's professional interests include the assessment and education of individuals with Autism Spectrum Disorders as well as legislative/advocacy work for public education. Dr. Szarko has served as member and chair of the ASPP Advocacy Committee. Dr. Szarko attended the Public Policy Institute offered by the National Association of School Psychologists (NASP) in previous years and continues to participate in annual "Hill Day." As ASPP President, Dr. Szarko will continue influencing public policy through advocacy work and through raising awareness to others about the need of and the means to making our collective voice heard for students. She



also intends on increasing ASPP membership and active involvement and networking among members.

James Glynn has been re-elected as

the ASPP Treasurer. He also serves as the membership chair and on the conference committee. Mr. Glynn currently works as a school psychologist and administrator for the Mohawk Area School District in Bessemer, PA and has been with that district for the past 28 years. He spends most of his time carrying out the duties of the K - 12 school psychologist, working on the child-study team and developing 504 service agreements. Mr. Glynn resides in Cranberry Township, PA.

In addition, one regional delegate was re-elected and three new delegates were elected.



Lynn Zalnasky was re-elected as South West Delegate, having served in this capacity since 2003. Ms. Zalnasky is a certified school psychol-

ogist in the North Hills School District. She completed her MS in Education and CAGS in School Psychology from Duquesne University. She is completing the PsyD program in School Psychology and is currently an adjunct instructor at Duquesne University. Her professional interests include childhood anxiety and executive functions.

**South Central:** The ASPP Executive Board welcomes Kevin Kuhn, elected as South Central delegate. Mr. Kuhn is a nationally certified school psychologist currently employed in Eastern Lancaster



County School District. He completed his MS and School Psychology Certification at Millersville University and is presently enrolled in The

Pennsylvania State University's Applied Behavior Analysis certification program.

**South East:** Amanda Garrett was



newly elected as the South Eastern delegate. Dr. Garrett is a certified school psychologist in Pennsylvania and New Jersey, and she additionally holds her

national certification. She earned her BA in Psychology from The College of New Jersey, her EdS in School Psychology from Rider University, and her PsyD in School Psychology from Philadelphia College of Osteopathic Medicine. Dr. Garrett is currently working as a school psychologist in Council Rock School District. She is also at Introspect of Buxmont.

**North East:** Christina Marco-Fies



was elected as the North East delegate. Dr. Marco-Fies is a nationally certified school psychologist currently employed in the Muhlenberg School District. She

earned her BS in psychology from Lebanon Valley College and her MEd in educational psychology, EdS Certificate in school psychology, and DEd in school psychology from Indiana University of Pennsylvania. Dr. Marco-Fies' professional interests include response to intervention, data analysis teaming, and treatment integrity.

Congratulations to all those elected! The ASPP Membership appreciates and values your leadership.



## How Will You Serve?



– Timothy J. Runge

*“Ask not what your country can do for you; ask what you can do for your country. My fellow citizens of the world, ask not what America*

*will do for you, but what together we can do for the freedom of man.”*

Most of us would recognize at least the first half of this quotation as one of the most famous lines spoken in American history. While President John F. Kennedy made this quote famous in his 1961 inaugural speech, the statement is a slight variation from the original, authored by Khalil Gibran in 1925. We recognize the meaning of that statement: know your responsibilities toward society and the nation and comply with the same instead of questioning what the nation has done for you. Put another way, President Kennedy was imploring citizens to stand up and do something for their country so that the country could return in kind. Delivered at a particularly troubling time in our nation’s history, President Kennedy was pleading with Americans and citizens of the world to rise up and deal with the challenges of nuclear-armed superpowers at bitter odds with each other, the Cold War, and, at home, violations of the civil rights of Black and other minority Americans. President Kennedy’s call for service and sacrifice resonated with the American public,

especially important given that he had just narrowly won election as President. He knew he needed to bring Americans together toward a common cause. He, likewise, knew that everyone needed to band together and work toward a common good.

You no doubt, at this point, are wondering why you are being given a history lesson regarding responsibility toward society and nation. I firmly believe that President Kennedy’s words apply to us as a profession of school psychologists and our state association, the Association of School Psychologists of Pennsylvania (ASPP). You may grunt in bewilderment, “Huh?” More on that in a moment.

I have had the distinct pleasure of traveling across our Commonwealth in the past few years meeting many wonderful school psychologists. I often ask school psychologists I meet if they are members of ASPP. Some respond favorably with a “Yes!” I subsequently thank them for their membership. Some respond, “I let my membership lapse a few years ago.” Still others respond, “No, because I’m not sure what ASPP does for me.” In fact, on more than a few occasions, the conversation about what ASPP does or does not do for them is rather frustrating to me. I have heard far too often comments along this theme: ASPP doesn’t do anything for me, so why should I join ASPP?

A figure I bet you did not know: there are over 1,300 school psychologists in Pennsylvania – yet

approximately 33% are members of ASPP. ASPP advocates on behalf of all school psychologists in Pennsylvania, regardless of whether one is a dues-paying member or not. An illustrative case may be helpful. Nearly two years ago, the School District of Philadelphia (SDP) was threatening to slash its ranks of school psychologist in a misguided effort to reduce costs. While a very small number of SDP school psychologists were members of ASPP, that fact did not matter. ASPP Executive Board members Julia Szarko, Jason Pedersen, Jean Boyer, and many others worked tirelessly to help save school psychologist positions in that district. In kind, a number of SDP school psychologists joined ASPP – and for that we are grateful. The point is, however, ASPP advocated for all school psychologists – we did not discriminate based on whether the school psychologists in the SDP were members. Although not on the same scale, ASPP has advocated in other districts for school psychologists whose positions were threatened.

ASPP successfully advocated for you in the past year in a ways too numerous to count and in areas that you likely were not aware. For example, ASPP volunteers participated in the lengthy and productive development of the professional evaluation rubric on which all school psychologists will be assessed in the coming year. Instead of having a cumbersome, extremely problematic rubric crammed down our throats, Jason Pedersen, Dick Hall, and others

worked with the Pennsylvania Department of Education to craft an evaluation rubric with which we can live. At a time when districts are cutting services for students with disabilities and access to mental health professionals, ASPP stepped in to help. ASPP members lobbied our representatives and senators in Washington, DC to make sure that the interests of public education, services for students with disabilities, and access to high-quality mental health professionals in school were voiced to legislators. Most of us work for school districts where the professional development needs of school psychologists are often overlooked. No worries – ASPP steps in. David Lillenstein, Jim Glynn, Shirley Woika, and others volunteered considerable time to plan and deliver an exceptional annual conference in State College.

All of those are examples of individuals serving and sacrificing for all school psychologists, not just ASPP members. Still others have stepped up to offer their service in the past year. We have fresh faces and ideas on the ASPP Executive Board, specifically new regional delegates Megan Hutchinson and Ginny Kelbish. Perri Rosen and other graduate students across Pennsylvania restarted a student committee. Newly elected regional delegates Kevin Kuhn, Christina Marco-Fies, and Amanda Garrett will join the Board beginning in July. This influx of members increasing their service to ASPP is both welcomed and necessary for the Association to remain vibrant and relevant.

These individuals have heeded the call for sacrifice and service. Granted, they likely did not hear the words of President Kennedy when they decided to volunteer

for a committee or run for elected office. These individuals, however, know the importance of giving back to the association that advocates for all school psychologists in Pennsylvania.

So, hear the words of President Kennedy. Do not wonder what ASPP does for you. ASPP does a lot for you. Challenge your colleagues to become members of ASPP. And all members should find ways in which they can give back to the Association. What can you do for ASPP? At a loss for ideas? I have plenty, but here is a short list: thank active ASPP members for their service and sacrifice; attend the annual conference – you will likely learn a lot; submit an article to *InSight* about something innovative you or your district are doing; present your work at the annual conference; volunteer for an ASPP committee; consider running for a regional delegate position or officer position; or nominate a peer for the School Psychologist of the Year award. Arguably the simplest thing you can do is hand a colleague who is not a member this issue and encourage him / her to complete a membership application.

Mark Shields, political columnist and commentator for the Public Broadcasting Service, reminds us of just what happens when we serve and sacrifice for a larger good. Mr. Shields observed, "There is always strength in numbers. The more individuals or organizations that you can rally to your cause, the better." ASPP is only as strong as its members and what they sacrifice for each other. Instead of wondering why you should join and be active in ASPP, consider what you can do with us for all of us. We need everyone contributing in their own way. So, how will you sacrifice and serve?

## ***School Psychologist of The Year***

*(continued from page 1)*

of many trades," even the most experienced and knowledgeable are only "masters of some." That is why, according to Dr. Della Toffalo, members of ASPP must come together to consult with their peers to continue learning and developing expertise as well as to promote advocacy, leadership, and unification.

During his acceptance speech at the ASPP conference, Dr. Della Toffalo stated that one of the most rewarding part of his job is supervising interns. He encouraged seasoned practitioners to consider hosting interns as a way to increase their own job satisfaction and, while 'giving back' to the profession of school psychology. He also offered advice for new practitioners and students in the field. Dr. Della Toffalo urged early career school psychologists to keep building their skills by consulting liberally with their more experienced peers, to be involved in their schools, and to find ways to craft their roles within their district to increase the efficiency and efficacy of school psychologists and related services. For graduate students in school psychology training programs, Dr. Della Toffalo recommended that students continue to attend conferences and join their local, state, and national associations. Dr. Della Toffalo stressed that joining these associations and attending conferences provides networking opportunities and fuels that promote ones continued skill growth as practitioners.

*Marissa L. Beveridge, BA, is a first-year graduate student in the Master's of Education in Educational Psychology program at the Indiana University of Pennsylvania.*

*Elizabeth A. Larcher, MEd, is a second-year graduate student in the School Psychology Certification Program at the Indiana University of Pennsylvania. ■*

## October 23, 2013 ASPP Executive Board Meeting Review

—Timothy J. Runge

The Association of School Psychologists of Pennsylvania (ASPP) Executive Board (EB) met in State College, PA on October 23, 2013 during the annual fall conference. This was the fall quarterly meeting. The following is a brief summary of discussions and votes.

Elizabeth Mason, Secretary, submitted the Minutes from the June 8, 2013 meeting which were accepted. Jim Glynn, Treasurer, submitted the Treasurer's Report which was discussed and accepted. ASPP's balance remains healthy.

### Fall Conference Update

Jim Glynn, Conference Co-Chair, reported that attendance on the local talent day for the fall 2013 conference is consistent with previous years. Attendance for the full-day workshop by Dewey Cornell is higher than in the past few years. The conference plan for future years is to keep the breakout, local talent sessions on Day 1 and the Bernreuter lecture on Day 2. Shirley Woika, Professional Development Chairperson, reported that ASPP continues to partner with the Midwestern Intermediate Unit 4 to provide Act 48 credit for conference attendees.

### Student Committee

Perri Rosen, Temple University student and intern at Derry Township School District, will convene the ASPP Student Committee at this conference. All training programs in Pennsylvania were asked to nominate a student to serve on this committee. At present, students representing five training programs have agreed to participate. The committee will be meeting to develop a mission and solicit representation from other training programs in the state. Another consideration for the committee is a scholarship or small budget for student activities and the development of a social media site for students. One of the larger projects the committee would like to complete is an internship database for the entire state. The role of program repre-

sentatives would be to collect and warehouse these data. The committee may consider establishing criteria salient to program-specific requirements for internship when developing this database.

### Temple University Conference

Faculty in the school psychology program at Temple University approached ASPP for support in delivering its spring school psychology conference. The ASPP EB considered a number of options to support Temple. These will be brought back to the faculty at Temple for further discussion.

### Research Requests

ASPP has reviewed 14 research requests since January 2013. Timothy Runge reported that a number of state associations have witnessed a sharp increase in research requests this past year. Dr. Runge suggested revising ASPP's Research Policy to include a triannual or quarterly competitive review process. In this scenario, a certain, pre-established number of approvals would be granted with ASPP specifically endorsing these projects via social media and other communications. A second consideration to the review process would be a require-

ment that researchers provide documentation that they are members of their state association. These ideas and others will be discussed by the Communications Committee with recommendations presented to the EB at the January 2014 meeting.

### School Psychologist of the Year (SPOTY)

SPOTY discussion included considerations for expanded advertisement of the SPOTY award and nomination process. It was suggested that advertisements be sent out to allied professional organizations such as the Pennsylvania State Education Association and Pennsylvania Association for Gifted Education. Discussion also occurred regarding removing the requirement that nominees provide a candidate statement and, instead, request that they submit their curriculum vitae. The candidate statement would only be required if the successful nominee wanted to be considered for the National Association of School Psychologists SPOTY. Details will be forthcoming on official changes.

The next ASPP EB meeting is scheduled for January 25, 2014 in Hershey, PA.

## Nominate the Next School Psychologist of the Year (SPOTY)

Do you know a school psychologist who performs his or her job in an exemplary manner? A school psychologist who is respected by colleagues, parents and students for the work that they do?

Nominate that person for the Association of School Psychologists of Pennsylvania (ASPP) School Psychologist of the Year (SPOTY) Award!

To nominate an outstanding school psychologist simply go to the ASPP website, click on S.P.O.T.Y link at the top (or visit <http://www.aspponline.org/SPOTY.htm>), and follow these three steps:

1. Complete a Candidate Information form and the Nomination Statement
2. Have the nominee complete the Candidate Statement
3. Solicit and submit Letters of Support, one (1) is required, but you can include up to three (3)

These forms can be downloaded on the S.P.O.T.Y page at:  
<http://www.aspponline.org/SPOTY.htm>.

Act now to recognize the best work in the field!

Nomination forms must be submitted no later than September 12, 2014!

Please direct any questions to and return the completed packet to:  
Jason Pedersen, Nominations and Elections Chair and Past President at  
[jasonpedersen@verizon.net](mailto:jasonpedersen@verizon.net)





## 2013-2014 Membership Application

Yes, I want to join the Association of School Psychologists of Pennsylvania or renew my membership. Please complete the form below or, to speed your membership, **visit [www.aspponline.org](http://www.aspponline.org)**

First Name \_\_\_\_\_ Last Name \_\_\_\_\_ Degree \_\_\_\_\_

Home Address \_\_\_\_\_

City \_\_\_\_\_ State \_\_\_\_\_ Zip \_\_\_\_\_ County \_\_\_\_\_

Home Phone \_\_\_\_\_ Work Phone \_\_\_\_\_

School District/Employer \_\_\_\_\_

Employer Address \_\_\_\_\_

City \_\_\_\_\_ State \_\_\_\_\_ Zip \_\_\_\_\_ County \_\_\_\_\_

Position \_\_\_\_\_

**Region of School District/Employer:**

- Northwest – IUs 4-6, 27 & 28       North Central – IUs 9, 10, 16 & 17       Northeast – IUs 14, 18-21 & 29  
 Southwest – IUs 1-3, 7&8       South Central – IUs 11-13 & 15       Southeast – IUs 22-25

**Select Your Membership Term**

ASPP’s membership year runs from July 1-June 30.  
Select your expiration date depending on the time of year you are submitting your dues.

- Join or renew – **Current or New Member**  
Pay the indicated dues rate, and your membership is valid through June 30, 2014
- Join after January 1, 2013 – **New Members Only**  
Pay the indicated dues rate, and your membership will continue through June 30, 2015

**Select Your Membership Category**

- |                         | <b>Current or New Member<br/>Joining or Renewing<br/>Membership through<br/>June 30, 2014</b> | <b>New Members Only<br/>Joining after Jan. 1, 2014<br/>Membership through<br/>June 30, 2015</b> |
|-------------------------|---|---|
| Regular                 | <input type="checkbox"/> \$75   | <input type="checkbox"/> \$125  |
| Student                 | <input type="checkbox"/> \$25   | <input type="checkbox"/> \$45   |
| Early Career – 1st Year | <input type="checkbox"/> \$50   | <input type="checkbox"/> \$75   |
| Early Career – 2nd Year | <input type="checkbox"/> \$50   | <input type="checkbox"/> \$75   |
| Retired                 | <input type="checkbox"/> \$25   |   |
| <b>Student Members</b>  | Name of University _____:   |   |
|                         | Expected Graduation Year: _____   |   |
|                         | Degree: _____   |   |

**Current Membership(s):**

- APA     NASP     PPA     PSEA     Other \_\_\_\_\_

**Volunteer Interest(s):**

- Conference       Legislation       Membership  
 Newsletter       Public Relations       Regional Representative

**Ways to Join or Renew Online:**  
[www.aspponline.org](http://www.aspponline.org)

**Mail: Check payable to ASPP:** James Glynn  
Treasurer, ASPP  
425 Deerfield Drive  
Cranberry Twp., PA 16066

## ASPP 2013-2014 EXECUTIVE BOARD



### EXECUTIVE BOARD

\*President Julia Szarko  
Central Bucks School District  
Bridge Valley Elementary School  
2280 Sugar Bottom Road  
Furlong, PA 18925  
(W) (267) 893-3697  
E-mail: jszarko@cbsd.org

\*Past President Jason A. Pedersen  
Derry Township School District  
450 Homestead Ave., PO Box 898  
Hershey, PA 17033  
(W) (717) 531-2277 ext. 5405 (H) (717)  
329-8911  
E-mail: jasonpedersen@verizon.net

\*Secretary Elizabeth Mason  
117 Circle Vue Dr.  
Carmichaels, PA 15320  
(W) (724) 938-4397 (F) (724) 938-4406  
E-mail: mason@calu.edu

\*Treasurer James Glynn  
425 Deerfield Drive  
Cranberry Twp. PA 16066-4023  
(W) (724) 667-7782  
E-mail: schoolpsych@zoominternet.net

### DELEGATES

\*North Western Region (IUs 4-6, 27 & 28)  
Douglas A. Della Toffalo  
102 Oak Lane  
Harmony, PA 16037  
(C – preferred) (724) 496-5717  
(H) (724) 473-0126  
(W) (814) 676-8787 ext. 522  
E-mail: dxd32@yahoo.com

\*North Central Region (IUs 9, 10, 16 & 17)  
Megan Hutchinson  
131 W. Nittany Ave.  
State College, PA 16801  
814-231-5357  
E-mail: mmm29@scasd.org

\*North Eastern Region (IUs 14, 18-21  
& 29)  
Ginny Kelbish  
Antietam School District  
100 Antietam Road  
Reading, PA 19606  
(H) (610) 670-5148 (W) (610) 779-3547  
E-mail: gkelbish@antietamsd.org

\*South Western Region (IUs 1-3, 7 & 8)  
Lynn Zalnasky  
424 Mallard Dr.  
Cranberry Township, PA 16066  
(W) (412) 318-1514  
E-mail: zalnaskyl@nhsd.net

\*South Central Region (IUs 11-13 & 15)  
Frank J. Stanko  
South Western School District  
225 Bowman Rd  
Hanover, PA 17331  
(W) (717) 632-2500  
E-mail: frank.stanko@sbsd.k12.pa.us

\*South Eastern Region (IUs 22-26)  
 Ryan T. Kieffer  
 1828 Windy Hill Road  
 Lancaster, PA 17602  
 (H) (717) 399-3544 (W) (610) 593-8228  
 E-mail: rkieffer@octorara.org

Educator Delegate  
 Jean Boyer  
 Department of Psychological Studies in  
 Education  
 Temple University  
 265 Ritter Annex  
 1301 Cecil B. Moore Avenue  
 Philadelphia, PA 19122  
 (W) (215) 204-6090  
 E-mail: jaboyer@temple.edu

NASP Delegate  
 Dick Hall  
 3 Springview Drive  
 Lititz, PA 17543  
 (H) (717) 627-0193 (W) (717) 354-1509  
 E-mail: dick\_hall@elanco.org  
 hallsoftlitz@dejazzd.com

Student Delegate  
 Perri Rosen  
 Temple University  
 rosenp@temple.edu

### **COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSONS**

Advocacy  
 Jason Pedersen, Co-Chair  
 See Past President listing above.

Robert Rosenthal, Co-Chair  
 Abington School District  
 970 Highland Avenue  
 Abington, PA 19001  
 (W) 215-881-2552  
 E-mail: roserj@abington.k12.pa.us

Communications  
 Timothy Runge  
 Indiana University of Pennsylvania  
 242 Stouffer Hall  
 Indiana, PA 15705  
 (W) (724) 357-3788  
 E-mail: trunge@iup.edu

Newsletter Editor  
 Timothy Runge  
 See Communications listing above

Web Editor/Technology Coordinator  
 Co-Chair Matt Ferchalk  
 E-mail: mferchalk@norleb.k12.pa.us

Co-Chair Caitlin Flynn  
 E-mail: caitlinflinn@hotmail.com

Urban Affairs  
 Sarah Lorraine  
 1900 Wharton Street  
 Philadelphia, PA 19146  
 (W) (215) 952-6222  
 E-mail: slorraine@philasd.org

Conference  
 David Lillenstein, Co-Chair  
 Derry Township School District  
 450 Homestead Road, PO Box 898  
 Hershey, PA 17033  
 (W) (717) 531-2277 ext. 5436  
 E-mail: dlillenstein@hershey.k12.pa.us

James Glynn, Co-Chair  
 See Treasure listing above

Crisis Prevention and Intervention  
 (Ad Hoc)  
 Barbara A. Schaefer  
 The Pennsylvania State University  
 105 CEDAR Building  
 University Park, PA 16802-3108  
 (W) (814) 863-2405  
 E-mail: bas19@psu.edu

Diversity  
 Nikole Hollins, Chair  
 Rowland School  
 Harrisburg School District  
 1842 Derry Street  
 Harrisburg, PA 17104  
 (W) (717) 703-1412  
 E-mail: NHollins@hbgsd.k12.pa.us

External Relations  
 Kris Vitucci  
 Centerville Middle School  
 Hempfield School District  
 865 Centerville Road  
 Lancaster, PA 17601  
 (W) (717) 898-5578 ext. 2146  
 E-mail: Kris\_vitucci@hempfieldsd.org

Membership Support  
 James Glynn  
 See Treasurer listing above.

Nominations & Elections  
 "Jason Pedersen  
 See Past President listing above"

Professional Development  
 Shirley Woika  
 The Pennsylvania State University  
 138 CEDAR Building  
 University Park, PA 16802  
 (W) (814) 863-2421  
 E-mail: saw194@psu.edu

Professional Practice  
 Neal Hemmelstein  
 P.O. Box 426  
 Lemont, PA 16851  
 (W) (814) 867-2802  
 E-mail: honest.neal@gmail.com

Workshop  
 Ryan T. Kieffer  
 See Regional Delegate listing above.

### **LIAISONS**

PPA  
 David Lillenstein  
 See Conference listing above.

PSEA  
 Ginny Kelbish  
 See North Eastern Region Delegate list-  
 ing above.

\*Denotes an elected ASPP officer. All  
 others are appointed.



## ASPP/SPSY Sharing

Please share an accomplishment, fun moment, or something that you are proud of through your work as a school psychologist.

---



---



---



---



---



---



---

Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Place of Employment: \_\_\_\_\_

- Yes  I give permission to use this information on the ASPP website or in the *InSight*
- Yes  Use my name when sharing this information on the website/*InSight*
- NO**  **DO NOT** use my name when sharing this information on the website/*InSight*

**ADDRESS CHANGE?** Send new information to:  
James Glynn, 425 Deerfield Drive, Cranberry Twp. PA 16066-4023 • e-mail: jglynn@mohawk.k12.pa.us

*InSight* is the official publication of the ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGISTS OF PENNSYLVANIA which is an affiliate of the NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGISTS

*InSight* is published three times a year as a service to the ASPP membership. Copies are also sent to members of the NASP newsletter editors' network and to the chairs of the school psychology programs in PA. It is an open forum for news, views and issues affecting the field of school psychology.

ASPP is a nonprofit, nonpartisan, educational and scientific association of school psychologists with the goal of serving the educational and mental health needs of children within the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

The content of the newsletter and the opinions expressed by the contributors do not necessarily reflect the opinions or policies of ASPP or of the Executive Board members. Endorsement is not implied in the publication of product reviews, advertisements or announcements.

Comments, letters and articles relevant to the profession are welcomed. Articles and reports of factual information may be edited to conform to space and format limitations and/or to improve clarity without the permission of the author. Expressions of opinion, as in a letter to the editor and editorials, may be edited only with the author's consent. Unsigned letters or articles will not be published.

Articles can be submitted to the editor via E-mail or on a CD-ROM. Specify the word processing program used and enclose a hard copy. Typed articles will not be accepted. Contact the editor for further information.

All uncopyrighted material in this newsletter may be reproduced by reciprocating state newsletter editors provided that the source and author(s) are credited. The permission of the copyright holder is needed to reprint copyrighted material. Editors condensing or modifying a reprinted article are expected to so note to their readers.

**FUTURE DEADLINES:**

March 15, 2014      Spring '14 issue

Forward material to: Timothy Runge, *InSight* Editor  
E-mail: trunge@iup.edu

Design by: Ron Malec,  
RM Graphic Design  
Lititz, PA. 717-626-3013.  
E-mail: rmgraphicdesign@aol.com

Printed by: Lanco-Graphics, Lititz, PA.

Assistant Editor: Julie Vandervort