

CDSPP Minutes—November 10, 2006

1. The meeting opened with an extended discussion of the mid-winter meeting and the portion of the program devoted to School Psychology students (e.g., attracting minorities, developing new faculty, the problem of increasing number of practicum hours) and who was going to discuss what: current demographics of the field (Kathy Bradley-Klug), undergraduate courses (Stacy), the next generation of academics (Jean & Mike), and practicum hours (Ed Gaughan and Alan Coulter). Steve will contact someone from NASP re: reconciling NASP and APA re: practicum hours. Emphasis on the need to establish a balance between presentations and information sharing and discussion.
2. Debra Crockett (attracting minority students) and Tom Fagan (for the remembrance portion) have been confirmed. Harcourt has sent a check for the Friday luncheon. The Saturday luncheon has not been confirmed, but it may still take place.
3. Cythia Belar has been put on the agenda at the suggestion of Ed Gaughan to make a brief presentation re: news from APA. She will have 15 minutes.
4. We have to have a report of the association on the bylaws and a vote on the changes. This has also been placed on the agenda.
5. Thursday evening—we will most likely have a dinner cruise. LeAdelle and Elaine suggested that the remembrance portion of the program be a part of the dinner cruise; that would free up some time on the agenda for Saturday morning. This would enable us to have an extended discussion of students' interest in academia (e.g., Jean's presentation of the data from her survey; Mike's presentation of his review of the counseling literature re: training students for academia).
6. Someone should talk about the demographics of our students. How will we do that? We may not have the presentation since no one seems to have collected the data. Stacy may not need an hour and fifteen minutes for her presentation on courses for undergraduates in School Psychology.
7. Council for combined programs. They would like to meet concurrently with us. We have a request from Giselle Esquivel (as a representative of ADSP) to make a short presentation; wants to do a focus group on standards for school psychology practice at the district level. Not sure where we could fit it in. Could tell them that they could ask for volunteers to participate after the meeting ends at 2:30 on Saturday. Everyone seemed to like this idea.
8. We could invite APPIC; Jean will call Steve McCutchen to ask if they are sending anyone, and if so, who it is. Jean is our representative to APPIC and they are very interested in having us be more visible in their organization. Jean was asked and has written an article for their newsletter about school psychology and school psychology students. APPIC is wrestling with the increasing # of practicum hours students present who are applying for internships. Ed mentioned that this could be a problem for school psychology students because they typically have fewer hours than their counterparts in the other disciplines. Beth mentioned that all these issues are getting a lot of play. Board of Education Affairs, at the request of CTPC, the training council, has asked APA to fund a major study of the workforce, which is in the pipeline, to get legislators behind increasing the

amount of money to get more people into the workforce. The purpose would be to get more federally funded internships, which used to exist in greater numbers, but no longer exist, because of a lack of data to support the need for the money.

9. Mike—the biggest problem is getting students to become faculty; more and more programs have open rank positions to attract senior faculty from other programs. This is related to all of the other issues we have been talking about, e.g., excessive numbers of practicum hours. Are new graduates going the licensure route, or are they focusing more on research? Clinical internships can dissuade students from continuing in school psychology, and can encourage them to get licensure and pursue jobs outside of school psychology. Do we need to do more about advertising/promoting becoming faculty; are programs allowing students to do child clinical internships? We should talk about all of these things in our Thursday meeting prior to the start of the conference on Friday. Do programs know what they really want to train students for and are they clearly articulating the purpose of their training. Mike suggested we spend an hour talking about the aforementioned on Thursday and that he and Stacy present some preliminary ideas for people to consider whenever it is that they are on the agenda. We need to keep APPIC in this discussion because we need to know what school psychology students need to be competitive with clinical and counseling students.
10. Question from LeAdelle—APA has no interest in doing another trainer workshop for APA site visits (want to do this every other year) but they are interested in doing a workshop on preparing folios for site visits. Would CDSPP support such a workshop? Unanimous agreement to have the workshop.
11. Room arrangements—Who is sharing with whom? Everybody will get rooms assigned to them; universities will pay half the rate for each.
12. By-laws revisions—Beth sent a tracking changes file to the committee. Generated a list of things we are not doing. We need to do them or change the by-laws. We need to get the changes out to the programs for their consideration with a note that we will be voting on the changes at the mid-winter meeting. For example, CDSPP has not asked that the administrative officer (department chair or dean) of each unit (university) to designate the representative of member programs. Do we want to do that? We have not been having a vote on member applications (more or less, if you pay you are in). We should vote on new members at this year's Thursday meeting, just to make sure that all applications are appropriate. Elections—people are supposed to be nominated to be on the ballot and the secretary is supposed to send the nominations to all members of the EC. The EC votes for who they think should be on the ballot, then the secretary is supposed to construct a ballot that goes to the membership consisting of those who received the most votes from the EC. We have not been doing this; change the by-laws so that we can approve the ballot by a motion. Everyone agreed. Also, we are supposed to have 2 meetings a year but we have used conference calls in lieu of meetings; change the bylaws to say in-person, by conference call, virtual office meetings, etc. In addition, we have not been distributing minutes to the membership. Cannot remember when this was last done. Link minutes to the website. Are there any other suggestions for the members of the EC? Changes need to be posted on the web-site by December at the latest. Beth will set a deadline for the EC to get back to her

(11/28) for changes. Once vetted by the EC, put the changes on the list-serve and website and make an announcement to the membership to review the changes for a vote at the mid-winter meeting.

13. Deb Crockett's survey—How are we going to reconcile the purpose of Deb's survey, to identify sources of funding for minority students, with problems such as those associated with the state of Michigan and reverse bias? For example, there may be a problem with the language used on the form, as different states and institutions use different language to refer to the same thing (e.g., under-represented groups). How do we deal with funds that are available to all students, not just those from under-represented groups? Because of the wording and structure of the form, will it adequately represent the monies available at different universities? Is there a way to make the form more flexible so it will more adequately represent what resources are available? This form is a very big problem for states like Michigan and California, who cannot ask questions that are worded like these are worded. What if a question was reworded to ask if there were funds available to support the costs of flying in a minority applicant for an interview? That would avoid the problem of asking about funds designated for a particular group or groups? How should it be formatted? Check boxes would be easier. Would it be appropriate for the EC to get a designee from each program, who would be a contact person for potential students from under-represented groups? How do we want to proceed? Will the survey go out under the CDSPP name or should we ask Deb to send it out under the aegis of another organization? Shall we support her trip here?
14. Issues from the CTPC council: (a) accreditation assembly; who will be our representative. Stacy will go but Steve is also thinking of going. Motion put forth for the Board to pay the costs of whoever goes. Motion passed. (b) CTPC would like to have joint training council every 10 years. This decision will have to be made at the mid-winter meeting.
15. Jean—Will attend APPIC meeting in April if the EC wants her to. Has already been approved.
16. Beth will try to arrange one more conference call before the mid-winter meeting.