The TASP board has received requests from members to interpret and clarify the nature of informed consent when LSSPs are asked to participate on RtI teams or otherwise consult in schools. The issue is that in some districts LSSPs are being sidelined in the RtI process because of how some school districts are interpreting the TSBEP Rules of Practice regarding informed consent and psychological practice. This article highlights relevant TSBEP Rules of Practice in light of the Federal regulations of IDEA.

The TSBEP Rules of Practice (July 2008) state that the delivery of school psychological services in the public schools is “[uniquely different] … from psychological services in the private sector” (Rule 465.38). The Rules permit LSSPs to “… utiliz[e] psychological concepts and methods in programs or actions which attempt to improve the learning, adjustment and behavior of students”. Some of those programs and actions, including assessment of emotional or behavioral disturbance for educational purposes, are specified in the Rule, but LSSPs “… are not limited to…” only them. The Rules define “psychological services” [465.1(10)] to include “consultation” but don’t specify who receives the consultation or the form it might take. Rules 465.11 (a) and 465.1 (4) describe the “informed consent” that must be obtained before psychological services can be provided. This informed consent process is lengthy and detailed, in keeping with its purpose of protecting the public and facilitating client participation in the treatment process. The question becomes, then, how do IDEA regulations and RtI impact provision of school psychological services, and how can informed consent be understood in light of these recent developments?

I am indebted to Stacy Skalski, NASP’s Director of Public Policy, for providing the information that follows. Sec 614 (a) (1) (E) of IDEA “Rule of Construction” states that: “The screening of a student by a teacher or specialist to determine appropriate instructional strategies for curriculum implementation should not be construed to be an evaluation for eligibility for special education and related services.” Tier 1 activities include screening and data collection to identify students at-risk for learning problems and behavior problems that interfere with learning. The IDEA regulation clearly states that screening...
I hope everyone that attended the 16th Annual Professional Development Conference in San Antonio had a great time and learned a thing or two along the way! It was good to see you all again! And for those friends who couldn’t make it, we missed you!!!

Our numbers were down from last year, but given recent events (worsening economy and Hurricane Ike), I think we had a good turnout overall-529 attendees to be exact. The Conference Committee worked hard to put on a great conference, constantly looking for ways to improve. Special thanks go out to the following people: Mindi Jeter, Kelly Anderson, Laurie Klose, Maureen Hicks (Exhibits Chair), and Rebecca Ray (CALC Chair) for helping make the conference great! I could not have done all the work without my Committee. These fabulous ladies helped make my life much smoother and less stressed.

One item that I wanted to address was some complaints about the lack of information about a workshop’s content and the title of the workshop not matching the description. This information is provided to TASP by the speakers themselves. We simply take what they give us. We have little control over this issue.

Another item I wanted to follow up on was regarding the issue of CEU certificates. NASP and TSBEP require your attendance throughout the entire workshop from start to finish before you will be granted a CEU certificate. Therefore, if you arrive late or leave early or take an extended break, you may be denied credit for the entire length of the workshop. Please don’t take your frustrations out on the people handing out the CEU certificates-these are simply volunteers who are just doing what they were told to do. Especially recognize this fact when you are attending a 3 hour Ethics workshop-not attending the entire 3 hours of Ethics and trying to earn CEU credit is very unethical. Shame on you!

I hope you are making plans to join us for the next conference. Get out your calendars now and mark these dates:
Oct. 8-10 2009  Houston  Omni Westside
Oct. 7-9 2010  Dallas  Omni Mandalay (in Irving)

If you have questions or ideas about the conference or for future conferences, don’t hesitate to contact me! See ya’ at the next conference!!!

---

Tarleton State University School Psychology Program

Tarleton State is now accepting applications for the Masters of Science degree program in School Psychology. This program is offered at both the Stephenville and Killeen campuses and includes all required coursework for the Licensed Specialist in School Psychology (LSSP) in Texas and the Nationally Certified School Psychologist (NCSP). Coursework emphasizes the traditional roles of School Psychology; assessment and consultation, with a particular focus on counseling skills. Re-specialization to School Psychology from closely related fields is also available.

For information contact:
Stephenville: Dr. David Weissenburger (weis-senburge@tarleton.edu) 254 519 1995
Killeen: Dr. Coady Lapierre (lapierre@tarleton.edu) 254 519 5428
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Coady Lapierre
1901 S Clear Creek RD
Killeen TX 76549
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Awards and Honors Bestowed at Conference
Evelyn Perez
Awards and Honors Committee Chair

Good day TASP Members! As the TASP Awards and Honors Committee Chair, I wanted to take this opportunity to thank the membership for coming together to nominate your fellow members in recognition of their contribution to the field of school psychology. Each nominee had outstanding qualifications and recommendations that spoke highly of their skills and passion for the profession. For those of you that were unable to attend the conference, I would like to relay the winners and nominees in each category.

The nominations for Outstanding Graduate Student Award (Specialist Level) included: Andrea Dennison of Texas State University, Belsida Quinn of Sam Houston State University, Marquita House of Texas Woman’s University, and Lyndsey Garner of Abilene Christian University. The recipient of this award was Ms. Belsida Quinn of Sam Houston University. Ms. Jonelle Ensign of Texas Woman’s University was nominated and the recipient of the Outstanding Graduate Student Award (Doctoral Level). Dr. Carol Booth was nominated and received the Outstanding Service to the Profession Award. Taylor Callahan Education Cooperative was nominated and received the Outstanding Delivery of Psychological Services honor. The honors for Outstanding School Psychologist (Specialist and Doctoral Level) went to Cathy Veith and Dr. Jon Lasser. Please see Dr. Laurie Klose’s article for more on these nominees. Each nominee and honoree has made great contributions to the field of school psychology and deserves recognition. Thank you to their peers/nominators for honoring them, and once again, congratulations to each of them!
The Texas Licensing and Certification Experience:
Separating Fact from Fiction, An Eyewitness Account – Part 2
Published in The Texas School Psychologist Vol. 18 (4)
Daniel C. Miller, Ph.D.
Editors Note: This is the second in a series of articles by Dr. Miller.

Will the Real Texas School Psychologist Please Stand Up

By the early 1990’s in Texas, there was a bifurcated path of certification or licensure to work in the schools delivering school psychological services. Texas was one of the few, if not only state at the time, that did not require professionals who want to work in the schools in the capacity of a school psychologist to be state certified as school psychologists. The Texas Education Agency (TEA) did have four levels of certification in place: Professional School Psychologist, Professional Associate School Psychologist, Intermediate School Psychologist, and Intermediate Associate School Psychologist. The Texas State Board of Examiners of Psychologists (TSBEP) had two levels of license that were germane to the practice of school psychology: the licensed psychologist and the licensed psychological associate. To add to the growing list of who could call themselves a school psychologist in Texas, NASP introduced the Nationally Certified School Psychologist credential in 1989. TEA had no provisions in their special education rules for the NCSP credential.

Texas was only one of two states that required practitioners to be licensed by a psychologist licensing board before being certified by state department of education. In a somewhat double standard, TEA allowed practitioners who were licensed, but not certified, to work within the schools delivering school psychological services. Between 1976 and 1991, if you asked a practitioner who was delivering school psychological services what credential he/she used to work in that setting, you would get a varied response. The minimum entry-level credential to work in the schools delivering school psychological services was the Licensed Psychological Associate (LPA) from the TSBEP. The LPA required 42 hours of graduate training in psychology; however, no specialized coursework in school psychology was required. Therefore, in Texas in the 1970s through the early 1990s, there were many practitioners who had...
no specific training in or professional identity with school psychology working in the schools attempting to deliver school psychological services.

The Question of Supervision
In the early 1990s, TEA Special Education Rules required that a licensed psychologist or a psychiatrist sign all eligibility reports which identified a child as emotionally disturbed. LPA (non-doctoral) practitioners in the schools were able to co-sign an ED eligibility report, but still had to have a psychiatrist or licensed psychologist to sign all reports. TEA rules allowed licensed psychologists with no formal training in school psychology to have full access to the delivery of psychological services within the schools. The supervision rule encouraged unprofessional and unethical behavior. For example, due to the fact that there was not a licensed psychologist available in every school, particularly the rural areas, a cottage industry sprung up. LPAs would overnight reports to licensed psychologists in other parts of the state who would sign the ED eligibility reports. The licensed psychologists would charge a fee for their signature, yet they would have never personally met the child whose life was about to significantly altered with an ED classification. The Texas Psychological Association (TPA) and the American Psychological Association turned a blind eye to this obviously unprofessional and unethical practice.

The Relationship Between the TSBEP and TEA
In 1990, the state psychologist’s licensing board (TSBEP) proposed to remove what was called an exempt status for the public schools from their rules and regulations. The exempt status for the schools relaxed the supervision requirements that are normally found in private practice. In private practice any activity by a non-doctoral LPA would be fully supervised by a Licensed Psychologist. In the schools, the only activity by the LPA that needed to be directly supervised (often by a signature alone) was the classification of a child as ED. In response to TSBEP’s threat, TEA threatened to eliminate all school psychology certification. The TSBEP backed down and the status quo remained.

In 1991, the Texas State Board of Education approved the NCSP as a viable credential for the practice of school psychology in the state. The approval of the NCSP credential in Texas was a major milestone. Left unresolved in 1991-1993 was the issue of where does the NCSP holder fall within the continuum of service delivery. Could a TEA certified school psychologist with a NCSP work independently in the schools without supervision by a licensed psychologists? This was the proverbial “$64,000 question” that created a great deal of tension among the wide variety of practitioners who were delivering school psychological services within Texas schools. The debate about the role of the NCSP in Texas unfortunately created a firestorm of political debate that had its basis in the doctoral – non-doctoral issue, and soon Texas would be thrust into the vortex of that long-standing national debate.

The Formation of the Texas Association of School Psychologists
It was against this political backdrop in the early 1990s that the need for a separate organization to represent school psychology issues became evident. I got involved tangentially with the initial NCSP recognition within the state and quickly learned that the Texas Psychological Association was an advocate for what was in the best interest of licensed psychologists and not school psychologists. The Division of School Psychology within TPA served in an advisory capacity only to the larger TPA. Also, as an affiliate of APA, their philosophical position was to represent the doctoral-level psychologist only.

There had been at least two attempts prior to 1993 to form a separate school psychology organization. A colleague told me the story of a non-tenured, assistant professor at a well-known Texas public university who had started the process of forming a separate school psychology organization. Halfway through the process, she was told that she would not get tenured and promoted if she continued that course of action. This may be an urban myth, but if true it speaks to the deep divide that existed in Texas between APA and NASP.

In 1991, I attended my first Texas Psychological Association (TPA) meeting in order to maintain my professional skills. I was disheartened by the experience because the three-day conference was geared to licensed psychologists and private practice issues and had very little to offer to me as a school psychologist.

The Dallas-Fort Worth Area has an organization with no political affiliation whose express purpose is to offer low-cost CEU training to area school psychologists. In the fall of 1992, I agreed to co-sponsor, along with the Denton Independent School District school psychologists, the next CEU training at TWU. Psychologists from Denton I.S.D. and TWU met several times to discuss potential topics. We kept returning to the idea of holding a debate about forming a separate organization for school psychologists.
In February, 1993, TWU hosted the Dallas-Fort Worth Regional Association of School Psychologists (DFW-RASP) meeting at TWU. The day was spent discussing and debating the pros and cons of forming a separate organization for school psychologists. NASP provided technical and financial assistance to bring Steve Crane from Oklahoma to help facilitate the meeting. The current NASP state delegate, Joe Hamelers, the current director of the TPA division of school psychology, Ginger Gates, and the past director, Gail Cheramie, were all part of the panel discussion. We had approximately 72 people in attendance. At the start of the day prior to any discussion, I asked the group to raise their hands if they were in favor of forming a separate organization for school psychologists and all hands were raised. After the discussion and debate of the day, the same question was asked of the audience and everyone raised their hand.

A subcommittee was formed to look into the viability of forming a separate organization for school psychologists within the state and I was put in charge of the committee. On March 1, 1993 over 700 surveys were sent out to psychologists working in the schools and 87% of the respondents were in favor of forming a separate organization for school psychologists. The DFW-RASP committee decides to hold elections for delegates to a Constitutional Assembly.

On May 22, 1993 the TASP Constitutional Assembly was held at Texas A&M in College Station. The meeting was open to elected statewide delegates and interested parties. Over 30 people attended. The Texas Association of School Psychologists Constitution and Bylaws were drafted and approved by the delegates. At the meeting, I was elected by the state delegates as the founding president of TASP.

**Immediate Successes and Challenges for TASP**

The 1993-94 year was incredibly busy. We only had five officers who met regularly in my living room; which is far cry from the 20 or so people who regularly show up these days for a board meeting. We held our first state conference in Houston in 1994 and had 102 attendees. In 2007, we had to turn away people who wanted to come to the conference because we could not accommodate the more than 500 attendees. We were able to be officially recognized by NASP as the state affiliate in the first year, and we held elections for new officers and regional representatives to the board. I was elected as the first official President of TASP for the 1994-95 year.

Politically, the first year of the organization was very busy. In the spring of 1994, the Texas State Board of Education decided it was time to revise the special education rules. The flash point within the proposed revision of the special education rules was the question of who could sign ED eligibility with or without supervision. Initial drafts of the proposed TEA special education rule changes included a provision which allowed NCSP holders to supervise licensed psychological associates and to conduct ED evaluations without supervision. This draft of the rules immediately polarized “school psychology” practitioners in the field. Several organizations were formed overnight by various constituencies who wanted representations for their positions. The Texas Association of Psychological Associates (TAPA) was formed with its chief mission to advocate for unsupervised private practice for Licensed Psychological Associates (LPAs). A political action group was formed in the San Antonio Area that aligned their position with TAPA. In addition, a group of doctoral school psychologists formed a group called the Psychologists in the Schools of Texas (PIST) who advocated for the doctoral-only position.

In 1994, all of these groups descended upon the State Board of Education (SBOE) hearing on the proposed rule changes and the SBOE members were overwhelmed. The TASP board offered several compromise positions to the other groups that would recognize the unique and valuable training specific to a school psychologist, as well as national training standards. Due to the strong political upheaval associated with the proposed rule changes, the SBOE decided not to change the rule that related to how non-doctoral school psychologists could identify ED children without supervision. This left the NCSP holder in the state without any authority to work independently in the schools.

In 1994, the U.S. Department of Education ruled that state certification boards could not have multiple certification levels for a single job function when the only major difference between the levels was the graduate degree. This ruling added to the uncertainty of licensure and certification issues within the state.

**Next edition:** The creation of the LSSP and rules of practice

Dr. Miller is a Professor and Department Chair in the Psychology and Philosophy Department of Texas Woman’s University. He is the founding president of TASP and a past-president of NASP.
Professional and Ethical Issues in the Education of School Psychologists

Laurie Klose, Ph.D.

The meeting of Trainers of School Psychologists at the TASP Professional Development Conference in San Antonio was a day filled with ideas, concerns and planning. The meeting was well attended by faculty from many school psychology graduate programs in Texas including Texas State University-San Marcos, Texas Women’s University, Texas A&M-College Station, Texas A&M-Commerce, Sam Houston State University, University of Houston-Clear Lake, Baylor University, University of Houston-Victoria, Trinity University, West Texas A&M, Abilene Christian University, and Tarleton State University.

A presentation by TSBEP member Donna Black and TSBEP legal counsel Diane Izzo provided important information and spurred intense discussion. TASP is committed to working with TSBEP to ensure that the practice of school psychology in Texas is regulated by appropriate and applicable rules and regulations. Ms. Izzo provided valuable suggestions for improving communication between TSBEP and practitioners of school psychology including attending board meetings, individual contact with board members and use of the board’s web site. Proposed rule changes are posted in the Texas Register which can be accessed through the TSBEP web site. All interested parties are encouraged to review proposed rule changes and make public comments. It was also reiterated that TSBEP is an agency whose primary function is the protection of the public through rule enforcement. Therefore, TSBEP is not intended to function as a professional resource for LSSPs. When LSSPs encounter questions about practice issues, they are encouraged to contact professional leaders, such as TASP executive board members, to raise these questions.

A lively ethical discussion was led by Dan Miller, Ph.D. from Texas Women’s University. This discussion focused on scope of practice issues and the severe shortage of LSSPs in Texas. Many ideas about planning for the ever increasing population of public school children were discussed.

Jennifer Schoeder, Ph.D., from Texas A&M-Commerce and Jennifer Shewmaker, from Abilene Christian University, led a discussion of the recent requirement that NASP program approval be submitted in an online electronic format. Helpful suggestions were provided to assist faculty in avoiding pitfalls in this process. This important discussion helps to ensure that Texas universities continue to hold NASP approval for their graduate programs in school psychology. This is important as TSBEP has adopted the NASP training standards as the educational requirements necessary to obtain the LSSP.

Four training programs in Texas now offer the Specialist Degree for graduates of school psychology programs. Texas Women’s University, Baylor University, Texas A&M-Commerce and Texas State University-San Marcos are approved to confer a specialist degree for graduates. This is an important development as training programs have requirements that far exceed the typical master’s degree requirements. This development brings graduate education in Texas closer to the degree status in most other states. The specialist degree is an outward and visible indicator of the advanced graduate training required in school psychology.

Conners Workshop

Kathy DeOrnellas, Ph.D., TASP Secretary

Penny Koepsel, Ph.D., LPC, LSSP of Multi-health Systems, Inc. conducted a workshop to introduce attendees to the Conners 3rd Edition™ and the Conners Comprehensive Behavior Rating Scales (CBRS)™. The Conners 3rd Edition is a new edition of the original Conners’ Rating Scale and is used primarily for diagnosing Attention-Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD). The CBRS has a broader application and can be used to diagnose DSM-IV-TR disorders commonly found in children and adolescents. It also looks at the diagnostic criteria from IDEA (2004) thus giving additional utility for the schools. Both instruments are useful in helping to determine those students who would benefit Special Education services. Results can be used for developing interventions and monitoring the student’s response to interventions. Dr. Koepsel provided helpful handouts, including actual test protocols and reports, and used a case-study approach to introduce the audience to these new assessment tools.

Renew Your TASP Membership TODAY!

All Memberships Expired On June 30!
Use the Membership Application on Page 9
Dr. Elaine Fletcher-Janzen, who recently “defected” to Ohio from Texas, is a school neuropsychologist who presented a practical, research-based workshop. She is an inspiring proponent of the role of neuropsychological functioning and assessment when identifying students with SLD. Here are some gems that I hope you find as useful as I did:

- **Aptitude-treatment interaction is alive and well.** Research shows that when learning weaknesses are targeted through RtI with correct interventions, the child’s brain can be changed.

- **We are learning more and more about brain structure and function through behavioral neuroimaging.** For example, Diffusion Tensor Imaging (DTI) is being used to examine the functional connectivity among white matter areas of the brain. This technique has revealed that brains of autistic individuals have weak corpus callosum function, which interferes with information transfer from one hemisphere to the other for integrated performance. Functional MRI (fMRI) studies of these brains show atypical activation patterns during processing of human faces. She showed a picture of a girl in Japan wearing a fMRI device on her head that permitted researchers to observe her brain in action as she moved around performing everyday tasks. A brain imaging validation study of the KABC-2 using this device is being planned in England. Neat, huh?

  - **This was a scary bit of information:** Stimulant medication for ADHD given when the diagnosis is correct can change the brain by growing neurons that control attention. If the diagnosis is wrong, however, you don’t want to increase dopamine using stimulant medication because the resulting neural scarring can lead to bipolar disorder. Does anyone else besides me wonder why we’re seeing so many kids diagnosed with bipolar disorder so young? I want to read more about this.

  - **I found this assessment technique very interesting and I plan to check it out with some of the kids I am testing.** Some children who appear visually distractible may have problems with binocular functioning of their eyes (their eyes don’t move together and converge properly). Here is the test: Sit across from the child. As the child watches the end of a pencil, move the pencil slowly from about arm’s length to about 4 inches from the child’s nose 10 times without pausing. After about eight times, the weak eye will drop down and away suddenly while the other eye continues to track. The child will look up and away to relieve the tension in the eye, and the attention-orienting part of the brain will then pay attention to whatever the child happens to look at. Voila! Distractibility! Dr. Fletcher-Janzen noted that six percent of children with orthographic reading problems have binocularity problems as a contributing factor to their reading difficulty. These children may also lay their heads on their arms when they write, with the weak eye on the arm to eliminate it while the stronger eye does all the work.

  - **Check out Dr. Fletcher-Janzen’s many books and don’t miss any more pre-conference workshops!**

---

*Pre-Conference Workshop on Neuroscientific Contributions to SLD Identification*

*Katherine Brehm*

*TASP President, 2008*

---

*Dr. Elaine Fletcher-Janzen reunites with her mentor, Dr. Christabel Jorgenson. Dr. Fletcher-Janzen attended SWT, now Texas State University, and credits Dr. Jorgenson for starting her career in school psychology.*
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Outstanding Specialist Level School Psychologist

Laurie Klose, Ph.D.

Cathy Veith was named Outstanding Specialist Level School Psychologist at the TASP Professional Development conference in San Antonio. Ms. Veith is a graduate of Texas A & M and the Trinity University School Psychology program. She has been employed in the Northside Independent School District since 1997.

Ms. Veith is an outstanding provider of psychological services to parent’s teachers and children. She has worked in variety of schools with the full age range of children. Ms. Veith consistently receives the most positive evaluations of her performance. She has worked with numerous challenges relating to low incidence conditions, difficult/demanding parents and resistant school staffs. Ms. Veith always manages to foster cooperation and collaboration among these groups. The administrators with whom she works have only the highest praise for her expertise and professionalism in managing these challenges. Campus administrators consistently request that Ms. Veith be assigned to their campuses as her reputation for excellence is well known.

While her clinical skills with children are outstanding, perhaps her greatest skills are those used in consultation with the adults who affect children’s lives and educational experiences. Through consistent and dedicated service to children, Ms. Veith has earned the respect and trust of teachers and administrators on her campuses. This allows her to serve as a trusted support. Teachers and administrators know that Ms. Veith will assist them in solving difficult problems without judgment or condescension. Ms. Veith is an active member of the problem solving teams on her campuses and her participation in these teams has led to significant reduction in the number of inappropriate referrals to special education. Ms. Veith participates in inservice training each year. She educates teachers and administrators on the special education process and demystifies the evaluation process. Teachers and administrators report that these inservices have increased their understanding of these processes in more significant ways than ever before.

Laurie Klose gives the Outstanding Specialist level Award to Cathy Veith

University of Houston College of Education

COLLABORATION FOR LEARNING & LEADING

Department of Educational Psychology
announces the approval of a Ph.D. in School Psychology
This is a cooperative doctoral program delivered at the University of Houston and supported by the University of Houston Clear Lake.

For more information contact:
Thomas Kubiszyn, Ph.D.
Professor and Director of Training, School Psychology Program
University of Houston
Department of Educational Psychology
491 Farish Hall
Houston, Texas 77204-5029
713-743-9830 (Department Phone)

Visit our new School Psychology Web Page at:
http://www.coe.uh.edu/mycoe/epsy/school.cfm
Ms. Veith has served as a supervisor for practicum students in school psychology training. Her supervisees report that she has provided them with excellent modeling, feedback and support. She ensures that her practicum students receive a wide variety of experiences; she has a keen awareness of when a practicum student is ready to work independently and when more support is needed. In addition, practicum students who work with Ms. Veith are energized about the profession as her enthusiasm is contagious! Ms. Veith engages in frequent and intense collaborative consultation with her fellow school psychologists. Other professionals seek Ms. Veith’s advice and counsel on all areas related to professional competence. She is known as someone who will listen to questions and concerns and respond with professionalism and without judgment. While she is not “officially” a supervisor or other LSSPs in her district, she is a valuable ally in exploring solutions to problems ranging from scoring test items to instituting system change.

Ms. Veith demonstrates leadership in school psychology by being a very visible ambassador of the profession. She participates regularly in district level staff development where she educates other professionals about the roles and skills of the LSSP. For the past several years, Ms. Veith has been the lead LSSP and coordinator of the summer assessment of 2-3 year olds who may need services in the following school year. In this role, Ms Veith coordinates 4-6 multidisciplinary teams (SLP, OT, PT, LSSP, teachers, autism specialists). Ms. Veith has also been a guest lecturer in several school psychology courses at Texas State University–San Marcos.

Ms. Veith has been participating the Pre-Elementary Education Longitudinal Study (PEELS) project for the past several years. This study is funded by the National Center for Special Education Research in the U.S. Department of Education’s Institute of Education Sciences. PEELS is following a group of children who receive preschool special education services as they progress through the early elementary years. She is assisting in the data collection of this important work that will inform early childhood service provision across the nation. Ms. Veith has also participated in a collaborative study of the proficiency of the use of the WJ-3 among practicing LSSPs. This study was done in collaboration with a Texas State University School Psychology faculty member and the manuscript is being prepared for publication at this point.

Cathy Veith demonstrates all of the qualities that define excellence in school psychology. The profession and the children in Texas public schools are better because she has chosen this career.

William Glasser, MD… in Person

A highlight

By Andrea Wolf, LSSP, Membership Chair

This past Conference was informative and possibly historic. William Glasser, MD and his wife Carleen presented for a full day about Glasser’s theory, experiences and his ideas for schools. The couple bantered back and forth, entertained questions and even guided some role plays.

They also spoke extensively about working with female prison populations using Choice Theory. The Glassers found this to be very successful and carried it over into their Glasser Schools. In fact, some of his books sold out at the Conference.

I had the honor of introducing the couple and it was historic for me. It was amazing to meet an icon from our textbooks. They were so approachable and were very flexible in their presentation.

There may not be many future opportunities to hear Dr. Glasser speak, and I am glad that I devoted my Thursday to listening to what he had to say.
Jon Lasser, PhD, was named the Outstanding Doctoral Level LSSP at the TASP professional development conference in San Antonio. Dr. Lasser is a most deserving recipient of this honor as he demonstrates excellence in the all of the areas of distinction in the field.

Dr. Lasser is an Assistant Professor of School Psychology at Texas State University-San Marcos. He was awarded tenure this fall in recognition of his scholarship, teaching and service to the university and school psychology. Dr. Lasser contributes to the knowledge base of school psychology by consistently engaging in scholarship that shapes the field. His research interests and activities have included parenting children with Asperger’s, school psychologists roles in promoting peace, visibility management in GLBT youth and adults, underage alcohol use in rural populations, self appraisal in developing consultation skills and ethical decision making. He has been recognized by Texas State as a nominee for the Presidential Award for Excellence in Scholarship. In addition, he has been acknowledged as a promising early career scholar by Division 16 of APA.

Prior to joining the school psychology faculty at Texas State, Dr. Lasser worked as a School Psychologist in Eanes ISD in Austin. These experiences inform his teaching of graduate students in school psychology. His students respect Dr. Lasser’s expertise and commitment to the mental health and educational success of all children. He has a unique way of presenting information and challenging students to engage in self discovery that results in graduate students developing a strong knowledge base and foundational skills that prepare outstanding professionals. Dr. Lasser’s frequent professional development programs at conferences, regional service centers, school districts and individual school sites allows practicing professionals to benefit from his talents as an educator.

Dr. Lasser provides outstanding service to the profession of school psychology through his scholarly and teaching pursuits and his contributions to professional advocacy for school psychology in Texas. He has served on the TASP Executive Board as an Area Representative. His is an active member of TASP, NASP and APA. His extensive work with university committees ensures that the highest standards for educating the next generation of school psychologists are maintained and promoted.

Jon Lasser is respected and acknowledged as a leader in the field of school psychology in both Texas and in the US. His contributions impact the delivery of school psychological services in ways that ensure the most positive outcomes for children.

---

**Outstanding Doctoral Level School Psychologist**

*Laurie Klose, Ph.D.*

---

**Sam Houston State University**

**HUNTSVILLE, TEXAS**

**SPECIALIST LEVEL PROGRAM IN SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGY**

Psych@SAM MA in School Psychology

Sam Houston State University offers a sixty hour graduate program in School Psychology culminating in the Masters of Arts degree in Psychology. Successful completion of the program leads to Texas licensure as an LSSP and as a Nationally Certified School Psychologist (NCSP). A respecialization program is available to individuals holding a master’s degree. Financial support is usually available and the internship year is generally paid. All of our graduates pass the National School Psychology Exam and obtain employment. Application deadlines are: August 1; December 1; and May 15.

For more information contact:

Thomas A. Wood, Ed.D., Program Director
Department of Psychology and Philosophy, Box 2447
Sam Houston State University
Huntsville, Texas 77341
Email: twood@shsu.edu  Phone: 936.294.4662
Summary of Workshop: CHC Theory and Psychoeducational Assessments
Jennifer W. Shewmaker, Ph.D.

Dr. Gonzalez is a psychologist in private practice in Florida. In her workshop on CHC theory and assessment, she reviewed CHC theory and discussed the research support for the theory based on factor analytic studies across age, gender, racial and ethnic groups. The history of the Horn-Cattell and Carroll theories were also reviewed briefly, with a discussion of the uniting of the two under the Carroll-Horn-Cattell (CHC) banner. Dr. Gonzalez then went on to define each of the constructs within the CHC theory of intelligence, these are comprehension/knowledge (Gc), fluid intelligence (Gf), visual processing (Gv), quantitative knowledge (Gq), short term memory (Gsm), auditory processing, (Ga), processing speed (Gs), and long-term retrieval (Glr). Each of these constructs was discussed in terms of how it relates to learning and achievement.

The presenter offered a warning that, in her opinion, if examiners only use the CHC model with intelligence and achievement scores, they may miss important information in determining the cause of their client’s difficulty. She advocated “playing detective” by reviewing the information presented in interviews, observations, and behavioral rating scales and linking the things found in those with the patterns of strength in weakness in cognitive ability as shown by the IQ and Achievement test scores. She then suggested that the examiner establish a preliminary hypothesis and follow up by investigating that with further assessment measures.

Dr. Gonzalez then went on to offer several case studies. While the first part of the workshop may have been a bit too basic for many TASP members, the second part, where we discussed the cases that the presenter offered and related them to CHC theory and interpretation, was more advanced. Being provided with specific case information and given time to discuss the information and interpretation with peers in the workshop was helpful, and generally seemed to be something that the participants enjoyed and felt was challenging.

Dr. Gonzalez also offered several “cheat sheets” which directly addressed her approach to using CHC theory in interpreting assessment data for clients who may have dyslexia, non-verbal learning disability, language-based problem, and ADHD. These were helpful, though did not appear to be as research driven as some of the other information that was provided in the workshop. In general, this workshop offered a basic introduction to CHC theory and the constructs within that theory of intelligence, with some of Dr. Gonzalez’s particular experiences and interpretations expanding them through case studies and her discussion of the cases with the participants.
of individual students by a teacher or “specialist” (in school psychology) is not equivalent to an evaluation/assessment and does not, therefore, require written informed consent. Indeed, a letter issued by OSEP and obtained by NASP in October, 2007, states that “an RtI process alone would not relieve a public agency of the obligation to conduct a comprehensive, individual initial evaluation of a child, for which parental consent would be required.” In other words, RtI and evaluation are not equivalent because RtI is not part of the evaluative process to determine if a child qualifies for special education services. The data gathered from an entire RtI process may be included as part of a subsequent comprehensive evaluation, but the information gathered during Tier 1 is screening data and does not trigger mandatory informed consent.

Licensed Specialists in School Psychology can and should be included in Tier 1 activities. The primary purpose of Tier 1 is to determine the initial appropriateness of instruction through universal screening. Adjusting instruction for entire classrooms of students, small groups, or individual students identified through screening as being at-risk, and providing basic accommodations to ameliorate those risks, is a normal, expected function of schools, not something “special”. In their role as members of RtI teams, LSSPs may work with teachers as their “client” to suggest more effective classroom management strategies, instructional practices, or relationship-building techniques to benefit students. In consultation terms, this is a problem-solving, indirect model of consultation. Other times, the LSSP might work directly with students individually or in small groups to teach, for example, specific organizational strategies for their desk or homework. The key distinction that should guide the LSSP in determining the need for fully informed consent is not necessarily who is the client (teacher versus student), but whether the intervention being provided by the LSSP is part of the normal expectation of a school to provide appropriate instruction.

To return to the questions posed at the beginning of this article, how do IDEA regulations and RtI impact provision of school psychological services, and how can informed consent be understood in light of these recent developments? Tier 1 interventions adjust and level the playing field without altering the nature or rules of the game. It is when you begin to alter the nature, rules or expectations of the game, or to intrusively investigate the need to do that as you determine the child’s response to intervention, that you move beyond accommodations that simply enhance the appropriateness of instruction into the possibility of modifications and targeted interventions that signal Tier 2. At the point that the need for Tier 2 intervention is anticipated, a parent’s right to the legal level of informed consent should be triggered concerning LSSP involvement. Of course, good home-school communication is critical to student academic success. Schools should notify parents at the outset of Tier 1 intervention that their child is struggling, and that teachers and other education support staff, such as the LSSP, are collaborating to improve the student’s success. “Notice”, however, is not the same thing as legal “consent” required by TSBEP Rules of Practice. IDEA clearly distinguishes screening by a teacher or specialist and provision of appropriate instruction, which does not require parental consent, from evaluation for eligibility for special education and related services, which does. Thus, consent for provision of school psychological services at Tier 1 is covered by IDEA federal regulations. TSBEP Rules of Practice 465.11 (a) concerning informed consent appears to concede to IDEA regulations (“… unless consent is precluded by applicable federal or state law”). TASP will continue its efforts to address this issue with TSBEP.

Area Reports

Area II
Shea Edwards

Hola to all Area II members and potential members. Those of you who did not attend this year’s TASP conference in San Antonio missed quite a bit. A great time seemed to be had by all. The conference was extremely informative and fun as well. The Omni hotel was an exquisite location for the conference.

Some of the breakout sessions included “Doing What Works: Brief Solution-Focused Counseling in Schools”, Multicultural Consultation and Communication in Diverse Schools: Collaboration Across Diversity”, and an Ethics workshop. Jim Walsh did his usual outstanding job in giving us the most important legal issues in special education over the last year. Those were just the workshops I was able to attend. Your TASP board members were working very hard for you behind the scenes. I am so proud to work with such a great group of people. Mindi Jeter and Ashley Arnold stood out as conference chairs. They truly made it the event that it was. I would like to thank them for all their hard work, as well as the work of others behind the scene.
I worked with Rebecca Ray on our TASP charity project, CALC. She did a bang up job and I truly enjoyed working with her. Let’s do it again next year!

On another note, we will be holding an Area II social and membership drive in the near future. I will let all Area II representatives know the details as soon as I learn more. Please invite all LSSPs that you know who are not currently members of TASP. I look forward to seeing you all there and to meeting those of you I do not know.

Please feel free to contact me with any questions, concerns, or comments. The easiest way to reach me is via email: kedwar03@sisd.net.

Area IV

Maureen Hicks

Hello Area IV members! It was great to meet so many of you at the conference in San Antonio. I heard from several people who had positive things to say about the conference overall. Some of these comments include that the conference seemed very organized and ran smoothly, that there was a nice variety of topics presented, and that breakfast (especially coffee!) and breaks were very much appreciated. As you can imagine, not everything ran as smoothly as we had hoped, but considering how many attendees we had and how few people helped to plan and organize the conference, I think things went incredibly well. That being said, we’re always open to your feedback to help us make next year’s conference even better. Additionally, please let me know if you have any ideas for topics you’d like presented or if you’re interested in hearing a particular speaker. We have already started planning for next year’s conference, so please let me know your interests as soon as possible.

I also wanted to remind you that TASP will be having our Day at the Capitol in January. I will send out a reminder to Area IV members before it happens. This is a great opportunity to show our legislators how interested we are in the legislative process, especially in legislation that directly affects our students. There is strength in numbers, so just think of what the presence of several LSSPs would say to our legislators! Please consider joining us on this day to show your support for our students and their families, for education, and for the profession of school psychology.

Brief Solution-Focused Counseling: I attended several interesting presentations at this year’s conference. One that I find myself thinking about quite often is the presentation made by Dr. John Murphy on solution-focused counseling. According to Dr. Murphy, there are five assumptions of brief solution-focused counseling that you must have in order to maximize results. The assumptions are as follows:

1) People are unique, capable, and resourceful—Dr. Murphy stated that belief in the student’s ability to change and to possess the skills needed to get through difficult times is essential in building rapport and that this rapport is instrumental in helping students make changes; 2) Cooperation (alliance) promotes solutions—Again, this is all about rapport building and the importance of developing trust with your students. In discussion of this assumption, Dr. Murphy said something that hit home for me. He said that accepting your student’s position does not mean you agree with your student’s position. I like the idea of helping your student feel supported, which in turn builds relationship, while not encouraging decisions that did not work well for the student; 3) It is generally more useful to focus on future solutions than past problems—Once you’ve established the way a student copes with difficult situations, Dr. Murphy said focusing on ways to determine solutions in the future helps to empower the student and helps them see a link between their actions and the consequences of those actions; 4) No problem is constant. There are always fluctuations and “exceptions” to the problem—Dr. Murphy advises to identify a time with the student when things weren’t as difficult, or when there was an exception to the problem. Helping students identify what they were doing well at that time can set the stage for real change. In the future, this can encourage the student to do something different than they have always done, thereby getting different results; 5) If it works, do more; if it doesn’t, try something different—This reminds me of the old adage from the recovery community: “The definition of insanity is doing the same thing over and over but expecting different results.” While this seems logical and obvious, this was a good reminder for me. When things are manageable at work, I have no problem thinking of creative solutions to problems, but when I get very busy, I sometimes have difficulty thinking outside the box. Dr. Murphy said that even making small changes (and acknowledging those small changes) can go a long way in helping a student make progress.

My brief discussion of solution-focused counseling was only intended to get you interested in learning more about this technique. If you would like to know more about solution-focused counseling and the resources available, you can go to Dr. Murphy’s web site (www.drjohnmurphy.com) for more information.
Attendance was good at the 16th Annual TASP Professional Conference in San Antonio