

California Delegate Candidate--Margaret Sedor

NASP recently adopted its *2010 Model for Comprehensive and Integrated School Psychological Services*. Under your leadership as NASP President what steps should NASP take to use its 2010 model to best solidify the professional identity of school psychologists and ensure access to school psychological services by all children, families, and schools?

The NASP 2010 Model for Comprehensive and Integrated School Psychological Services is one of the first national policies developed by our organization with potential to have profound impact on the practice of School Psychology. As a member of the NASP Delegate Assembly, I was afforded the opportunity to participate in the adoption of this policy. Throughout the process, I learned so much about the vast diversity across our nation of School Psychologist in terms of role definition, practice and state licensure and/or credentialing. The NASP Practice Model provides a uniform foundation of national principles that guide our profession and services to the diverse needs of our students, schools and the community. In turn, professional competency of School Psychologist is strengthened resulting in the enhancement of evidence-based learning and mental health practices and services we provide our students.

Many states have already utilized the NASP practice model as a vehicle in advocating for our profession and in the provision of services to students, schools, and community. For example, the state of Maine has been successful in the passage of a statute which defines the scope of school psychological service consistent with the NASP standards. Some states have formed committees to develop comprehensive performance evaluations for School Psychologists consistent with the 10 domains of the NASP Practice Model. In efforts to define our roles amidst the drastic budgetary challenges, some states are exploring the creation of a rubric to define the role of a School Psychologists as determined by the number of days and/or amount of time allocated as a specific school site. It's exciting to be a part of this significant time in history of our profession.

As the NASP state delegate for California, I have presented the NASP Practice Model to the CASP board which we subsequently adopted as a state organization. We plan to work collaboratively with the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) in hopes of integrating the domains of the practice model into the language of our state credential for School Psychologists as well as into the graduate training programs throughout the state. As an adjunct faculty member, I have been working with a committee to embed the 10 domains of the NASP Practice Model into our internship program. School Psychology interns are documenting their practice hours and developing their portfolios within each of the 10 domains of the NASP Practice Model. In addition, I have presented and disseminated the NASP Practice Model to local associations, to practitioners in school districts, local special education directors and have embedded the model into the coursework of local school psychology graduate training programs. I have also utilized the NASP Practice Model as a tool to present to school board members in a

district considering eliminating School Psychologist positions, to date they have retained all of their School Psychologists. All of these steps serve to solidify our profession identify and I look forward to continue my advocacy work as the local, state, and national level as the NASP state delegate for California.