Which one of NASP’s five strategic goals do you judge to be most important? Why do you judge it to be most important, and as president, how would you work to address it?

As I said in my introductory video, only about 7% of NASP membership votes in the election. The social justice priority appears to be a concrete example of how the profession of school psychology has become a bully pulpit for a small group of individuals.

Social justice as presented by NASP with core principles of redistribution of resources and access to resources is, in my opinion, simply thinly veiled and repackaged Marxism. As such, NASP’s social justice initiatives create a culture of victimhood rather than a culture of empowerment while demanding institutional redistribution of resources. NASP does this by pitting “marginalized groups” against other groups (e.g., the concept of “white privilege”) for limited resources through legislative activism and other means, to the point that one prominent social justice advocate recently (July 2019) posted on NASP Communities that:

“All of our work as school psychologists is political, whether we think of it this way or not. … to say that NASP should stay out of anything that touches "politics" to me is saying that school psychology should not take its mission to support children seriously. I WANT our organization to be out there advocating for children, whether this is considered "politics" or not. Anything less and we are betraying our ethics code.” (emphasis the author)

Another prominent member of NASP recently encouraged members, via Communities, to oppose legislation that would ostensibly require school psychologists to report to parents when a student “exhibits symptoms of gender dysphoria.” The opposed legislation reportedly would “require parental consent…to provide ‘treatment’ for gender dysphoria,” and “require service providers to disclose information about a young person’s gender expression … to parents….”

Both of those authors strongly implied that disagreement with their position, or support for the legislation they opposed, would be a de-facto violation of NASP’s ethical standards. NASP leadership, through various position statements and legislative initiatives, is obviously pushing a political, social engineering agenda that the general membership may or may not support. To my knowledge NASP has never surveyed membership to determine if the NASP agenda actually represents the majority position(s). NASP is obviously a “top down” organization that tells members what to think and how to act.

As stated in the NASP social justice priority, I agree that school psychologists should be advocates for all children. I agree also that school psychologists need to lead in educational settings so that all children are valued and that all children’s rights are honored.

I disagree though, that acting on the belief that all school psychology activities are political, or blindly supporting a NASP position on legislation or political initiative is an ethical thing to do. A belief that, ethically, all my professional activities are political is essentially carte blanch to manipulate and exploit. I believe exactly the opposite; to infuse my political beliefs into practice and to base all of my interactions and interventions on my personal political beliefs would be an ethical violation.
The profession of school psychology and NASP as an organization should not be used for the advancement of a political/social engineering agenda determined by its’ apparently minority leadership. It should not use children, the profession and NASP as political tools to advance NASP leadership’s own personal political agendas.

In my mind NASP needs to actually advocate for ALL children not just those who fit the current social justice agenda. For example, the rights of children who maintain traditional values and customs (e.g., gender binary bathrooms, fair competition in sports based physiology not ideation) need to be supported. Other groups of children (e.g., female children subjected to circumcision, forced marriage, those children facing religiously and culturally motivated violence) are also in need of attention.

As NASP president I would strive to ensure that truly all children would be valued and that all children’s rights would be considered and supported. I would encourage a broadening of scope to include consideration of the rights of children’s groups such as those mentioned above. I would encourage a re-conceptualization of social justice from the current, apparently Marxist, orientation to one that emphasizes the importance of local control, support of the family as the basic unit of society, individual contributions to the empowerment of others, and promotion of the concept of unconditional positive regard for all humans.