Of Remembrances, Stupid Human Tricks, Top-10 Lists, and Prophecies

Dear Colleagues,

I want to thank those who responded to my request for a copy of a back issue article of this newsletter. Here is the result of your generosity. I hope I made it worth your trouble.

In addition, as a result of my request to find my original article from 1994, Neil Charness sent me a copy of his Div. 20 Newsletter article from 1995 titled: I Have a Dream, and It Involves the Internet. Here is an excerpt:

“What the WWW (World Wide Web) makes possible is individual publishing of complex documents that are elegantly formatted for the viewer. … In other words, as you prepare your documents in the usual way for submission to academic journals, you will also, with a little extra work, be able to prepare them for WWW format. Plus, you can also include your datasets for people to access via a link from your article. In short, some day, we should be able to browse the Internet for journal articles and have the reference section contain links that enable you to read the references, and possibly get access to the dataset as well!”

Neil also mentioned potential barriers to this dream, primarily opposition from journals and organization owning copyright to published articles. His dream is technically realizable today (as it was at the time he wrote his article, though much more easily accomplished (technically) now. The barriers he foresaw still exist, though there is strong effort on the part of NIH and other groups to make both published materials and data more accessible without cost, at least after a suitable “waiting period” occurs from the date of publication of articles in journals. We will see how this plays out.

In this, the last of my presidential columns, I hope you will indulge me as I look back – not over this past year, but back to a moment almost exactly seventeen years ago. At that time, I was honored with a request to present an overview of research in cognition and dementia at the Cognitive Aging Conference (CAC). The talk was a lead-in to a symposium on the topic and was to be presented first thing on a Sunday morning – a tough time to give any presentation, especially since attendees tended to close an Irish pub in Atlanta on Saturday nights/Sunday mornings.

The night before, Gus Craik had put the conference in stitches explaining how his bad handwriting had forced his administrative assistants to interpret his messages into seminal ideas for a research paradigm, e.g., “Leaving for Portugal” into “Levels of Processing” (an in-joke for cognitive psychologists; please forgive). The next day, it was my turn to speak. How to follow that? To make matters worse, at the previous CAC, Lars Bäckman had performed a masterful job of
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summarizing the exact same topic, and so I did not want to simply overview new developments since the last conference. What to do?

In a fit of desperation, I told the attendees that while Gus’ administrative staff created brilliance because of an implicit, unconscious process, I was well aware of my staff’s sterling qualities as writers and put them to work quite explicitly. However, I too suffered from bad handwriting. Thus, my note to create a presentation that combined the methodological sophistication of Dave Balota and the theoretical sweep of Lars Bäckman was interpreted as a request to create a presentation in the style of Dave Letterman. At that point, I proceeded with an opening monologue (a laconic yet ironic overview of the papers to be presented in the following symposium), a stupid human trick (it was tough to juggle in the old days when the microphones included cords you could trip over), and a Top 10 list.

The Top 10 list was described as 10 areas or topics that weren’t being heavily investigated at the time, but (in my humble opinion) should be. These were the “ground” to the “figure” Bäckman had previously outlined. In truth, they also represented 10 areas or topics that I thought would be interesting for my own future research efforts. These 10 topics, from 1994, which were later published in the Div. 20 newsletter are:

10) Is the study of different memory systems going the way of the study of different forms of intelligence (and if so, is this a bad thing)? (e.g., Will our models of memory begin to approach the order of complexity of Guilford’s model of intelligence, or will memory models have a limit on the number of types of memory proposed – say, 7 + 2?)

9) Is a first-in/last-out model of cognitive development/cognitive decline useful in understanding and predicting the course of dementia? (Perhaps activities for persons with dementia based on activities and materials from Montessori schools has potential.)

8) How does metacognition functioning change/influence cognition and affect in persons with dementia?

7) Why not conduct more research with mixed dementia populations?

6) What are the effects of memory-enhancing drugs on memory in persons with dementia?

5) Can on-line studies of brain functioning in memory tasks better inform our research in dementia? (e.g., What would researchers see if brain scans were taken when persons with dementia perform both implicit and explicit memory tasks?)

4) Do memory-enhancing drugs make cognitive/behavioral interventions more effective?

3) Why are we not conducting more intervention research with demented populations? (e.g., There has been very little research conducted on cognitive interventions for dementia associated with Parkinson’s Disease.)

2) Why not give away results? (i.e., “Intervention research could adopt a criterion of effectiveness which could include the following: Can this intervention be taught to caregivers and implemented by them?”)

1) What will we do if a cure for AD is found?

Regarding my Top 10 list, the reader can judge which of these items came to the forefront. Some did (with a vengeance, e.g. item 6) or led to a modest amount of work by a small number of persons (see Barry Reisberg’s work on retrogenesis and my own and others’ work on Montessori-based dementia programming for item 9; the rise of “translational research” for items 2, 3 & 9), or have not been given nearly the attention I had hoped for (items 8, 7, and 4).

Item 1 — well, there is a puzzle. I remember
chatting with Paul Baltes in 1993 about a line of research I was starting on interventions for persons with dementia, and he told me that I should get started quickly, because Alzheimer’s disease would be cured before the end of the century. Paul was a brilliant researcher, but he was wrong on this prediction. In 1994, regarding item 1, I commented “This is a problem I hope to face in my own lifetime, preferably tomorrow.” That is still my hope, but my hope has significantly diminished. In truth, I do not expect to see AD cured within my lifetime. Given that I am about 60 years of age, I think that the wisest wager is that when I show the signs of dementia (don’t give me a spinal tap; I’ll assume that I’ll get it, and if not ….), symptomatic treatment will be all that is available.

Here’s a first prediction, then: The amyloid hypothesis will not lead to a cure. It will be something else — something entirely from a different place (left field?). Buy me a drink, and I’ll tell you why.

Here’s a second prediction: If and when a cure is ever found, millions of persons living today with dementia or who will be diagnosed with dementia in their lifetimes will have had to learn how to live with it, either well or poorly.

Allow me to quote myself from my first Div. 20 newsletter article as president:

“I have heard that ‘the cure is 5 years away’ many, many times. John Lennon said that life is what happens while you are making plans. It is time to focus on creating a society that values quality of life for all persons, especially those with dementia — now.”

We must not wait for deus ex pharmacology to save the day. We are psychologists. We must take action. Now means now.

(It’s good to be president.)

-- Cameron J. Camp

---

Report by the Early Career Psychologist Task Force  
Submitted by Peter Lichtenberg

The Division 20 Early Career Task Force created in 2009-10 is responding to the results of their survey conducted last year. “Early Career Psychologists (ECPs) in Division 20 were telling us that they need networking and informational programming outside of APA conferences,” according to Ann Pearman, co-chair of the Task Force. Peter Lichtenberg is following up on that request this year by organizing two webinars for ECPs of the Division.

The first webinar on grant seeking was led by Division members Angela Jefferson and Joe Gaugler and assisted by Joe Casciani. The webinar attracted 60 registrants and was held on April 26th. The webinar was exceptionally well received and is available for anyone to view by going to the following URL: http://connectpro72663412.na5.acrobat.com/p51393354/

A second webinar on establishing a clinical career in hospitals and organizations is scheduled for June 28th 2-3:30 pm EDT. It will be led by Carol Manning and Caitlin Holley.
In academia, the peer-review process is designed to enhance scientific progress and regulate the standards of published research. Researchers neatly package their work into manuscripts and send them off to journals, eagerly awaiting reviews and editorial decisions. Reviews are compiled by colleagues with relevant experience in the field and are intended both to improve the quality of published work and filter out subpar research. Without recognizing some of the positive aspects of serving as a reviewer, some fall prey to the temptation of turning down a request due to a busy schedule or perception that such service offers little career benefit. Of course, engaging in the review process in a meaningful way often can be time-consuming and effortful. Below we have compiled some tips to help streamline your reviewer experience.

**Deciding Whether to Review**

When you first receive an invitation to review a manuscript, it is important to consider three main questions when making your decision to accept it or not.

First, do you have the expertise to offer a proper critique? For graduate students, this question may be less relevant because the bulk of your review experiences will be funneled from your mentor whom you will assist with the review. Postdocs should ask themselves whether their grasp of the relevant literature is sufficient to gauge both the quality of the research and its appropriateness for the journal. Typically, this is not a problem since review requests are sent to you based on your expertise. However, on the off-chance that you receive a manuscript that is outside of your area, your review may raise irrelevant concerns or miss serious concerns. Such problematic reviews are unhelpful to the editor and also frustrate the author.

A second essential consideration is whether you have the time. Depending on the nature of the manuscript (e.g., review, original scientific article, brief report) and its technical quality (e.g., organization, grammar, diction), the time spent reviewing it may range from one to several hours. For particularly dense papers, an initial read may be necessary before revisiting it a few days later to gear up to write a review. For graduate students, determining whether or not you have the time to complete a review is tricky if your advisor has asked you to do it. In most cases, you might just have to “make it work,” although you should discuss with your advisor if you feel that additional work is not feasible. For postdocs who have a bit more control over their workloads, you may struggle with dedicating the proper amount of time for the review. You should keep in mind that accepting the request means that you agree to provide the editor and author(s) with a review that is clear and also helpful to both parties and their respective agendas.

Lastly, you should consider whether there would be any conflicts of interest associated with your role as a reviewer. For example, if you will benefit financially from the publication or have biases against an author for personal reasons (e.g., ex-spouse), you should reconsider your participation. Able, willing, and conscientious reviewers are a hot commodity and often get more requests than they can reasonably fulfill. Asking yourself these three questions may help maximize your service to the community and minimize the associated headaches.

**Formulating Effective Critiques**

Once you’ve accepted the request and received the manuscript, how do you go about formulating a review that will enhance a publishable manuscript? One of the most important goals of reading the manuscript is to understand the hypotheses or aims of the study and their significance to the field. This will help you gauge whether the authors provided an adequate rationale, designed an appropriate study, subsequently made the right conclusions, and ultimately whether the manuscript is appropriate for the journal. Initially, you should be able to briefly summarize the study in your own words, which you may include as part of your review. Next, given your understanding of the study, highlight its potential contributions. Equally as important, identify what you think are the major flaws of this work. These points should be included in the section of your review where you raise significant concerns about the theoretical argument, the methodology, or conclusions. You should be very selective about what you highlight in your review as a significant concern as those are the points that will help you (and the editor) determine whether to accept the manuscript for publication. Also, do not be flippant about suggestions you include in your review. For example, consider whether following the suggestion to complete another experiment would enhance the current work, whether it’s more appropriate for a future study, and whether you are being critical for the sake of being critical. Some senior faculty members have even said that reviewers should not make suggestions unless they believe the author must make those changes. Issues like grammar or formatting are easily correctable and should be included under a different heading, reflecting a lesser degree of concern.

Finally, be aware of your language in the review. Carefully select language to indicate whether the comment or suggestion is critical to the study. Keep the tone of the review as objective as possible. No one wants to read a review that is overtly offensive, regardless of the quality of the manuscript. Do not use informal language like, “my beef with this procedure is...”. Many journals have specific guidelines about the tone of reviews, and a hostile or condescending tone ensures that you will not be invited to serve as a reviewer for that journal again.

Continued on p. 8
Continuing Education Report
Submitted by Shevaun Neupert

Joe Gaugler, Ph.D., presented an APA Division 20 Webinar: “Doing the Best We Can: An Overview of Online and Clinical Resources for Care Providers of Families Struggling with Dementia” on Monday, April 4th, 2011. Approximately 43 individuals attended the webinar (some watched in a group under a single log-in name, so it is difficult to get an exact estimate), and it was also successfully recorded. CE credits were given to those who requested them. If you are interested in viewing the recorded webinar, please send an email to shevaun_neupert@ncsu.edu. CE credits are also available.

Anyone with suggestions for CE workshop topics for the APA Convention in 2012 are encouraged to send them to Shevaun Neupert (shevaun_neupert@ncsu.edu) or Julie Wetherell (jwetherell@ucsd.edu).

Fellows Report
Submitted by John Cavanaugh

Over this past year, we have once again been given excellent news by the APA Fellows Board about our nominees for initial Fellow status. Because we cannot announce the names of those who were nominated until APA Council votes on approval in August, you will unfortunately be kept in suspense until the Business Meeting (or the next newsletter). Meanwhile, we would like to encourage all of our members and fellows to think ahead to the 2012 cycle. The Division 20 deadline will be December 1 in order for us to process the applications and meet the APA deadline in early February. One of the reasons we have been so successful over the past many years with our nominees is that we have set an early deadline for nominations, thus giving the Fellows Committee ample time to review the nominations and compose letters of support from the division. The materials are now available online so that will help facilitate the process both for applicants and endorsers.

Nominees, then, need to assemble three recommenders whom they will ask to complete an evaluation form, a worksheet, and a letter. Ideally, the recommenders are Division 20 Fellows themselves. Second, nominees need to write a self-statement in which they highlight their involvement in psychology in general and Division 20 in particular. This is a case in which scholarly achievements are important, but so is service to the division. Third, nominees need to prepare their CVs by showing which of their publications were in refereed journals. Ideally, potential nominees prepare all their materials that they will be submitting and provide these to their recommenders so that the recommenders have in front of them everything that the nominee will be submitting.

If you think that you are qualified for Fellow status (and to be sure, check the APA website (http://www.apa.org/about/division/fellows.html), please let me know at some point during the summer, but no later than the APA Convention. That way, I will know how many to prepare for, and I can also give you advice about making your nomination as strong as possible. The same is true if you would like to ask me about a colleague you are thinking of nominating. Finally, we are always trying to expand our horizons and so if there is a Fellow of another division who you think should be a Fellow of Division 20, by all means let me know and we can solicit the materials needed for that process, which fortunately is much simpler.

This year, we are continuing the new “tradition” of a New Fellows and Awardee Symposium to be held as a session at the APA convention. Please check the program for details and plan to attend to support our newest honorees.

To everyone who helped in this year’s nominations, including the Fellows Committee (Peter Lichtenberg, Cameron Camp, and Carolyn Aldwin), on behalf of the Division, I would like to offer my sincere thanks. Thanks also to all of those who provided endorsements of our candidates—your support is essential. Please contact me at jcavanaugh@passhe.edu if you have any questions.
## Membership News

Submitted by Joe Gaugler, Chair

As we continue through 2011, we are hoping to match or exceed our total membership from last year! If you have not renewed your membership, please consider doing so or joining as a new member! As a long-time member of the Division myself, membership has allowed me to enjoy the multitude of professional benefits of Division 20 including job opportunities, faculty development, research training, and networking contacts that will help me throughout my career.

Please visit the APA Division 20 membership page (http://apadiv20.phhp.ufl.edu/join.htm) and fill out an application to join as a new member or a renewed member. The membership page also provides a wealth detail of why membership in Division 20 is such a great professional opportunity.

In response to the need to create flexible membership options and encourage more robust participation in Division 20, we are excited to announce two new membership categories for new or current members:

1. **Professional affiliates** are persons who, due to their proficiency in areas related to the mission of the Division, can contribute to the Division’s objectives but do not hold membership in the American Psychological Association.

2. **International affiliates** are also proficient in areas related to the mission of the Division and can contribute to the Division’s objectives, but reside in a country outside of the United States. International affiliates do not have to hold membership in the American Psychological Association to join Division 20.

Dues for both Professional and International Affiliates are the same as Divisional dues for full members (e.g., $44 per year) and confer many of the same benefits as Full Members, including subscriptions to *Adult Development & Aging News* as well as *Psychology and Aging*. However, to reiterate: one does not have to join APA itself in order to be an Affiliate of Division 20!

To join as a Professional or International Affiliate, please go to http://memforms.apa.org/apa/cli/divapp/. If you have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact me at the email address or telephone number provided below.

If you are already a member, you will note on the APA Division 20 membership page that we have designed new brochures. If you would like some brochures to post in your office or share with colleagues, please let me know, and I would be happy to mail you some. Please spread the word and encourage your colleagues to join.

If you have any questions, or if there is anything I can do to help facilitate your membership in APA Division 20, please do not hesitate to contact me!

Contact info: Email - gaug0015@umn.edu; Phone - 612-626-2485
Division 20 welcomes the new members who have joined during the last year!
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Congratuations to our newly-elected members to Division 20 offices! The Elections Committee is pleased to announce the results of this year’s election, as follows:

**President-Elect:** Patricia Parmelee

**Secretary:** Lisa M. S. Miller

**Members-at-Large:** David Chiriboga
Adam Davey

**Division Rep to APA Council:** Susan Whitbourne

A special thanks to all of our candidates who stood for election. Your willingness to serve the division in this manner is vital to its successful governance and effectiveness. We also thank our fellow Division members who participated in this important process by taking time to consider and vote for candidates for office. Please consider running for office yourselves – I will be recruiting candidates soon enough for next year’s election!

---

**Student News, continued from page 4**

**To Accept or Reject?**

The entire review process boils down to this question: Should I recommend this manuscript for publication? Some questions to help with this decision are: 1) Is the manuscript appropriate in topic and quality for the journal? 2) Do the contributions of the study outweigh its flaws? 3) Are the major concerns about this manuscript addressable or are they inherently tied up in the theoretical rationale and/or methodological design? In most cases, the decision is not limited to “Accept” or “Reject.” Many journals now have some “in-between” choices like, “Revise and Resubmit,” or other variations to indicate whether a manuscript is closer to the printing press or the curb. However, if you do select one of these responses, be ready to make a decision about the manuscript if it returns with revisions.

**Benefits of Reviewing**

And yes, they do exist. Although reviewing manuscripts can be effortful, engaging in this process can be beneficial as well. The most obvious benefit is that you become a more critical reader and consumer of science. You learn how to distill a manuscript to its core message. You may be exposed to relevant literature you had not seen before, develop familiarity with a subject area you had intended to learn about, or gain information on promising and novel techniques. You may even come across a study that will change the field (OK, we acknowledge that this is rare, stop rolling your eyes). But even if you don’t, your scientific perspective will be sharper – not only do you see what works well, but you also become keenly aware of what doesn’t work. Though the changes may be subtle, take a minute to think about how reviewing manuscripts has changed (or can change) the way you think, write, or design studies. Additionally, as you submit more of your own manuscripts, you also will discover an appreciation for an effective review because it elevates the quality of your work. Finally, providing reviews allows you to form connections with people in your field and get your name out there.

With repeated practice, you develop the ability to complete reviews more efficiently (so we hear). So the next time you receive a review request, think twice before turning it down! You never know, the next manuscript you review may be groundbreaking stuff!
Teaching Tips: Undergraduate Lab Classes in Adult Development and Aging
Submitted by Dr. Matthew C. Shake, St. Bonaventure University

Those who teach lecture courses in adult development and aging often have the challenge of impelling traditional students to appreciate the interesting topics in our field. Indeed, looking back at the past 10 years of Teaching Tips articles in our newsletter reveals common themes such as classroom techniques for dealing with negative aging stereotypes among students, sparking student interest in difficult aging topics, etc. The implications of this challenge are significant; stimulating undergraduates to appreciate studies in adult development strengthens our field.

Promoting active learning through more applied, hands-on courses (Mathie et al., 1993) is a good way to tackle these types of challenges; however, applied laboratory courses in adult development and aging appear to be much less common than in other areas of psychology (Stoloff et al., 2010). In this Teaching Tips column, I briefly describe an advanced laboratory course I teach in which students take their prior exposure to adult development topics (from a lecture course) and apply that knowledge to short research projects.

Students in the laboratory course are juniors or seniors who have completed research methods/statistics and have just finished a semester-long lecture-based course on adult development and aging. As other readers of this newsletter do, in the lecture course, I emphasize interesting areas by asking them to read original research (this is sometimes like pulling teeth, but to alleviate this somewhat I allow them to pick only the most interesting articles to read and write about). In writing assignments, I ask them to generate questions they have about the research and to consider ways they might go about answering those questions. Sometimes, their solutions are a bit ambitious (“I would distribute a survey to older adults in fifteen countries to investigate cross-cultural effects in X.”), but other times their solutions are actually things that are manageable (“I would examine whether prior experience with specific kinds of technology play a role in age differences in X.”). Unknown to them, of course, sometimes their ideas have already been investigated by researchers, but my emphasis is not on originality; rather, I want them to display initiative and curiosity.

Upon entering the laboratory course the following semester, each of them is asked to choose a topic we had reviewed previously and to conduct a simple study to investigate one of their questions. At first, students are daunted by this request; many of them can’t fathom the idea of conducting research, let alone accomplishing this in one semester. I describe the laboratory course as being analogous to a roller coaster: slow, steady uphill crawls, punctuated by furious, blindingly fast parts. In the first 3 weeks, the uphill crawl begins: finding more articles about their question, reading the articles, and writing a short literature review. Bouncing ideas and progressive drafts off of classmates and myself in each class, students quickly come to the valuable realization that research is not an overnight process (something that seems rarely appreciated in a lecture class). The typical undergraduate does not spend three weeks doing any one single thing, so this seems like an eternity. They are accustomed to writing term papers in one weekend. About 1-2 weeks later, their research proposal and methods are due. To increase accountability and critical thinking, I ask them to present their idea and hypotheses (backed by their brief lit review) to the rest of the class. Everyone receives extensive feedback and help simplifying and refining their proposal. Are the proposals all unique, compelling, and well designed? No, but the point is to get them to appreciate research on adult development and aging by doing, rather than simply reading and reciting.

At this point, I tell them the roller coaster is about to descend. Over the next two weeks, they acquire approval from the IRB for their project (using pre-designed templates from me to help speed the process). The following three weeks, data collection ensues. Some of them tap local pools of older adults (e.g., a nearby abbey, nursing home, etc.), whereas others propose studies of development that focus on college students (e.g., asking students to reflect on specific aspects of development in perceived future selves). Three weeks of data analysis follows, including more class evaluations from peers and their professor. Finally, they spend three weeks writing up their results and a discussion section, culminating with an oral presentation of their findings and a paper.

Feedback from students after the course is completed suggests several things. For the first time, students become personally aware of many of the challenges we discuss in the prior semester’s lecture class, for example: (a) handling aging stereotypes in themselves and their participants, (b) flaws in developmental research designs, and (c) that collecting answers to questions takes time! Students in this kind of advanced hands-on course do more than apply their knowledge of research methods, reading, and writing skills. They report becoming more invested in adult development topics, and they report their experiences help reinforce and retain more of the concepts drilled into them in the lecture-based course. Perhaps most importantly, they reflect on their own foray into the science of developmental psychology and, hopefully, discover a place for it in their own goals and ambitions.
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Thanks to amazing contributions from our members, we have an excellent Division 20 program lined up for the 2011 APA Convention. We have two poster sessions representing a wide variety of student and faculty cutting edge research. We also have several exciting symposia, two of which will offer continuing education credit, and two stimulating conversation hours. Definitely plan to spend your Friday evening with us – we will kick off our festivities with Dr. Camp’s presidential address, “Psychological Treatment of Dementia: Fried Won Tons, Photographs, and a Little Help From My Friends”, then we’ll move into our annual business meeting and awards presentation, and then move off-site for a rollicking cocktail hour and dinner. Below is more information on our social event, and a detailed program listing follows. We hope to see you there!

SOCIAL EVENT DESCRIPTION
Division 20 and the Society for Clinical Geropsychology (division 12, section 2) will host a combined social hour/cocktail reception on Friday, August 5th from 6:30 to 7:30 pm in the atrium of Washington’s oldest, most historic bar, Old Ebbitt Grill, located near the White House. The cost is 20 dollars per person to cover appetizers and space rental. During the cocktail reception, there will be a cash bar.

Special entertainment has been arranged that you will not want to miss. At 7 pm, the correspondent on aging issues from The National Psychologist newspaper will be interviewing Dr. C. Cameronkowsky, a 1,000 year old psychologist! He will provide tips on longevity and healthy aging.

To make reservations for the reception, please make out a check directly to Erin Emery ($20 per person) who will be collecting for Div. 20 and Div. 12-2 members and interested guests. Make your reservations by July 25th. Address: Erin E. Emery, Ph.D.; Rush University Medical Center; Department of Behavioral Sciences; 710 S. Paulina St., Suite 431; Chicago, IL  60612; email: Erin_Emery@RUSH.EDU.

Special Opportunity for Students!!!: Division 20/Division 12 Sct. 2 will subsidize half of the event price ($10) for the first 40 students to make a reservation with Dr. Emery!

Dinner is not included in this event, but you may wish to dine afterward at Old Ebbitt Grill. If so, please make reservations for your group on your own (202-347-4801).

Facts about Old Ebbitt Grill: Founded in 1856, Presidents Ulysses S. Grant, Andrew Johnson, Grover Cleveland, Theodore Roosevelt, and Warren G. Harding supposedly refreshed themselves at its stand-around bar. In 1983, Old Ebbitt moved to its current location at 675 15th Street, N.W., to the Beaux-Arts building that was once the old B. F. Keith’s Theater. Bringing its rich history with it, the “new” Old Ebbitt remains a virtual saloon Smithsonian. Old Ebbitt acquired beer steins, animal heads (reportedly hunting trophies of Teddy Roosevelt), and wooden bears said to have been imported by Alexander Hamilton for his private bar. The Victorian interior evokes Washington saloons at the turn of the century. Antique gas chandeliers and fixtures light the Main Dining Room. The wooden crossbeams on the 10-foot ceilings are accented by a style of pinstripe stenciling popular at the turn of the century. The chairs in the dining room are copies of antique Victorian bentwood chairs from a New York Central Railroad dining car. Historic paintings are found throughout the restaurant, including a ceiling mural by New Jersey artist Carol Loeb and impressionist-like paintings to capture unofficial Washington.

PLEASE JOIN US ON FRIDAY AUGUST 5TH FOR A MEMORABLE RECEPTION WITH YOUR FRIENDS AND COLLEAGUES!
Thursday 8/4/11

- 8-9:50am, Convention Center/Room 203
  - Symposium: Social Relations Across Time and Context
    - Chair: Toni C. Antonucci, PhD
    - Participant/1st Author
      Katherine L. Fiori, PhD
      Presentation Title: Positive and Negative Social Exchanges and Mental Health: The Mediating Effect of Loneliness
    - Participant/1st Author
      Yen-Pi Cheng, MA, Purdue University
      Presentation Title: Young Adult Offsprings’ Support of Middle-Aged Parents
    - Participant/1st Author
      Lindsay H. Ryan, PhD, University of Michigan—Ann Arbor
      Presentation Title: A Dyadic Analysis of Social Engagement and Spouse Support: Does It Matter for Both Husbands and Wives?
    - Participant/1st Author
      Besangie S. White, PhD, University of Pittsburgh
      Presentation Title: Profiles of Social Networks Among Older African American Men Who Are Aging Successfully
    - Participant/1st Author
      Francine Conway, PhD, Adelphi University
      Presentation Title: Friendships and Health Among Ethnically Diverse Older Adults: Relations Between Social Network Changes and Physical Health

- 10-10:50am, Convention Center/Halls D and E
  - Posters: Social Relations, Multicultural Issues, Cognition, Successful Aging, Attitudes Toward Aging

- 11am-12:50pm, Convention Center/Room 144A
  - **CE Symposium: Spirituality, Health, and Well-Being in Later Life—Pitfalls and Promises
    - **CE Credit Available for this Symposium. See **below for more details.
    - Chair: Amy L. Ai, PhD
    - Participant/1st Author
      Paul Wink, PhD, Wellesley College
      Presentation Title: The Relationship Among Religion Dwelling, Spiritual Seeking, Wisdom, and Mental Health Outcomes
    - Participant/1st Author
      Crystal L. Park, PhD, University of Connecticut
      Presentation Title: Religious and Spiritual Struggle in Advanced Congestive Heart Failure of Older Adults
    - Participant/1st Author
      Amy L. Ai, PhD
      Presentation Title: Religious Involvement and Long-Term Recovery of Older Patients After Open-Heart Surgery
    - Discussant
      Carolyn M. Aldwin, PhD, Oregon State University
Thursday 8/4/11 (continued)

- **1-2:50pm, Convention Center/Room 151A**
  - Presidential Symposium: New Diagnostic Categories for Dementia—A Panel Discussion
  - **Participant/1stAuthor**
    - Cameron Camp, PhD, Hearthstone Alzheimer Care, Woburn, MA
  - **Participant/1stAuthor**
    - Denise C. Park, PhD, University of Texas at Dallas
  - **Participant/1stAuthor**
    - Adam M. Brickman, PhD, Columbia University in the City of New York
  - **Participant/1stAuthor**
    - Maria Carrillo, PhD, Alzheimer’s Association National Office, Chicago, IL
  - **Participant/1stAuthor**
    - Daniel R. George, PhD, Penn State University College of Medicine
  - **Participant/1stAuthor**
    - Sara Honn Qualls, PhD, University of Colorado at Colorado Springs

Friday 8/5/11

- **8-9:50am, Renaissance Washington Hotel/Meeting Room 5**
  - Executive Committee Meeting

- **10-10:50am, Convention Center/Halls D and E**
  - Posters: Clinical Issues

- **4-4:50pm, Convention Center/Room 203**
  - Presidential address, Dr. Cameron Camp
  - “Psychological Treatment of Dementia: Fried Won Tons, Photographs, and a Little Help From My Friends”

- **5-5:50pm, Convention Center/Room 203**
  - Division 20 Business Meeting and Awards Presentation

- **6pm, Old Ebbit Grill, 675 15th Street, N.W, 202-347-4801**
  - Social Event (reservation required, $20; Erin Emery, Erin_Emery@RUSH.EDU)

Saturday 8/6/11

- **8-8:50am, Convention Center/Room 204A**
  - Symposium: Role of Cognition in Health and Health Behaviors in Later Life
  - **Chair:** Lisa M.S. Miller, PhD, University of California—Davis
  - **Participant/1stAuthor**
    - Laura D’Andrea, MS, University of Illinois at Urbana—Champaign
    - Presentation Title: Health Knowledge and Older Adults’ Comprehension of Multimedia Health Information
  - **Participant/1stAuthor**
    - Elizabeth A.H. Wilson, PhD, Northwestern University Feinberg School of Medicine
    - Presentation Title: Health Literacy and Cognitive Functioning Among Older Adults: The Cognitive Factors Surrounding Health Care
• Participant/1stAuthor
   Lisa M.S. Miller, PhD, University of California—Davis
   Presentation Title: Decision-Making Processes Associated With Use of Nutrition Facts Panels by Younger and Older Adults
• Participant/1stAuthor
   Scott C. Brown, PhD, University of Miami
   Presentation Title: Weight Change and Cognitive Functioning in Hispanic Older Adults: A Prospective Longitudinal Analysis
• Discussant
   Jeffrey W. Elias, PhD, University of California—Davis School of Medicine

• 9-9:50 am, Convention Center/Room 140A
• Division 38/20 Developmental Health Award Presentation and Invited Address
• “Cutting Issues in Stress, Health & Aging Research” presented by 2011 Developmental Health Award Recipient, Professor Carolyn Aldwin, Oregon State University

• 10-10:50 am, Renaissance Washington Hotel/Meeting Room 3
• Retirement Coaching—A Growing Need and a Growing Market
  Chair: Bill Roiter, EdD, MVP Research, West Chatham, MA

• 11-11:50 am, Convention Center/Room 155
• Baltes Distinguished Research Achievement Award Presentation and Invited Address
• “Stability in the Face of Change: Language, Hearing Acuity, and the Aging Brain” presented by the 2010 Baltes Distinguished Research Achievement Award Recipient, Professor Arthur Wingfield, Brandeis University

• 12-1:50 pm, Convention Center/Room 203
• Symposium: Innovative Approaches That Support and Enhance Cognition in Older Adults Through Community-Based Programs—Bridging Science and Practice
  Chair: Paula E. Hartman-Stein, PhD, Center for Healthy Aging, Kent, OH
• Participant/1stAuthor
   Elizabeth A.L. Stine-Morrow, PhD, University of Illinois at Urbana—Champaign
• Participant/1stAuthor
   Jeanette S. Biermann, PhD, University of Akron
   Presentation Title: Short Courses in Meditation Improve Well-Being in Older Adults
• Participant/1stAuthor
   Daniel R. George, PhD, Penn State University College of Medicine
   Presentation Title: The Protective Power of Social Networks: Innovative Community-Based, Intergenerational Programming for Persons With Alzheimer’s
• Participant/1stAuthor
   Tom Meuser, PhD, University of Missouri—St. Louis
   Presentation Title: Life Review in Aging and Dementia: Clinical Considerations
• Participant/1stAuthor
   Helga Noice, PhD, Elmhurst College
   Presentation Title: Acting on the Mind: An Evidence-Based Theatrical Intervention
• Discussant
   Asenath LaRue, PhD, University of Wisconsin—Madison

• 5-6:30 pm, location to be named
• CONA Conversation Hour and Award Presentation
Sunday 8/7/11

- **8-8:50 am, Convention Center/Room 209B**
  - Symposium: Findings From the Normative Aging Study—A Tribute to Raymond Bosse
  - **Cochairs**
    - Carolyn M. Aldwin, PhD, Oregon State University
    - Avron Spiro III, PhD, Boston University
  - **Participant/1st Author**
    - Gilda E. Ennis, MS, North Carolina State University
    - Presentation Title: Longitudinal Changes in Daily Reactivity to Stressors
  - **Participant/1st Author**
    - Heidi Igarashi, MA, Oregon State University
    - Presentation Title: Effect of Marital and Parental Status on Change in Health: No Country for Old (Married) Men?
  - **Participant/1st Author**
    - Carolyn M. Aldwin, PhD, Oregon State University
    - Presentation Title: Longitudinal Changes in Stressful Life Events: Findings From the Normative Aging Study
  - **Discussant**
    - Jacqui Smith, PhD, University of Michigan—Ann Arbor

- **9-10:50 am, Convention Center/Room 155**
  - Symposium: Older Adult Sexual Well-Being—Cognitive—Behavioral and Third-Wave Cognitive—Behavioral Approaches Within a Sex-Positive Context
  - **Chair:** Linda R. Mona, PhD, VA Long Beach Healthcare System, CA
  - **Participant/1st Author**
    - Rebecca P. Cameron, PhD, California State University—Sacramento
    - Presentation Title: Sex in Context: The Culture of the Older Adult
  - **Participant/1st Author**
    - Maggie L. Syme, PhD, SDSU/UCSD Cancer Center Comprehensive Partnership, San Diego, CA
    - Presentation Title: Sex-Positive Approach to Conceptualization and Assessment of Older Adult Sexual Functioning
  - **Participant/1st Author**
    - Linda R. Mona, PhD
    - Presentation Title: Sex-Positive Treatment for the Older Adult: Cognitive—Behavioral, Third-Wave Cognitive—Behavioral, and Experiential Strategies
  - **Discussant**
    - Larry Lemos, RN, RS, MS, VA Long Beach Healthcare System, CA

- **11-12:50, Convention Center/Room 154A**
  - **CE Symposium: Assessment and Treatment of Older Adult Anxiety**
    - **CE Credit Available for this Symposium. See **below for more details.
  - **Cochairs**: Christine E. Gould, MS and Barry A. Edelstein, PhD, West Virginia University
  - **Participant/1st Author**
    - Nancy A. Pachana, PhD, University of Queensland, Brisbane, QLD, Australia
    - Presentation Title: Assessing Late-Life Anxiety in an International Context: Experiences With the Geriatric Anxiety Inventory
  - **Participant/1st Author**
    - Christine E. Gould, MS, West Virginia University
    - Presentation Title: Measuring Social Anxiety in Late Life: A Psychometric Evaluation of a Newly Constructed Self-Report Measure of Social Anxiety
**Call for Nominations to the Committee on Disability Issues in Psychology**

APA’s Committee on Disability Issues in Psychology (CDIP) seeks nominations for two new members to begin three-year terms on **January 1**. The Committee’s mission is to promote the:

§ psychological well-being of people with disabilities;
§ inclusion of knowledge about disabilities and disability issues in education, training programs, policies, and professional development of psychologists;
§ development and implementation of psychological service delivery modes responsive to the needs of people with disabilities; and
§ awareness of disability in psychological research as well as specific research activity in disability areas.

CDIP provides leadership within APA to shape policy, research and best practices in the field of psychology and disability. 2011 – 2012 initiatives include the identification, implementation and dissemination of culturally-competent and accessible services. Examples include but are not limited to multidisciplinary initiatives around health care disparities and the delivery of telehealth services. CDIP is also particularly committed to promoting alliances with other underrepresented groups within the field of psychology in an effort to continue to increase the presence of disability in psychology while also appreciating the intersection of multiple identities with disability.

CDIP actively recruits members of the disability community and/or their allies who are full members of APA with specialization in disability issues. To this end, the Committee strongly encourages applications from those who have a disability and/or those with personal experience with disability. The Committee also seeks psychologists who are members of other underrepresented groups.

Selected candidates will be required to attend two committee meetings each year in Washington, DC, with expenses reimbursed by the APA, and are encouraged to participate in CDIP-sponsored activities held during the APA Convention at their own expense. Members are also expected to participate in email discussions and conference calls, and work on Committee priorities between meetings.

Nomination materials should include a current curriculum vitae and a letter from the nominee indicating willingness to serve on CDIP and highlighting specific competencies, interests, and potential contributions to the work of CDIP.

Nomination materials and supporting materials should be sent by **August 20, 2011** to: Anju Khubchandani, Office on Disability Issues in Psychology, 750 First Street NE, Washington, DC, 20002-4242 or akhubchandani@apa.org.
The Education Committee and its Task Force is soliciting help from members to maintain and update new and existing print and digital instructional tools. We and the members of the Division would greatly appreciate it if you would be willing to share information on any of the following areas:

1. Do you teach a graduate or undergraduate class on Aging? If so, please share with us your syllabus and course material (audio/video recordings of lectures would be valuable).

2. Have you read an interesting book? Please send us names of recent textbooks (introductory, advanced, special topics), fiction or non-fiction books on Aging (Published in 2005 & onwards).

3. Do you use any educational videos in class or have you seen a fascinating movie on aging? Please send us names of some you would recommend (old and new are welcome).

4. Do you have any tips for teaching the new generation? We are always looking for members who would be willing to write the Teaching Tips column for our newsletter. If you would like to write one, please let us know.

Please fill the survey on https://virginiatech.qualtrics.com/SE/?SID=SV_cu4TbdcJ5ouFMeq to send us any information. We look forward to hearing from you.