As you likely are aware, April is National Child Abuse Prevention Month, so this is an opportune time to reflect on both the continuing challenges as well as the advances in our field. Since January, we have been celebrating the Section’s 15th year as a professional organization. I recently scanned Section newsletters from our early years and was struck by the fact that so many of the concerns that were pressing 15 years ago remain challenges today. For example, in 2003 Dan Dodgen wrote a newsletter article on child maltreatment legislation in which he stated, “…the next few years may offer opportunities for some good legislation, but funding will be a major concern. Child advocates will need to make their voices heard so that legislators, particularly appropriators, know that child maltreatment is an important concern in their states and communities”. Sound familiar?

Today, federal funding for research on child maltreatment continues to be inadequate and the situation is unlikely to improve soon given the ongoing economic crisis; there are still service gaps for youth “aging out” of foster care; and most families lack access to empirically-supported interventions to strengthen parenting (the Kauffman Best Practices Report was published in 2004). And we all know that, every year, far too many children are severely neglected and/or abused by their own caregivers. Clearly the purpose of the Section remains relevant in 2011—“…to advance scientific inquiry, training, and professional practice in the area of child maltreatment as a means of promoting the well-being, health, and mental health of children, youth, and families.”

In spite of what sometimes feels like sluggish progress in our field, there are reasons to be optimistic. There have been many significant advances since the Section began—I’ll list just a few. The volume and quality of research in child maltreatment has increased significantly, with several new journals emerging in the past 15 years (e.g., Child Maltreatment; Trauma, Violence, & Abuse; Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment & Trauma); there has been a very recent influx of federal funds to support evidence-based home visiting programs throughout the U.S.; psychological research is increasingly used in development of policies and practices related to child welfare; and forensic interviewing centers, using best practices based on research in child development and children’s testimony, have opened throughout the world.
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So there has been notable progress in terms of prevention and intervention, training, advocacy, and direct services to families.

How can professionals in our field contribute to further advances in protection of children and support of families? One way is to be an active member in the Section on Child Maltreatment and invite colleagues to join us! The Section has a long history of collaborative, interdisciplinary activity that moves our field forward. Check out our website at http://www.apa.org/divisions/div37.child_maltreatment/homepage.html to read about the current prevention activities of individual Section members. One purpose of the Section is to “grow” such individual efforts by first providing opportunities for members to network with one another and then supporting projects that are proposed by groups of members with similar interests and related areas of expertise. Most of the past accomplishments of the Section began with an individual member having passion to make a change in policies and practices and taking initiative to say, “we have to do something about this”. I strongly encourage you to consider how you might be able to leverage Section networks and resources to address a pressing issue in child maltreatment. If you have an idea for a project or an interest area you’d like to pursue on the national level, please contact me.

One mechanism to network with other Section members face-to-face is to attend the upcoming APA convention in Washington DC, August 4-7. Karen Budd, the President of the Society for Child and Family Policy and Practice (Division 37) chose to focus 2011 convention programming on issues related to parenting, so there are many symposia and poster presentations relevant to Section members. I’m very pleased that many of our members are presenting their research at the convention this year. My Presidential Symposium will be a discussion with leading advocates and researchers on the intersection of child maltreatment and family homelessness; we are thrilled that Gary Melton will be the Discussant. The symposium will be followed by a business meeting for the Section—all are welcome and encouraged to attend. You are also invited to attend the Executive Committee meeting that will be held on Friday. This meeting is open to the membership and is a great way to get involved in the Section. Please review the full Division/Section convention program in this issue of the newsletter. I hope to see you all there!

Please join us!
The Annual APA Convention is from August 4-7, 2011 in Washington DC

There will be many exciting Section events this year! See Section Programming on pages 15-16 for more details.
Best Practices

**Foster Youth Alumni Services Program: Promoting Pathways to College Access and Retention of Youth Who Have Aged Out of Care**

Angelique Day, PhDc, MSW

Angelique Day is the Coordinator of foster care initiatives at Michigan State University and is a Doctoral Candidate in the Interdisciplinary Health Sciences Program at Western Michigan University.

Both individual and systemic factors contribute to poor educational outcomes for foster youth. At the individual level, most children enter foster care because of abuse or neglect by their parents. The trauma experienced by children who have been neglected or abused can lead to a variety of developmental problems, such as learning disabilities or behavioral and emotional disorders (Harden, 2004). At the systemic level, additional trauma is experienced when children are taken away from their birth families (despite being removed from an abusive and neglectful environment), when they are separated from siblings, or when they change foster care placements (Folman, 1998). One outcome of repeated placement changes is difficulty in the academic setting. Indeed, compared to their non-foster care peers, foster care youth are over three times as likely to be without a high school diploma, half as likely to have completed any amount of college, and one fifth as likely to have a college degree (Courtney, Dworsky, Lee & Raap, 2010). Services provided at the college level may help former foster care youth in successfully completing a college degree.

The program is composed of a compilation of student support services including:

- Foster Care Youth Scholarship Program (supported by an endowment)
- Pre-College Camp for Foster Care Youth
- Mentoring Program
- Care Packages for MSU Students
- Website

**Foster Care Youth Scholarship Program**

The Foster Care Youth Endowed Scholarship Program was first implemented in the fall of 2006 and is administered by the MSU School of Social Work, the Office of Admissions and Scholarships, and the Office of Financial Aid. It provides a limited number of tuition-and-living-expense scholarships to incoming MSU freshmen who have spent some part of their childhood or adolescence in a court-ordered foster care placement in Michigan. For more information, and to receive an application, contact the MSU School of Social Work at 517-355-0333 or email Gary Anderson (gary.anderson@ssc.msu.edu).

**Foster Care Camp**

Maximizing Educational Opportunities for Youth In Out of Home Care is a rolling residential pre-college summer camp program (3 nights and 4 days in summer semester), held on the campus of Michigan State University for approximately 30 foster youth from across the state. The camp aims to prepare and support foster care youth who are considering attending institutions of higher education by increasing knowledge and understanding about eligibility for financial support, student life and studying at MSU. In addition to serving youth who are currently in foster care, the camp also provides a service
learning opportunity for former foster youth who are currently enrolled at MSU to build and practice responsibility and leadership skills. The project has now moved from a seed grant obtained in the summer of 2008 to a self-sustaining project funded by Title IV-E youth in transition funds. Private funders and individual donors have provided resources for private scholarships for students who are not IV-E eligible. Since the summer of 2008, 70 high school students have been served by the program, and 21 college students have provided leadership and mentoring during the summer camp experience.

Mentoring Program

The mentoring program is available to current or former foster care youth who are currently enrolled at Michigan State University. The program is designed to match students with faculty and community members-at-large who share similar career interests. Those interested in becoming mentors are required to participate in a day-long training designed to assist them in understanding the trauma foster care youth face while in the system and the emotional “baggage” they may bring with them to campus. The formal relationship between the mentor and mentee is designed to last for no less than a year, allowing time for an ongoing relationship to develop the mentee’s personal and professional skills. The mentoring relationship consists of face-to-face meetings in addition to telephone, e-mail, and other social media mediums. The mentoring program has been supported through the receipt of Americorps funds through the Michigan Community Service Commission. Mentor recruitment is supported through partnerships with the Capitol Area United Way Volunteer Center.

Care Package Program

The care package program is an organized, campus-wide outreach effort to provide former foster care youth with a care package to be delivered during final exam week each semester. Care packages provide tangible items like school supplies, personal hygiene products, non-perishable food items, gift cards, and campus memorabilia. This program provides students with something that is immediate and tangible - resources that are key to building rapport and trust with populations that are hard to serve. In addition to interdepartmental partnerships, support for pulling together the baskets has come from MSU Alumni clubs and the MSU Extension office. This program has grown significantly; in the program’s first inception, 28 baskets were delivered to eligible students in the fall of 2009. In the fall of 2011, over 70 baskets were delivered.

Website

The website (http://www.finaid.msu.edu/fyas/AppMain.asp), which rolled out in the Spring 2009 semester, operates as an information and referral service to former foster youth currently enrolled at MSU. Housed and maintained by the Office of Financial Aid, the website is a means of communication to students who register on the website for services. Eligible students are identified through responses on the Federal Application for Financial Student Aid (FAFSA) form who checked that they were a “ward of the court” at the time of application to college. These students are invited to register on the FYAS website through e-blast communications from the Office of Financial Aid. Behind each service is a designated “foster child champion” or student support staff person that has gone through specific training to increase sensitivity to the issues and need of the population. Services available through the website include student employment, financial aid, tutoring, health (including health insurance, physical health care clinics, dental care and mental health services), housing, mentoring, child care and financial well-being services.
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Meet the 2003-2004 Section’s President

Vera Chelyapov, interviewed Past President Thomas Lyon, Ph.D.
Dr. Lyon was the Section President in 2003-2004

In this issue of the Section newsletter, our 15-year celebration continues with an interview of Past President Thomas Lyon (2003-2004). Please stay tuned for interviews with Bette Bottoms (2001-2002) and Sharon Portwood (2005-2006) in the final issue of the 2011 newsletter. There is much to learn from these extraordinary leaders who governed our Section in the past and who continue to be highly influential in the field of child maltreatment.

You were President of the Section in 2003 and 2004, what were some of the Section’s achievements during that time?

Several things jump out. Some accomplishments were the Supreme Court amicus brief, conferences that we co-sponsored, and task forces that we supported. I brought to the Section my connections with law, obviously, and my desire to make things very practice-oriented and interdisciplinary.

Tell me a little more about the amicus brief.

The brief was for Stogner v. California, which involved extending the statute of limitations for child sexual abuse. Technically the issue was whether it constituted an ex post facto law. But the hard core legal issues were not what was of interest to the Section, and ultimately to the organizations that sent out the brief. What Stogner gave us was an opportunity to tell the Supreme Court about the dynamics of child sexual abuse. There are several aspects to that. First, and this was directly connected to extending the statute of limitations issue, there is the problem that people often fail to disclose abuse, or if they do disclose tend to disclose relatively late in life. So the obvious problem that needs to be solved is you don’t want the statute of limitations to run because the person failed to disclose.

But there were other issues that weren’t so directly legally relevant but were of interest to people, and these were the issues related to the harms of sex abuse and the recidivism of sex offenders. The harms of sex abuse probably were obvious to the Supreme Court, but there were extra-legal reasons why we were interested in the issue. Previously a meta-analysis was published in the Psychological Bulletin that questioned whether or not sexual abuse was indeed harmful. The APA was seriously criticized for not censoring the paper. Now of course, it would be a terrible thing for the APA to censor such a paper. Basically everyone, even those who disagreed with the paper, agreed the APA shouldn’t do so, but because of the controversy, the APA was very sensitive to this issue. When they saw this brief come along, they said, “Great! This is an opportunity for us to officially say, ‘We think Sex Abuse is a bad thing.’” And I think that was a large part of the reason why, when we finally approached them, they were ready to sign on.

The recidivism issue did have some legal relevance because part of the reason you want to extend the statute of limitations for sex crimes is that sex offenders don’t age out. And this I think the court may not have been aware of. A policy justification for extending the statute of limitations is that even if the guy is now fifty, the prosecution can potentially reduce recidivism because child molesters tend to molest well into their old age.

How did the Section help you with creating the brief?

We thought well, this is a great opportunity to say something to the Court, and the goal wasn’t strictly to affect the decision in Stogner, but it was to write a brief that Justices would read. We could anticipate that in future cases they would be dealing with sex abuse. With the support of the Executive Committee, I started to talk to different people in different organizations about sponsoring the brief. It was relatively easy to get the American Professional Society on the Abuse of Children (APSAC) involved. APSAC is multidisciplinary, and I met the board of directors and they were in favor of the legal argument: that we should extend the statute of limitations, and they agreed with the dynamics of the abuse issues.
Then I approached the National Association Council for Children, and they are a legal organization whose members predominately represent children in dependency cases. We wanted to build a groundswell of support before approaching the APA.

I think because I was section president, I had access to the people within the APA. We found out that the Section on its own couldn’t submit a brief, but the APA said, “We’re not trying to shut you down, we think we can get association wide support for your brief.” It’s funny because I didn’t strategically approach the APA thinking that [the harms of sexual abuse issue] would be the lynch pin that would help us get this brief, but it all worked out very well.

I think, obviously, it helped that I knew enough about law, so that I was able to approach people in law. Arnold & Porter, a very prestigious law firm that had done a lot of Supreme Court work, formally wrote and submitted the brief. I helped out as did several members of the Section, including Kathleen Kendall-Tackett, Mark Chaffin, Jodi Quas, Angela Crossman, and Sharon Portwood. The Section is very small, but even that limited status was enough to enable us to work with the APA. And the APA is of course a very gigantic, powerful organization. So I appreciated the Section’s ability to get things done.

How does the Section help promote working with different groups?

If the Section didn’t exist, one might think that no one in the APA works on child maltreatment. The Section allows coordination of different groups. For example, there’s a lot of overlap between the interests of the Section and Division 41, Law and Psychology, but the Law and Psych folks tend to come more from the applied memory side, and less from the clinical dynamics of sex abuse side. And what the Section is able to do is pull people together, people who might never otherwise talk to each other. I knew that had been the goal of the organization for some time, and I was definitely interested in getting those kinds of linkages going.

The other thing that was clear to me, just because I’m a law professor, was that I saw opportunities for greater interaction with lawyers. Now of course the amicus brief is one example of that, and the other thing that we did while I was President, that I was proud of, was that we worked with the American Bar Association to co-sponsor one of their annual Children and the Law conferences. Just because I was “president” I was able to talk to people within the ABA. When I approached the Children and the Law group with this, they were very excited. From their perspective it was an opportunity to get people within psychology, who really knew the research and were some of the best people in their field, more involved with legal practitioners. And this was our perspective too. Researchers will often say to me, “How can I get involved with cases?” They assume that it’s all about expert witnessing, but that’s really an inefficient way of spreading the word. A great way is to do training, and work with lawyers who are dying to understand child development or child psychopathology.

Sharon Portwood and I served on the steering committee for the conference. As a result, I was able to call up people that I admired, and ask them to give talks that I knew would be enormously helpful to people in the field. So, for example, the Child and Law conference included several talks by Michael Lamb on interviewing kids. It was a great opportunity to bring out the leading researcher on interviewing to speak to a practitioner audience.

And then something else that the Section did was that we put together a day long training at the APSAC conference, that included Heather Stewart from the Salt Lake City Children’s Justice Center and Mel Pipe, a long-term collaborator of Lamb who does excellent research. These are just some examples of bringing people together from different fields that might not otherwise communicate.

You also mentioned that there were Task Forces you were proud of. Describe some of the work in which they were involved.

There were two Task forces that were going strong during my presidency. There was the Reactive Attachment Disorder Task Force that Mark Chaffin chaired. That resulted in a publication in Child Maltreatment in 2006 that made some policy recommendations to avoid some of the abusive and coercive treatments that were popular at the time. The other task force was on corporal punishment that was chaired by Sandra Graham Bermann. The Executive Committee gave them some start-up funds during my Presidency. They came out with a report in 2008. Both of these topics are obvious candidates for interdisciplinary work because they have legal implications; they’re definitely not pure theoretical research issues. They are very significant policy issues, and actually very contentious policy issues. Task forces are a great way to approach these issues, because you can try to find consensus among what otherwise looks like a very divided field. And I can’t say that I did a lot of work for any of these Task Forces, but one of the jobs as President is to say, “This is a great idea. Do you want to work on this? Maybe we can give a little money to get started.”
What are some challenges that you are seeing in the field, and how could the Section help navigate or solve some of those?

One of the major challenges that I see is that although a lot of these innovative interviewing methods have penetrated the consciousness of people who investigate abuse, I don’t see them as having much of an effect on the Family Courts, where the allegations are less than criminal abuse, but still really serious: conflicts between parents, children’s preference as to custody, etc. I would like to see the Section recognize that a lot of the message it has for practitioners who work with abused kids, and abuse as a criminal matter or abuse as a social services matter, are equally relevant to people who work with milder maltreatment that people see in divorce or custody cases, and to some extent, domestic violence cases. There’s still a separation where child maltreatment people are on one side, and people who do divorce, custody and to some extent, domestic violence, are on the other side.

How has the field changed over the course of your career, in general, in terms of child psychology and maltreatment?

I unfortunately don’t have the breadth of understanding to talk about the entire field. But I can talk about my little corner of the field, which is child interviewing. That’s changed dramatically. When I first got involved in the late 80s we were just going through the era of these high profile mass abuse allegations in preschools. And the suggestibility folks were really just getting going in terms of taking some of these horrible coercive techniques being used in the field and bringing them into the lab and showing that preschool kids can be dramatically suggestible.

Then the practitioners fell into a great depression. Because they were basically being attacked by the best researchers in developmental psychology, and the defenders of child interviewing tended to be clinicians without a lot of research behind them. They felt, “Well what do we do? Kids are highly suggestible, our interviewing methods are terrible, do we just stop investigating child abuse?” And that was where the field was in the 90s. And then, thanks to Michael Lamb and other researchers who were as concerned with getting it right as with showing what was going wrong, the field started to transform into a more positively oriented approach. Where it was as much about, these are the techniques that can increase children’s productivity, as these are the techniques you should avoid. And that’s the really lovely thinking that I’ve seen evolve.

There still is a very active group of people who point out the flaws of children’s testimony, and I’ve gone from being a critic to embracing a lot of their negative message. At the same time, there’s a group of researchers whose primary focus is on the good things we can do. And I think of myself as in that camp, so what’s emerged is a specialty, a field of people who are interested in investigative interviewing. And it’s, from my perspective, the best kind of field because it’s truly interdisciplinary. It has obvious applications, in fact it’s born of applied psychology, at the same time it really benefits from people with a basic research background getting involved.
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Public Policy

2011 BUDGET DONE, CONGRESS MOVES ON TO 2012 AGENDA

Thomas L. Birch, J.D.
National Child Abuse Coalition

2011 BUDGET AGREEMENT FINALLY DONE

The final budget agreement negotiated by President Obama with House and Senate Republican and Democratic leaders sets 2011 funding for the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) at a total of $70.6 billion, a cut of 4.5% below 2010 appropriations and 7% above the funding proposed in H.R.1, the budget-cutting full-year continuing resolution (CR) passed by the House in February.

In March, the Senate rejected H.R.1. At the same time, senators failed to pass a Democratic alternative with appropriations for most services to children and families at the 2010 spending levels. The final spending agreement for 2011 represents a midpoint between the two and appears closer to the original budget of cuts proposed by the House Republican leadership before the more fiscally conservative freshmen Republicans began piling on their demands for deeper, broader spending cuts.

The 2011 full-year continuing resolution reduces federal spending overall by $38.5 billion from 2010 spending levels, down from the $61 billion in cuts passed by the House of Representatives in H.R.1. The bill includes the $12 billion in cuts already taken and signed into law in three previous continuing resolutions, as well as nearly $28 billion in new budget reductions. Funding for CAPTA and other children’s and families’ services is assumed in the bill’s account totals to remain at the 2010 funding level (presumably minus the $3 million in earmarks eliminated from CAPTA discretionary spending in the first short-term CR).

Unfortunately in a CR, unlike in a regular appropriations bill, there is no program-by-program allocation of funding amounts. However, the account totals in H.R. 1473 make assumptions about funding levels for specific programs, including the assumption that CAPTA is funded at last year’s level. However, those assumptions are not binding on HHS and the administration has flexibility within the account totals to allocate spending. As such, the new CR instructs federal agencies to provide Congress within 30 days of enactment of the bill with a detailed spending plan for the remainder of the 2011 fiscal year. At that time the funding levels for all programs will be revealed. Highlights of the HHS portion of the CR include the following:

- Head Start: Provides $7.575 billion, an increase of $340 million over 2010, allowing the current number of children to stay in Head Start. H.R.1 would have cut 218,000 low-income children from the program.
- Child Care: Restores cuts made in H.R.1 and increases support by $100 million above 2010 funding to $2.227 billion.
- Maternal and Child Health: Maintains level funding at $662 million; H.R.1 would have cut $50 million from the program.
- Community Services Block Grant: Provides $680 million to support local community services for low-income people, a cut of $20 million from FY10 but $285 million more than H.R.1.
The President’s 2012 budget for HHS also includes an increase of $250 million to support a reform agenda focused on improving foster care through incentives to states. Funds would be available, presumably on a competitive basis, to decrease the rates of maltreatment recurrence and the rates of re-entry into foster care. States could use the funds to improve outcomes for children in foster care by reducing the length of stay in foster care, and increasing permanency through reunification, adoption and guardianship.

The new program aims at helping states on the front end of the child welfare system. The initiative would seek to help states achieve declines in the numbers of children who need to enter foster care and to improve upon providing services to families with more complex issues. States would receive support for demonstrations to test innovative strategies that improve outcomes for children and reward states for the efficient use of federal and state resources.

OBAMA’S 2012 BUDGET PROPOSES CHILD WELFARE INITIATIVE

On February 14, in the midst of the House debate over the 2011 budget, President Obama sent to Congress his budget proposal for fiscal year 2012. The funding request embodies a freeze on discretionary spending at the 2010 level, with adjustments made in programs throughout the government. While proposing cuts to some programs in order to allow increases to others the administration hopes to realize its pledge of an overall freeze in domestic spending.

The 2012 discretionary budget for the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) Administration for Children and Families (ACF) proposes a decrease of $1.2 billion from 2010, for total request in 2012 of $16.2 billion. Included are significant cuts in programs such as the Community Services Block Grant and the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP), while additional funding is proposed for Head Start and child care. Funds for the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (CAPTA) basic state grants, discretionary grants and community-based prevention grants would all be held at current funding levels.

The budget target set by the Republican and Democratic party leaders actually matches the original number proposed by the House Republican leadership in the first version of H.R. 1, a measure rejected within 24 hours in February by the Republican freshmen and members of the fiscally conservative House Republican Study Committee and never taken to the House floor.

WELFARE REFORM PROPOSED BY HOUSE STUDY COMMITTEE

Staking out an early position on the upcoming reauthorization of the Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF) program, Rep. Jim Jordan (R-OH), chair of the House Republican Study Committee, a caucus of conservative House Republican members, has introduced the Welfare Reform Act of 2011, H.R. 1167, which would reduce available annual TANF funding by $1 billion, from $16.566 billion to $15.566 billion, eliminate a TANF caseload reduction credit, and impose work requirements for food stamp recipients. Otherwise eligible recipients on strike because of a labor dispute would lose eligibility to participate in the food stamp program.

H.R. 1167 is intended to take the approach from TANF’s work requirements and apply them to the food stamp program requiring food stamp recipients to either work or prepare for a job. The bill would also roll back the TANF funding to 2007 levels after
unemployment falls to 6.5% and then be allowed to grow with inflation.

The bill would also require that the President’s budget proposal each year report figures for total federal, state, and local welfare spending over the ensuing decade. The bill identifies 77 means-tested federal programs that would be tracked, including: cash assistance and welfare programs; child care; health, housing, and education assistance; maternal and child health; Head Start; job training; nutrition and energy assistance; Title IV-E foster care and adoption subsidies; Community Services Block Grant and Title XX Social Services Block Grant.

The legislation has been jointly referred to the Committees on Ways and Means, Budget, Rules, Agriculture, and Energy and Commerce.

**CHILDREN’S BUREAU AND HEAD START REINFORCE PARTNERSHIP**

The U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) Children’s Bureau and the Office of Head Start have issued a joint Information Memorandum to state agencies and tribal organizations responsible for administering the CAPTA state grants as well as child welfare funds through Title IV-B and IV-E to promote partnerships between child welfare and Head Start agencies in serving their families.

This Information Memorandum mirrors one sent in July to Head Start and Early Head Start agencies to reinforce the Head Start commitment to serving abused and neglected children and to provide guidance through promising practices in recruiting and serving families involved in the public child welfare system. This new memorandum is meant to provide similar information to reinforce child welfare agencies’ partnerships with Head Start and Early Head Start, with the awareness that early intervention and attention to early development can effectively mitigate negative outcomes for those infants and young children who are at greatest risk for abuse and neglect.

The Information Memorandum notes that the Office of Head Start encourages Head Start and Early Head Start agencies to prioritize children in the public child welfare system when establishing enrollment selection criteria and selecting children and families for services, observing that a program may prioritize these children for enrollment due to the level of risk and the needs of the family even if a child is not automatically eligible.

According to the memo, the Head Start statute requires Head Start and Early Head Start agencies to take an active role to encourage cooperation with community partners and affirmative steps to establish collaborative relationships with community organizations, which includes child welfare agencies.

In fact, the instructions in the Information Memorandum reflect actions to implement a group of amendments drafted and proposed by the National Child Abuse Coalition and enacted in the 2007 reauthorization of Head Start recognizing that abused and neglected children and children at-risk of maltreatment and in need of preventive services can benefit from Head Start and Early Head Start services. The amendments addressed themes of:

- greater attention to serving children who have been maltreated or are at-risk of abuse or neglect,
- greater attention to the training needs of parents (especially in Early Head Start),
- improved coordination with existing home-based services, and
- improved collaboration with the state agency responsible for child welfare services and child protective services.

The joint memo also points out that CAPTA has since 2003 required child protective services to refer all cases involving substantiated victims of child maltreatment under the age of 3 to Part C of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) to be evaluated for the receipt of early intervention services such as
speech, language, and physical therapy, family counseling and home visits, medical care, nursing and nutrition services.

With Head Start placing a high value on outreach and comprehensive services to families and children with involvement in the public child welfare system, those children could be receiving greater attention through the kind of comprehensive services offered by Head Start and Early Head Start programs which support children by providing early identification of developmental delays and access to early intervention, health care and mental health services. Of similar importance for these families are the family support and parent education services provided by Head Start and Early Head Start.

The joint memorandum encourages local child welfare agencies and Head Start and Early Head Start programs to enter into a formal agreement such as:

- establishing an agreed upon standardized referral process to Head Start and Early Head Start programs by the local or state child welfare office;
- arranging cross-training opportunities to educate staff from each agency about child welfare services and Head Start and Early Head Start objectives, policies and services offered, as well as to establish working relationships, and joint trainings on topics of mutual interest, such as working with high-need families (e.g., families with substance abuse issues, criminal histories, and mental health problems); and
- designating a child welfare liaison to Head Start and Early Head Start programs and/or co-locating Head Start staff within the local child welfare agency
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Case Notes

OMG, I C UN8KD!
A Revealing Look at Teen Sexting, Psychology, and the Law
Bradley D. McAuliff, JD, PhD
California State University, Northridge

“Sexting” or the act of sending sexually explicit photographs electronically via text messaging or posting on the internet has received increasing public and scholarly attention in recent years. A survey by the Pew Research Center found that almost 20% of respondents ages 12 to 17 with cell phones have sent a sexually suggestive nude or nearly nude image of themselves to someone else via text messaging or received one (Lenhart, 2009). This statistic jumps to nearly 40% when only the responses of 17 year-olds are considered. Legal cases across the United States have begun to highlight the unique challenges inherent in efforts to regulate minors’ sexting behavior under existing, and perhaps ill-fitting, state laws.

Legal Cases
In Orlando, Florida, a young man by the name of Phillip Alpert had a late-night argument with his girlfriend. He had just turned 18 years old, she was 16, and they had been dating for almost 2½ years. After the spat, Alpert electronically forwarded a naked picture of his girlfriend (that she had taken and sent to him) to her contact list of friends and family members. Several days later, police arrested Alpert and charged him with 72 counts of various crimes including felony possession and distribution of child pornography. Alpert eventually was convicted and sentenced to five years of probation. Florida law requires him to register as a sexual offender until the age of 43 (Florida Department of Corrections, No. X61836) and today his picture still can be found on Florida’s sexual offender website.

In a second Florida case, two Tallahassee teenagers took naked photographs of themselves engaging in various sexual acts (A.H. v. State of Florida, 2007). The girl, Amber, was 16 years old at the time and her boyfriend, Jeremy, was 17. Together they sent photos from a computer at Amber’s house to Jeremy’s personal email account; nobody else received the photos. When police later learned about the photos, they arrested the two teenagers and charged them with “producing, directing, or promoting a photograph featuring the sexual conduct of a child.” Jeremy was also charged with possession of child pornography. Amber was adjudicated a delinquent and the judgment was upheld on appeal. Writing for the majority, Judge James Wolf reasoned in part that the two teenagers could have ended up selling the photos to child pornographers or showing the images to their friends.

Psychological Research and Legislative Responses
These cases demonstrate an alarming trend in which child pornography laws intended to protect minors are being used to punish them instead. This trend is particularly troubling in light of recent U.S. Supreme Court case law recognizing that “adolescence is different” with respect to serious criminal sanctions such as the death penalty (Roper v. Simmons, 2005) and life without parole (Graham v. Florida, 2010). In both cases, the Court’s majority opinion relied heavily on developmental research by Laurence Steinberg and cited three aspects of adolescents’ immaturity that diminish criminal culpability: an underdeveloped sense of responsibility (and difficulty controlling their impulses); their heightened sensitivity to peer pressure; and the unformed nature of their characters (Steinberg & Scott, 2003). Undoubtedly, these unique developmental characteristics of adolescents affect their sexting decisions and must be considered by officials who treat adolescent sexters as sexual offenders under state law.

Several states have begun to modify existing legislation or craft new statutes to address sexting by minors. In 2009, Vermont created a reduced charge for sexting in which violations were treated as juvenile misdemeanors rather than child pornography felonies. Nebraska took a somewhat different approach by making affirmative defenses available for the creation of child pornography if (1) the defendant was less than 18 years old when the visual depiction was created; and (2) the sexually explicit conduct includes no one other than the defendant. Similar, albeit slightly more complicated, affirmative defenses exist for the distribution and possession of child pornography in Nebraska as well. Unlike Vermont law, which downgrades the punishment for sexting, Nebraska law decriminalizes sexting altogether if certain criteria are met.

Yet another legislative response to sexting can be found in a May 2010 bill passed in Ohio. Instead of modifying existing child pornography statutes, Ohio passed a new law that specifically targets sexting by minors. The law applies to the production, possession, or distribution of nude images of a minor by a minor using a telecommunication device and states these materials are subject to a juvenile misdemeanor charge. Under Ohio’s approach, prosecutors have wider discretion when charging sexting cases involving minors because they can prosecute under the new law or existing child pornography laws. This is not the
case in Vermont or Nebraska.

**Implications for Psychologists**

It behooves the psychological community to stay abreast of continuing legal developments involving minors and sexting. Laws intended to regulate this behavior must be carefully tailored so as to take into account the developmental immaturity of adolescents. Psychologists and the U.S. Supreme Court agree that this age group is different and not deserving of certain serious criminal sanctions given to adult offenders. Like the death penalty and life without parole, requiring sexting minors to register as sex offenders well into adulthood does not seem appropriate from either a psychological or legal perspective.

Practitioners who work with adolescents are particularly well-positioned to discuss sexting behavior with young clients and their families. These discussions should incorporate unforeseen legal, as well as social, consequences for adolescents who are less likely to consider this type of information when making decisions than adults. For researchers, the large percentage of teens (20-40%) who report sending or receiving sexts provides a unique opportunity to collect data from a larger, more representative sample than studies that focus on less common, more serious types of delinquent behavior. Better understanding “the who and why” of sexting should help hone our psychological and legal responses to this problem, thereby minimizing the negative ramifications for everyone involved.
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Look for these Sessions at the Upcoming APA Annual Convention  
Washington DC, August 4-7, 2011

Thursday, August 4:

9 – 10:50 a.m.  Symposium: *Intersection of Child Maltreatment and Family Homelessness—The Problem and Emerging Solutions*  
Convention Center (Room 154A)  
Cochair: Mary E. Haskett, PhD; Lauren D. Stokes, MA. Participant/1stAuthor: Beryl Cowan, JD, PhD; Staci Perlman, PhD; Abigail Gewirtz, PhD. Discussant: Gary B. Melton, PhD.

11 – 11:50 a.m. Poster Session (F): *Child and Family Research, Policy, and Practice—I*  
Convention Center

12 – 1:50 p.m.  Symposium: *Strengthening Parenting Within a Rural Children’s Mental Health System of Care—Planning for Implementation and Intervention*  
Convention Center Room 204A  
Chair: Brenda J. Huber, PhD. Participant/1stAuthor: Brenda J. Huber, PhD; Mike Wells, MS; Brent Sylvester, PhD; Adena B. Meyers, PhD. Discussant: Rosalyn M. Bertram, PhD.

2 – 3:50 p.m. Symposium: *Public Policy and the Science of Child Mental Health—How Communication Science Bridges the Divide*  
Convention Center (Room 144A)  
Chair: Mary Ann McCabe, PhD. Participant/1stAuthor: Nat Kendall-Taylor, PhD; Michael Erard, PhD. Discussant: Ron Manderscheid, PhD; Karen Saywitz, PhD.

5 – 7:50 p.m.  Division 37 Executive Committee Meeting  
Renaissance Washington Hotel (Meeting Room 2)

Friday, August 5:

8 – 8:50 a.m.  Conversation Hour: *Advocating for Children-Mentoring Breakfast for Students Interested in Policy*  
Convention Center (Room 154A)

9 – 9:50 a.m. Discussion: *Being an Advocate for Children and Families—PsycAdvocates Day and Beyond*  
Convention Center (Room 151B)  
Chair: Sandra J. Bishop-Josef, PhD. Participant/1stAuthor: Cindy Miller-Perrin, PhD.

10 – 10:50 a.m. Symposium: *Twenty-First Century Implementation of Evidence-Based Parent Training Programs in Community Settings and Business Meeting*  
Convention Center (Room 143A)  
Chair: Karen S. Budd, PhD. Participant/1stAuthor: Sheila Eyberg, PhD; Matthew R. Sanders, PhD; Carolyn Webster-Stratton, PhD. Discussant: Marc Atkins, PhD.

2 – 3:50 p.m.  Section Executive Committee Meeting  
Renaissance Washington Hotel (Meeting Room 5)

4 – 4:50 p.m. Symposium: *Use of Technology to Enhance Parenting Programs and Prevent Child Maltreatment*  
Convention Center (Room 152A)  
Chair: Beverly L. Fortson, PhD; Participant/1stAuthor: Jennifer B. Lefever, PhD; Steven J. Ondersma, PhD; Beverly W. Funderburk, PhD. Discussant: Shannon R. Self-Brown, PhD.
Saturday, August 6:

9 – 9:50 a.m. Symposium: *Role of Mental Illness in Decisions About Parenting Capacity and Termination of Parental Rights*
Convention Center (Room 154A)
Chair: Karen S. Budd, PhD. Participant/1stAuthor: Barbara A. Kahn, JD; Kate Joshi, PsyD; Jennifer R. Clark, PsyD. Discussant: Karen S. Budd, PhD.

10 – 10:50 a.m. Poster Session: *Child and Family Research, Policy, and Practice—II*
Convention Center

11 – 12:50 p.m. Symposium: *Public Health Strategies to Enhance Positive Parenting—Research and Programs From the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention*
Convention Center (Room 143C)
Chair: Jennifer W. Kaminski, PhD. Participant/1stAuthor: Jennifer W. Kaminski, PhD; Camille Smith, MS; Kim S. Miller, PhD. Discussant: Larke N. Huang, PhD.

1 – 1:50 p.m. Invited Address: *Lifetime Advocacy Award [Mary Campbell]*
Convention Center (Room 144B)

Sunday, August 7:

11 –11:50 a.m. Symposium: *Foster Parent Training—Incorporating Foster Parent Needs to Inform Practice and Policy*
Convention Center (Room 154B)
Chair: Angela M. Tunno, MS. Participant/1stAuthor: Angela M. Tunno, MS; Yo Jackson; Richard W. Puddy, PhD, MPH.
CONTINUING EDUCATION WORKSHOP
APA 119TH CONVENTION 2011 - WASHINGTON DC

INCREASING EFFECTIVENESS OF PROVIDERS FOR CHILDREN VICTIMS OF VIOLENCE

TOPICS
*Trauma-Focused Evidence-Based Interventions
*Review of Trauma Assessment Tools
*Integrated Interventions Involving Families & Other Providers
*The Role of Culture on Trauma and Treatment Experiences

CE Workshop Fee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Early Bird</th>
<th>Regular</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Member</td>
<td>$220</td>
<td>$275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-member</td>
<td>$260</td>
<td>$335</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Regular enrollment fee begins July 1 through August 7, 2011

WORKSHOP DETAILS (Enrollment begins on April 15th at 10:00 AM EST).
To enroll, please visit www.apa.org/convention or call (800) 374-2721, ext. 5991.

Date/Location:
August 3, 2011
8:00 AM to 3:50 PM
Hyatt Regency Washington (400 New Jersey Ave., NW)

CE Credits: Eligible for 7 CE Credits.
This workshop has been reviewed and approved by the APA Office of Continuing Education in Psychology (CEP) to offer continuing education (CE) credits to psychologists. The APA CEP maintains responsibility for the content of the program. This flyer was supported by grant number 2010-VF-GX-K008, awarded by the Office for Victims of Crime, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice. The opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this flyer are those of the contributors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

Sponsored by the APA Violence Prevention Office in collaboration with the National Center for Victims of Crime (NCVC) and Childhelp under a grant awarded to APA by the U.S. Department of Justice's Office for Victims of Crime.

Guest Speaker: Susana Rivera, PhD
Program Director, Serving Children
Section Elections

The Section on Child Maltreatment will hold an election for three positions on the Executive Committee this Fall, with terms to begin January 1, 2012:

Member-at-Large
Newsletter Editor
Case Notes Editor

Member-at-Large:
Each of the Section’s three Members-at-Large provide direction to the Executive Committee and, in consultation with the other members of the EC, creates and carries out at least one project over his or her 3-year term.

Participation on the Section Executive Committee helps to promote the mission of the Section and is an effective way of starting or expanding participation in a range of Section, Division, and APA activities. Previous experience in Section or Division activities is not required, and people who have never held an office in APA and who are eager to participate in Section activities are encouraged to apply. To run for and to serve in office, membership in the Section is required.

Newsletter Editor:
The Newsletter Editor is appointed by the Executive Committee, upon recommendation of the President, for a three-year term beginning January 1 after his or her appointment.

Major Responsibilities include involvement in all activities involved in publishing the Newsletter, including the solicitation of material, editing, layout and formatting of issues, coordination of printing services, distribution of the Newsletter, and distribution of back issues. Specific tasks include: Development and Dissemination of the Newsletter, which involves creating a file containing the formatted Newsletter. This file is then forwarded on disk to APA Division Services for printing. Division Services also prepares labels and handles mailing. Newsletters for the Section are developed 3 times per year (January, May, and September).

Casenotes Column Editor:
APA Div. 37, Section on Child Maltreatment, is seeking a new Casenotes Column Editor to begin August 2011. The purpose of the column is to describe a recent case or legal issue involving children (or a related topic) and then to discuss its implications for legal professionals, psychologists, and researchers. The primary responsibility of the editor is to write the column and/or solicit authors for the column and edit this work. Columns are published in the newsletter three times per year (January, May, and September). Self-nominations are encouraged.

Self-nominations may be made by sending a vitae and letter of interest. Those wishing to nominate someone else should check to see that he or she would be willing to accept the nomination, and then submit a letter or nomination. The nominee will also be asked to submit a curriculum vitae to the Elections Committee.

Please submit applications by July 1, 2011 for the Case Notes Column Editor position; and October 15 for Newsletter Editor and Member-at-Large positions:
Cindy Miller-Perrin, PhD.
cindy_perrin@pepperdine.edu
Meet the Newsletter Contributors!

Mary E. Haskett, PhD, Section President
Mary E. Haskett, PhD, is a Professor of Psychology at North Carolina State University. She and her students explore characteristics of physically abusive parents and their children, mechanisms that link together the family and school contexts in which children develop, and factors that support positive adjustment of young abused children. Her research has been supported by NIMH and NICHD. As a school and clinical child psychologist, Mary teaches graduate courses in family interventions and supervises practicum students in delivery of home-based parenting support.

Vera Chelyapov, Newsletter Special Feature Contributor
As Dr. Lyon’s Project Director, Vera Chelyapov oversees 15-20 undergraduate research assistants involved in various ongoing studies at Dr. Lyon’s USC Child Development lab. She is interested in forensic interviewing following Dr. Lyon’s Ten Step Investigative Interview based on the NICHD Protocol, and learning more about the wonderful minds of children.
Meet the Newsletter Contributors (continued)!

Thomas L. Birch, J.D., Public Policy Editor

For close to thirty years, Tom Birch has served as legislative counsel in Washington, D.C., to a variety of non-profit organizations, including as director of the policy and advocacy work of the National Child Abuse Coalition. An attorney by training, he came to this work from Congress, having served as legislative counsel to members of the United States Senate and House of Representatives on issues of domestic policy. He is the author of articles on legislative advocacy and topics of public policy, particularly in his areas of specialization in child welfare, human services, and cultural affairs. Birch received the American Psychological Association’s 2003 Award for Distinguished Contribution to Child Advocacy, and in 2006 he was honored by Casey Family Programs for his commitment to advocacy for vulnerable children.

Tom was a founding member of the D.C. Child Abuse and Neglect Prevention Children’s Trust Fund, and has served on the boards of a number of nonprofit organizations, including the Duke Ellington School of the Arts, Family Stress Services of D.C., the DC Campaign to Prevent Teen Pregnancy, and American Humane Association. He was a Peace Corps volunteer for three years in Morocco.

In November 2010 Tom was re-elected to a fifth term in public office as neighborhood commissioner in Washington, D.C.

Thomas L. Birch
1000 Vermont Ave., NW, Suite 700
Washington, DC 20005
202-347-3666
bircht@earthlink.net

Please Let Us Know What You Think

We invite our members to contribute to the newsletter!

If you have suggestions for the newsletter; comments about the articles and issues discussed; or would like to contribute an article or details of recent publications to be included in future newsletters, please contact the editor at the following address along with your contact information.

Attention Authors/Editors of New Books and Publications

If you have recently published an article, or have other exciting news (e.g., featured on a radio show, etc.) that you would like to share with other Section members, email the information to: Amie Lemos-Miller at amielemos@hotmail.com. The announcement will be included in a future edition in the Section’s newsletter.

Please join the Section’s listserve! Email amielemos@hotmail.com to join and receive pertinent updates and information regarding the Section. Future newsletter editor may also be sent via the listserve.
Section Executive Committee

**President**
Mary Haskett, PhD  
Department of Psychology  
North Carolina State University  
Mary_Haskett@ncsu.edu

**President-Elect**
Rex Culp, PhD, JD  
College of Education  
University of Central Florida  
rexculp@mail.ucf.edu

**Past-President**
Cindy Miller-Perrin, PhD  
Social Science Division  
Pepperdine University  
cperrin@pepperdine.edu

**Secretary**
Jenelle Shanley, Secretary  
Associate Director of Training  
National SafeCare Training & Research Center  
Georgia State University  
jshanley@gsu.edu

**Treasurer**
Amy Herschell, PhD  
Western Psychiatric Institute & Clinic  
University of Pittsburgh School of Medicine  
HerschellAD@upmc.edu

**Member-At-Large**
Sara Maltzman, Member at Large  
HHSA Child Welfare Services  
A.B. and Jessie Polinsky Children’s Center  
smaltzman@cox.net

**Member-At-Large**
Amy Damashek, PhD  
Western Michigan University  
Department of Psychology  
Amy.Damashek@wmich.edu

**Member-At-Large**
Lisa M. Jones, PhD  
Crimes Against Children Research Center  
University of New Hampshire  
lisa.jones@unh.edu

**Membership Chair**
Margaret C. Stevenson, Membership Chair  
University of Evansville  
Department of Psychology  
ms446@evansville.edu

**Section Program Chair**
Elizabeth C. Risch  
Center on Child Abuse and Neglect  
University of Oklahoma Health Sciences Center  
Elizabeth-Risch@ouhsc.edu

**Section Program Co-Chair**
Lana Beasley  
Oklahoma State University  
Department of Psychology  
lana.beasley@okstate.edu

**Newsletter Editor**
Amie Lemos-Miller, PhD  
Sacramento Job Corps  
amielemos@hotmail.com

**Graduate Student Representative**
Lauren Drerup Stokes  
Clinical Child Psychology Program  
University of Kansas  
LDrerup@ku.edu

**Student Representative**
Kate Cuno  
American School of Professional Psychology  
Washington DC  
kate.cuno@gmail.com