President’s Message

I thank the membership of Division 5 for electing me President. I am greatly honored. It is daunting to follow in the footsteps of the accomplishments of my immediate predecessors Marcy Andberg, Todd Little, and Irv Weiner. It is even more daunting to contemplate the giants of evaluation, measurement, and statistics who have served in this office from the beginning of the Division—L. L. Thurstone, Quinn McNemar, Lee Cronbach, Jane Loevinger, Anne Anastasi, Fred Lord, Don Fiske, Lee Sechrest, and Roger Kirk, to name just a few of our distinguished past presidents.

I come to this role with a long history of service to Division 5, including Member at Large, Fellows Committee, and also two terms as Program Chair, so I have some familiarity with the Division. I am now coming back to a Division leadership role after several years serving as editor of Psychological Methods, a role that kept me from central involvement with the Division. I will look to past presidents, members of the Executive Committee, and members of the Division for guidance and suggestions. I look forward to becoming reacquainted with new and old friends who volunteer their time and who are the people that make the Division work. I invite members to consider becoming involved in the Division 5 committees and some of our members who will serve in key roles in future issues of The Score.

Over the past year, president Marcy Andberg, building on the efforts of her predecessors, led the Division through two challenging, interlocking tasks. First, the Division’s bylaws had not been revised in many years and were seriously out of date. With input from the Division 5 Executive Committee, APA Division Services, and members of the division, Marcy carefully went through and updated the bylaws (see page 6). Second, after extensive discussion over multiple years, Marcy brought consideration of a new section for the Division, the Society for Qualitative Inquiry, to a vote of the Division membership. Both actions proceeded in a clear and transparent manner; both actions were overwhelmingly supported by the membership of the Division. Division 5 has a long history since it was founded as one of the original divisions of the APA in 1948 as the Division of Evaluation and Measurement. The Qualitative Inquiry section is the first new section to join the Division since the Assessment Section joined us about 20 years ago. One of my roles as president will be to help incorporate the Qualitative Inquiry section into Division 5. As the Executive Committee assured when the Assessment Section joined us,
The Score is the official newsletter of APA Division 5—Evaluation, Measurement, and Statistics—and is published quarterly in January, April, July, and October. In keeping with this mission, The Score publishes the division’s business meeting minutes, committee reports, and announcements.

In addition, where appropriate and space permits, short articles (800–1000 words) on technical issues and professional activities of Division 5 members, or on topics of current interest may be accepted. Brief announcements and calls for presentations related to conferences or meetings of particular interest to Division 5 members may also qualify. Submissions should be sent to Score Editor, Julie Lackaff: julie.lackaff@pearson.com.

Submission deadlines are one month prior to publication: March 1 for the April issue, June 1 for July, September 1 for October, and December 1 for January.

The Score is published solely online and distributed via e-mail notification. Division 5 members receive the e-mail notice through the Division 5 DIV5ANN email listserv (see the box below).

Guidelines for advertising appear elsewhere in this issue. Paid advertisements are solicited from a variety of sources and are not officially endorsed by Division 5.

Guidelines for the “What’s New?” column are provided with the column. Urgent announcements should be submitted to the Division 5 e-mail lists, described in the box below.

### E-mail Lists

Keep up with the absolute latest Division 5 news through its two e-mail lists.

**DIV5** serves as a vehicle for discussion among members on topics related to evaluation, measurement statistics, and assessment.

**DIV5ANN** is used exclusively for announcements from Division leadership, such as convention or workshop information or policy changes. This is a “one-way” list that does not support listwide replies (that is, it is not structured to support discussion).

To subscribe to either or both lists, send the following message to

LISTSERV@LISTS.APA.ORG:

**SUBSCRIBE DIV5ANN John Doe**

**SUBSCRIBE DIV5 John Doe**

(change “John Doe” to your name)

If you have any questions, contact Mark Daniel at Mark.Daniel@pearson.com.
Minutes: Division 5 Executive Committee Meeting, March 3, 2012, Courtyard Marriott, Tempe, AZ

Present: Todd Little, Marcia Andberg, Jodi Casabianca, Amy Schmidt, Pat Shrout, James Bovaird (telephone), Deborah Bandalos, Abigail Panter (telephone), Steve West, Lesa Hoffman

Absent: Julie Lackaff

President Marcia Andberg called the meeting to order at 8:06 am on Saturday, March 3, 2012, in Tempe, AZ.

Notes

- The agenda distributed prior to the meeting was not followed. Alternatively, President Andberg modified the agenda so that the morning session would involve a comprehensive discussion of the division bylaws and reporting of division business by committees after lunch.
- In an effort to reduce the costs associated with the mid-year meeting, only the voting members of the Executive Committee plus the Treasurer, Secretary, and Newsletter Editor were invited to attend the meeting.

August 2011 Annual Meeting Minutes

- Dr. Little moved to approve the minutes from the 2011 Executive Committee meeting. The motion was seconded by Dr. Bandalos, and approved by the Executive Committee (EC).

Bylaw Revisions

- Dr. Andberg provided a context for the need to revise the current bylaws. Through extensive discussions with Division Services, it was determined that the current bylaws are in substantial need of revision due to earlier revisions that have led to a cumulative lack of internal consistency. Major elements include:
  - The bylaws contain procedural elements that belong in the administration manual.
  - Inconsistent use of the division name.
  - The Treasurer and Secretary may be more effective as elected positions so that they would have a vote.
- There was significant discussion over the election/selection and roles of the Secretary and Treasurer. In particular with the Secretary position, it was discussed to change the Secretary position into a combined Executive Officer/Secretary role so that the President can focus on strategic priorities. The proposed new position would be referred to as a “Coordinating Officer” and would have his or her own projects; reorganization of the decision-making process; and moving action items forward. The Coordinating Officer would also assist the incoming President so as to ease transitions. Pat Shrout was asked to write a job description that details his vision for the position which will be inserted into the proposed bylaw revisions and Administrative Manual.
- Additional bylaw revisions were discussed and will be distributed to the membership for comments prior to official voting. The process is expected to be completed by the August 2012 EC meeting.

President Report

- Following the vote at the 2011 Business Meeting to accept the petition to establish a new section on Qualitative Inquiry, the appropriate documents needed for balloting were prepared and reviewed by Division Services. On January 17, 2012, a mail or electronic ballot on the petition to amend the bylaws to include a section on qualitative methods was sent to all voting Associate Members, Fellows, and Members of Division 5. Ballots were sent to 820 Division 5 members. Keith Cooke reported that this response rate of 245 votes is a high response rate based on other bylaws votes he has done. Voting on the Division 5 bylaws changes closed 2/17/2012. APA Division Services counted up the votes and found that all of the items were approved by at least 61% of those voting. The bylaws say “adopted if approved by a majority of those returning their ballots,” and this requirement was met.
- Dr. Andberg has planned a symposium for the 2012 APA convention: Understanding and Predicting Violent Behavior: A Variety of Pathways.

Listserve Report [Read into the minutes by Dr. Bandalos]

- Subscriptions to the Discussion listserve (Div5) have increased from 789 to 884 since 2010. Subscriptions to the Announcements listserve (Div5Ann) have increased from 1,607 to 1,970 over the same period.

Membership Report [Read into the minutes by Dr. Bandalos]

- There are approximately 634 voting members to date.
- Several initiatives from the Membership Committee were reported. They will focus on expanding membership and strengthening ties with students, etc. Dr. Andberg asked that the Membership Committee be thanked for their work, and noted that the EC is very interested to see what progress they’ve made toward their initiatives at the Annual Meeting. Dr. Little asked that the committee also be asked to suggest specific incentives (including financial incentives) to encourage membership and retention.
Dr. West suggested that we contact members who drop out to see why they leave; that we send routine emails to members to get feedback, telephone subsets of members to check in, etc.; and that we check with students to find out what they’re looking for when it comes to membership benefits.

APAGS/DRSN Report [Read into the minutes by Dr. Casabianca]

- Nazia Rahman, the division’s APAGS/DSRN representative, reports that she has completed a draft of a student procedure manual, which specifies the roles and responsibilities for student members of standing committees.
- There was discussion about how to recognize students who serve—ideas like certificates, letters to deans or chairs of departments from the President, creating a service recognition award.
- There was also discussion around how to standardize roles and responsibilities across committees and chairs, and how to set expectations for committee chairs so that the student is supported in his or her role.
- Other suggestions for improving the student leader experience included exit interviews of student leaders to determine how to improve the experience; have a separate listserv or Facebook presence for students; and to create a monthly web chat with “stars” in our field.
- Dr. Casabianca will provide Ms. Rahman with the feedback from the EC.

Awards Committee Report [Read into the minutes by Dr. Hoffman]

- The 2012 award winners are:
  - Anastasi Award: Dr. Jelle Wicherts, Assistant Professor of Psychological Methods (with tenure) at the University of Amsterdam.
  - Jacob Cohen Award for Distinguished Contributions to Teaching and Mentoring: Dr. Charles Judd, Professor of Distinction in Psychology at the University of Colorado, Boulder, and Dr. Gary McClelland, Professor in Psychology at the University of Colorado, Boulder, who are long-time collaborators in teaching.
  - Distinguished Dissertation Award: Dr. Zhushan “Mandy” Li, Assistant Professor in Educational Research, Measurement and Evaluation, Boston College.
  - Samuel J. Messick Distinguished Scientific Contributions Award: Dr. Alan Kaufman, Clinical Professor of Psychology, Yale University School of Medicine.
- The Awards Committee felt that clarification is needed in terms of exactly what awards consist of in terms of financial support for the awardees. Practice does not match what is in the Administration Manual—for example, in the past awardees have received $500 instead of free registration and $250 towards their travel. Getting clarification this year is particularly urgent as we have 5 winners this year, due to a joint award. There was a lot of discussion about how the monies should be allocated—should there be a flat rate for all, or a higher honorarium for the senior awards in recognition of their seniority, or more for the junior awards whose winners may need it more? One suggestion was to award $250 for the award, with an additional $250 if they show up and present. An alternative suggestion left the base prize as a plaque and a year membership in Division 5, with $500 to defer travel expenses if they attend the conference and present a paper. No action was taken.
- There was considerable discussion regarding fundraising to support the awards.
- Dr. Hoffman reported that she will update the Administration Manual and Call for Nominees to clarify when students had to have defended their dissertation.
- It was reported that Roger Kirk is considering endowing something, and Dr. West agreed to follow up with him.
- There was also a discussion of a student award/best poster to be selected from among those presenting at the annual meeting. Dr. Casabianca reported that she set up a budget line for a student award, but it needs a process, criteria, etc. It was agreed that the student posters will be evaluated this year in Orlando at the annual meeting.

Diversity Committee Report [Read into the minutes by Dr. Shrout]

- Dr. Shrout reported that the dates for the Quantitative Training for Underrepresented Groups (QTUG) conference appear to be later than in the past. The reception is on 8/1/12 from 3:00 pm to 5:00 pm, and the EC meeting is also on the same day from 5:00 pm to 10:00 pm. Dr. Andberg agreed to start the August EC meeting at 5:30 pm on 8/1 so that EC members can attend the QTUG reception.

Treasurer Report

- Dr. Casabianca reported on the financial status of the division, noting that she’s looking into getting an adjustment from APA Division Services for an incorrect transaction regarding the division’s journals. The proposed budget will reflect cuts in expenses for social events and meetings.
- Division 5 had total revenue of $30,949.64 for 2011, which is $998.64 more than the amount budgeted. While the division brought in more than expected, there were several areas that were individually below budget.
- Dr. Casabianca would like to thank several organizations for their very generous contributions in support of our awards and social programs as follows: Cohen award (Taylor & Francis Group), Anastasi award (College Board, Fordham University), Social Hour—APA Convention (College Board), Assessment Breakfast—APA Convention (Multi-Health Systems, Pearson, Psychological Assessment Resources), and the EC Meeting (Society for Multivariate Experimental Psychology, SMEP). Note that the donation from SMEP is still pending.
- Division 5 had expenses of $43,223.51 which exceeded the amount budgeted by $8,073.51. The most likely culprit is an incorrect cost to the division for the (new) membership
journal subscription fee. This year our total costs were $11,508.00 compared to our expected $5,200.00. This discrepancy is currently being investigated. *The Score* is another area in which we came over budget along with the EC meeting at the 2011 convention.

- Dr. Shrout made a motion that we establish a committee to set long term financial investment goals and to make specific recommendations in terms of what kind of investments can be made. The motion was seconded by Dr. Andberg, adding that Dr. Little could head the committee. The motion was approved. Dr. Casabianca agreed to check with CBIZ to see how our monies are invested.

**Newsletter Report** [Read into the minutes by Dr. Schmidt]

- Thanks to Alan Reifman for posting issues on the division website and Mark Daniel for announcing the new issues via the division announcements listserve. Additional appreciation is due to Micheline Meyers, Keith Cooke, and the APA Division Services staff who work most closely with us in producing *The Score*. They have been timely and helpful and we thank them for their efforts and responsiveness.
- *The Score* is costing quite a lot with the involvement of Division Services, despite being electronically delivered.
- A motion was made to form an ad hoc committee to explore alternative electronic ways of delivering *The Score*, with Julie Lackaff in charge. The motion was seconded by Dr. Little and approved by the EC.
- There was additional discussion around advertising revenues and ways to optimize payments and increase revenues.

**Elections Committee**

- Three election slates were prepared by the committee:
  - President Elect: Thanos Patelis, Abigail Panter, and Keith Widaman
  - Member at Large: Leigh Wang, Mark Freeman, and Mark Daniel
  - Council of Representatives: Ken Kelley, Susana Urbina, and Fred Wertz

**Program Committee** [Read into the minutes by Dr. Little]

- Division 5 received 72 poster and 6 symposia proposals appropriate for review by the division. Of these, 7 posters and 0 symposia were rejected. Dr. Andberg’s symposium was in addition and accepted in lieu of her allotted invited-address hours.
- Division 5 will use 14 substantive and 6.5 non-substantive hours for the 2012 convention. An article titled *Upcoming Division 5 Sessions at the 2012 APA Annual Convention* will be published in the April 2012 Issue of *Score*. The summer issue will feature program details and highlights.
- Dr. Little praised the Program Committee for the 2012 Annual Meeting slate.
- He suggested that we make efforts to remove the EC meeting and the Business meeting from “the books” in order to maximize our program hours.

**Public & International Affairs Report** [Read into the minutes by Dr. Bandalos]

- The committee launched an international column in *The Score* starting with the October 2011 issue.
- At the 2011 APA Convention in Washington, DC, Division 5 joined 26 other divisions in showcasing their members’ international activities. Division 5 members’ (Barbara Byrne, Gary Canivez, James Choca, Giuseppe Costantino, Geoff Cumming, Howard Everson, Kurt Geisinger, Ronald Hambleton, Lisa Harlow, Art Kendall, Tom Oakland, and Thanos Patelis) international involvement received high praise as an exemplary model of members reaching out across the borders to make a significant impact in the global community. The poster was featured in the 2011 Annual Report of APA Committee on International Relations in Psychology (http://www.apa.org/international/governance/cirp/2011-report.aspx) and the October 2011 issue of *The Score* (http://www.apa.org/divisions/div5/pdf/Oct11Score.pdf).
- The committee developed several resource pages on our division website: conferences, journals, and career opportunities.
- The current committee membership suggested several items for future efforts: inviting to attend and recognizing international researchers at the Division 5 Social Hour at the August meeting; improving the member resources section of the division website; and generating email news alerts regarding significant awards, grants, publications, conferences, workshops, etc. of interest to members.

**Fellowship Committee** Report [Read into the minutes by Dr. West]

- The committee solicited, received, and evaluated Fellowship nominations. Of the 10 nominations received, seven were able to complete all required paperwork for fellowship evaluation in time to be considered for this year’s fellowship evaluations. All 7 nominees were favorably evaluated. The names of the initial fellowship nominees were forwarded to APA for an evaluation by the APA Fellowship Committee. Nominees who were already fellows of other APA divisions do not require further evaluation and will be notified in May/June. New fellows will be announced after APA review at the August Council of Representatives meeting.
- A list of potential nominees was compiled for next year’s committee to solicit nominations from. This list includes individuals from the past two years who were unable to complete the required nomination materials (e.g., evaluations and support letters from current fellows). The list will be shared with next year’s committee.
- A recommendation was made to charge the Fellowship Committee with considering a plan to update the list of Fellows presented on the website. Options to consider include removing or otherwise noting those fellows that are now deceased.
Website Report [Read into the minutes by Dr. Hoffman]

- There was conversation regarding updating the division’s website, especially the Links and Announcements pages. Conversation turned to expanding the number of people we have contributing to the site beyond just Alan Reifman—perhaps it’s time to get student involvement again.
- Dr. Andberg moved that we form an ad hoc committee led by Dr. Shrout that will survey students regarding the website. The motion was seconded by Dr. Bandalos and approved by the EC.

Historian Report

- An article was published in the January 2012 issue of The Score outlining the goals of the new Historian and requesting assistance in submitting hard copies of past issues of The Score that are missing from the archives according to the archive records. Three issues have been submitted to date including: Vol XV, No. 1, April, 1994; Vol XVII, No. 4, October, 1994; and Vol XIII, No. 1, January 1995.
- Dr. Koskey continues to send division business documents to the archives in a timely manner.
- Dr. Koskey will continue Dr. Robertson’s efforts on the biographical sketches project.
- Robert Glaser, a former Division 5 President (1979-1980), passed away in Pittsburgh on February 4, 2012. Dr. Koskey is looking for potential scholars who might be willing to be interviewed to reflect on his great accomplishments and contributions.

Council of Representatives Report


Other Business

- **PENS:** Dr. Andberg moved to stay silent on the issue of the annulment of the PENS report, which is being requested by the Coalition for an Ethical Psychology. The motion was seconded by Dr. Hoffman and approved by the EC.
- **CODAPAR Nominations:** Dr. Andberg raised the issue of a lack of process around nominating people to various committees in a systematic and strategic way. Dr. West will ask Leona Aiken to take on the task of developing a process by which we identify candidates.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:00pm on Wednesday, August 3, 2011.

Respectfully submitted,
James A. Bovaird, Secretary
Amy Schmidt, Member-at-Large

---

**Revision of Division 5 Bylaws Approved by Membership**

Voting on the revisions to the Division 5 Bylaws closed on July 28, 2012. Each of the revisions was approved by at least 89% of those who voted (range = 89-93%).

The Division 5 Executive Committee and bylaws revision task forces drafted a revision of the Division 5 Bylaws. The revision was reviewed by the Director of APA Division Services and APA counsel, and approved by the Division 5 Executive Committee for release to Division 5 membership for comments prior to submitting it to a vote by the membership.

The revisions were open to the membership for comment for 30 days. Comments were collected and reviewed and text revised as needed. Members of the Division (N = 1375) received a ballot on June 28, 2012 and had a 30-day voting period in which to cast their votes. Members could choose to submit a vote on the revision as a whole, or on each Article or on each item. APA Division Services tabulated the results and reported that 236 members submitted a ballot. Out of 236, 192 (81%) voted to approve all. If adding individuals who voted by article or item, 89-93% approved the Bylaws. Balloting results are found in Table 1 (on the next page).

The Division sincerely thanks all who voted and the many individuals who helped draft and review the document.

---

**Big Issues in Testing Conference:**

**Improving Admissions and Learning in Higher Education**

**March 28-29th, 2013—Lincoln, NE**

Hosted by Buros Center for Testing—University of Nebraska-Lincoln

Buros Center for Testing is sponsoring a conference on testing issues in higher education. The conference will highlight research and insights regarding the current state of admissions and learning assessment at both the undergraduate and graduate level. Issues to be discussed include the extent to which testing and assessment produces desired result or effect, influence of the context in which assessment occurs, implications for special and minority populations, lessons higher education can learn from K-12 assessment for accountability, and challenges to thinking about in the future of testing and assessment for admissions and learning.

Registration for attending in person or via webcast will be available November/December 2012.

A list of presenters and topics can be found at [http://buros.org/big-issues-testing](http://buros.org/big-issues-testing)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Approve</th>
<th></th>
<th>Disapprove</th>
<th></th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>I. Name &amp; purpose</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Name</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Purpose</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>II. Membership</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Lists classes of members</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-7. Rights of classes of members</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Expulsion</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Non-payment dues</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>III. Officers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2. Officers and duties</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4 &amp; 7. Terms and duties</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-6. Coordinating Officer and Financial</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IV. Executive Committee</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 &amp; 4. Members of Exec Comm</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3. Members-at-large</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Quorum</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>V. Advisory Committee</strong></td>
<td>192</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VI. Nominations &amp; Elections</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Voting members</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Exec Comm</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Section voting mem</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Election Comm</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. APA Elections Office</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VII. Meetings</strong></td>
<td>192</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VIII. Committees</strong></td>
<td>192</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IX. Sections</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2. Sections and org goal</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Est new section</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Section society name</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Dissolution of section</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Choose primary and secondary</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Sections establish bylaws</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Section provides bylaws</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Section rights</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Section responsibilities</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Autonomy to sections</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>X. Dues &amp; Assessments</strong></td>
<td>192</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>XI. Governance &amp; Amendments</strong></td>
<td>192</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section Memberships

Division 5 has three sections. The sections represent scientific and professional interests organized within the Division.

- **Assessment Section**—focuses on construction of assessment instruments, collection of assessment information, and decision-making processes related to such information
- **Evaluation, Measurement, and Statistics Section**—focuses on psychometric theory, psychological statistics, program evaluation, test construction, and research methods
- **Society for Qualitative Inquiry in Psychology Section**—focuses on principles and practices of qualitative inquiry

The Division membership may choose to affiliate with one or more sections. Those members of the Division who do not declare a Primary Section are assigned to the Evaluation, Measurement, and Statistics Section.

APA Division Services contacted Members in May 2012 and asked them to choose their Section memberships. Table 1 and Figure 1 display the results. Of the 1375 polled, 204 chose the Assessment Section, 149 chose the Society for Qualitative Inquiry in Psychology Section, and 514 chose the Evaluation, Measurement, and Statistics Section. The remaining 508 did not choose a primary section and were assigned to the Evaluation, Measurement, and Statistics Section. As a result, 74% of the Division 5 Members represent the Evaluation, Measurement, and Statistics Section as their Primary Section, 15% of the Members constitute the Assessment Section, and 11% chose the Society for Qualitative Inquiry in Psychology Section as their Primary Section.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Primary Section</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation, Measurement, and Statistics</td>
<td>1022</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualitative Inquiry</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>1375</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Secondary Section</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation, Measurement, and Statistics</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualitative Inquiry</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>738</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>1375</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tertiary Section</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation, Measurement, and Statistics</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualitative Inquiry</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>1077</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>1375</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1. Pie charts represent the percentage of the total of 1375 members choosing each section for primary, secondary, and tertiary sections.
Section Memberships
continued from p. 8

Penn State’s 20th Annual Symposium on Family Issues
October 8 - 9, 2012

This year’s symposium is titled “Emerging Methods in Family Research.” Advances in research on families will rely on innovations in design, measurement, data collection, and data analysis that allow researchers to capture the multi-level complexities of family systems. Fifteen scholars from the social sciences will address the question of whether new and/or alternative approaches are needed to address the complexities of family phenomena. A complete program and registration is available at http://www.pop.psu.edu/events/national-symposium-on-family-issues

Section Memberships
If you are a Member, Fellow, or Voting (5+ years of membership) Associate of the Division, you may participate in the election within your Primary Section for the Section Representative to the Division 5 Executive Committee. If you are an Associate with less than 5 years of membership, Professional Affiliate, Student Affiliate, or International Affiliate, you are not eligible to vote but are encouraged to join one or more sections.

APA Division Services gathers and maintains section membership information and provides this information to sections as requested. Each individual retains the right to request that APA Division Services assign him/her to a different primary section at any time.
Report of August 1st and 3rd, 2012
Meeting of the Council of Representatives

Deborah L. Bandalos and A. T. Panter

Introduction to Meeting and APA Presidential Initiatives
APA President Suzanne Bennett opened the meeting with her report on the progress she has made in the past year in promoting her three presidential initiatives: engaging the next generation of psychologists, promoting interdisciplinary science and practice, and fighting obesity. Accomplishments in these areas include development of a new APA journal to be staffed by members of APAGS, organization of an Evidence Based Summit on behavior change interventions sponsored jointly through a USAID-APA partnership, and the development for treatment guidelines for obesity, currently underway.

CEO Report
Norman Anderson, CEO of APA, provided a summary of the accomplishments of the APA staff. These include filing seven Amicus Briefs in areas including marriage equality and the accuracy of eyewitness testimony, advocacy efforts on behalf of graduate internships, and increased outreach to APA members. In addition, new APA products PsycTherapy and PsycTests have been released. The latter resource may be of particular interest to members of the division. PsycTests is a searchable database of measurement and assessment instruments for clinical and research work. More information is available at http://www.apa.org/pubs/databases/psyctests/index.aspx. Also of possible interest to Division 5 members is the annual Stress in America Survey, which was administered by APA for the eighth year.

Open Agenda Items

New Journals Approved
Council voted to approve two new APA journals. Of particular interest to members of Division 5 is the approval of a journal to focus on qualitative methods in psychology which was proposed by the Division’s new Section on Qualitative Methods. Development of a journal to be focused on sexual orientation and gender identity, proposed by Division 44, was also approved. Finally, Council approved a rule change that would allow “open access publishing” of a new journal entitled Archives of Scientific Psychology. Open access publications are generally internet-based and freely available to the public rather than subscription-based. Instead of requiring readers to purchase subscriptions, open access publications require those submitting and publishing articles to pay a fee to cover costs. Authors of articles published in the journal must make their data freely available as a requirement of publication. The editors of the new journal are Harris Cooper and Gary VandenBos and associate editors include the current editors of all APA-published journals. More information is available at http://www.apa.org/pubs/journals/arc/.

Proposal to Recognize Psychotherapy Effectiveness
Council voted to adopt as APA policy the Resolution on the Recognition of Psychotherapy Effectiveness.

Financial Report
The financial report was delivered by Archie Turner, the Chief Financial Officer of APA. He indicated that APA’s long term portfolio has grown 5% over the first half of 2012, and other aspects of APA’s financial status are also strong. Buildings in Washington, DC, owned by APA are 100% leased, sales of APA products and licensing are strong, and all expenses are at or under budget. In addition, net assets have increased relative to liabilities in every year since 2008, including the present year. Council approved the budget plan submitted by the CFO.

Proposal to Fund “Internship Stimulus Package”
In response to chronic problems with insufficient internship sites for students needing these, a proposal for an “Internship Stimulus Package” was presented to Council. The main focus of the proposal is to provide funds for internship sites to achieve APA accreditation. Council approved the funding package, which allows up to $1 million per year for three years. Programs can apply for funding of up to $20,000 beginning this fall. These funds can be used to help offset program expenses such as application and site visit fees, program consultation fees and/or intern stipends and benefits.

Other Council Activities and Informational Items

• Seating of Representatives from Ethnic Minority Psychological Associations: Council approved a motion that one representative from each of four National Ethnic Minority Psychological Associations (the Asian American Psychological Association, the Association of Black Psychologists, the National Latina/o Psychological Association, and the Society of Indian Psychologists) continue to be invited to attend and participate in Council meetings for an additional three years and to receive full reimbursement for their attendance at the February and August Council meetings in 2013-2015. Because this would necessitate a change in the bylaws, the proposal will be sent to the membership for a vote. A discussion ensued regarding whether pro and con statements should be included with the ballot. Some council members argued against the inclusion of such statements on the grounds that in the past this has resulted in members voting against the change.

1 These minutes are jointly written.
However, no systematic study of this issue has been done. Division 5 representatives Abigail Panter and Deborah Bandalos volunteered to study this issue.

- **Public Education Campaign:** Rhea Farberman, Executive Director of Public and Member Communications, provided Council with an update on the Public Education Campaign. As part of this campaign, an interesting survey was conducted to obtain information on how psychology is viewed by the general public. Results indicated that 70% of adults surveyed agree that studying human behavior has a positive impact on the quality of life. One third think of psychology as a “hard” science. Another group surveyed was school guidance counselors. This group were supportive of psychology as a career, but had trouble explaining the field beyond its clinical applications. Thus, the survey results indicated that greater public education is required to inform school guidance counselors about careers in quantitative psychology and psychometrics.

- Council received an update on revisions to the Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing.
- Council voted to approve $12,300 in additional expenditures to fund a meeting and conference calls in 2012 of the Task Force on Trafficking of Women and Girls.
- Council voted to approve $6,300 in additional expenditures to contribute to the funding for a meeting and conference calls in 2012 of the Guidelines for Psychological Practice with Older Adults Revision Working Group.
- Council received an update on the business pending item “Value Neutral Language for End-of-Life Choices.”
- Council received an update on the business pending item “Resolution on Aid in Dying.”

### Awards and Recognitions

- On Friday morning, Charlie D. Spielberger, PhD, and Mrs. Carol Spielberger were recognized for their generous contribution to the American Psychological Foundation.
- Geoffrey Reed, PhD, and Pierre Ritchie, PhD, received presidential citations following their update to Council on the Revision of the World Health Organization’s International Classification of Diseases-10 Mental and Behavioral Disorders.
- The awarding of the 2012 Raymond D. Fowler Award to William C. Howell, PhD, was reported to Council and the text of his citation was read on Friday morning. Dr. Howell, a longtime member, governance leader, psychology researcher and educator, and APA executive director for science, died in April.

### Good Governance Project

On Wednesday afternoon COR members participated in small group discussions about three different scenarios for change in APA’s governance structure. The first scenario involved minimal changes such as leaving day-to-day business and decisions in the hands of an executive board, leaving COR members free to focus on weightier issues. Under the second scenario, changes to the current COR make-up would be made. These may include selection of at least some representatives from “interest groups” rather than the traditional selection system based on divisional and state representation. The third scenario, termed the “clean slate” scenario, is the most radical, and would potentially involve a complete restructuring of all levels of APA elected leadership. COR discussed these options in small groups, with each group selecting one of the options to support. Somewhat surprisingly, scenarios two and three received the most support from representatives. These options will be discussed further in the February 2013 meeting.

### Things We Have Learned (So Far) by Following Jacob Cohen’s Footsteps

Gary H. McClelland and Charles M. Judd
University of Colorado Boulder
Division 5 Jacob Cohen Award Presentation

Jacob Cohen published “What I Have Learned (So Far)” in the *American Psychologist* (1990). We continue that journey and suggest some insights inspired by Cohen’s work. One of Cohen’s many contributions was reminding us that regression and analysis
of variance were merely special cases of the general linear model and had no important differences. In our textbook *Data Analysis: A Model Comparison Approach* (Judd, McClelland, & Ryan, 2009) we push that unified perspective even further. This allows a common approach to statistical power analysis, another topic very important to Cohen. A key insight by Cohen and others is that the magnitude of a test statistic such as Student’s *t* is the product of a study’s effect size (e.g., Cohen’s *d*) and its study size (i.e., number of observations). Specifically,

\[
t = d \times \frac{\sqrt{df}}{2}
\]

the generalization of *d* as the effect size for any one-degree-of-freedom comparison between two linear models provides a unified approach to power analysis. A further insight is that a study’s effect size is not fixed but rather itself is the product of the raw, unstandardized effect (e.g., the mean difference, the slope in regression, or the coefficient for the product term in moderated regression models) and aspects of the research design. Specifically,

\[
d = b \times \frac{\sqrt{V(e1)}}{V(x1)}
\]

where *b* is the raw effect size (a mean difference or a slope), *V(e)* is the variance of the error term (estimated by the mean square error) in the general linear model and *V(x)* is the variance (residual variance in the case of more complicated models) of the predictor variable. The (residual) variance of the predictor also plays an important role in determining the width of the confidence interval. That is,

\[
b \pm t_\alpha \frac{\sqrt{V(e1)}}{N \sqrt{V(x1)}}
\]

All of the terms under the radical are equipotent in determining the width and hence precision of the parameter estimate and ultimately statistical power. Most researchers underestimate the effect of the variance of the predictor on statistical power. For example, if two researchers are studying exactly the same linear phenomenon and the distribution of *X* for one researcher has only 25% of the variance of *X* compared to the other researcher’s findings, then the one with the less variable predictor will need (1/0.25 = 4) four times as many observations to have the same precision and approximately the same statistical power. If we replace each value of the predictor below the median with the mean predictor value of all the observations below the median and similarly for those above the median, then the expected value of the regression coefficient is unchanged. Comparing the variance of the original variable to the variance of its dichotomized version measures the loss of precision and power, which can only be remediated by adding more observations. For example, dichotomizing symmetric, bell-shaped distributions produces a dichotomized variable having only about 67% of the variance of the original. To have the same power, a researcher using a dichotomized variable must have 1/(2/3) = 3/2 = 150% as many observations. The interactive *Mathematica* demonstration available at [http://demonstrations.wolfram.com/MedianSplit/](http://demonstrations.wolfram.com/MedianSplit/) graphically illustrates the loss of variance and power due to dichotomization. Perhaps surprisingly, the effects are similar for dichotomizing a skewed distribution. Using a 10/90 split, as is common when studying extreme performance, either high or low, is especially deleterious. For a symmetric, bell-shaped distribution, a 10/90 split produces a predictor variable that has only 33% of the variance of the continuous predictor, thus necessitating three times as many observations to have the same precision and power.

**Optimal Design**

The availability of computers to compute general linear models frees us from the equal-*N* designs that were once required to simplify the arithmetic. Equal-*N* designs are sometimes not the most powerful designs for particular questions. Optimal designs maximize the variance of the predictor variable for the question of interest. For detecting a linear trend, the optimal design places half the observations at each feasible extreme for the predictor variable. Examining the variance of the predictor variable for a non-optimal design provides an easy way to compare the differences. For example, a 3-to-1 split has a variance equal to 75% of the optimal
equal split, so only \(1/(3/4) = 4/3 = 1.33\) times as many observations would be required to have the same precision and power. Detecting a quadratic trend is based on contrasting the obtained mean for a middle category to the mean predicted by the average of the two extreme means. Dividing the observations equally between those two comparisons yields the optimal design distribution of \((\frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{4})\). Examining a variety of distributions over \(X\) a researcher might use to detect linear and quadratic effects reveals that a symmetric, peaked distribution like a normal distribution is pretty much the worst-case scenario. Having a number of observations at the extremes provides the leverage necessary for precisely estimating linear and quadratic effects.

**Detecting Interactions**

The power to detect the linear \(x\) linear interaction and its effect size are a function of the (residual) variance of the product term in the linear model. Up to some distributional adjustments that are usually small, the variance of the product is close to the product of the variances. Hence, any compromises to the variances of the components are multiplicatively deleterious for the variance of their product. The optimal design is a \(2 \times 2\) design with one quarter of the observations at each feasible extreme. If instead a researcher uses a \(3 \times 3\) design with intermediate values for both predictor variables, then the variance of the product is only 44% of the optimal variance, requiring 2.27 times as many observations for equivalent power for testing the linear \(x\) linear interaction. And a \(5 \times 5\) design has only 25% of the optimal variance, requiring a staggering four times as many observations. But much worse is a bivariate normal-like distribution that one might obtain from a random sample. Its variance for the product is only about 6% of optimal, requiring more than 16 times as many observations! To make this more concrete, if we take 20 observations per cell as a standard for a \(2 \times 2\) lab design, then a researcher with a bivariate normal-like distribution would need more than 16 \(\times 80 = 1,280\) observations to have equivalent precision and power when studying the same phenomenon. Much more common are studies looking for interactions with random samples of around 128 observations, which corresponds in terms of power to a \(2 \times 2\) design with two observations per cell. Researchers using random samples who cannot afford more than 1000 observations should over-sample extreme observations to provide the necessary leverage for detecting the linear \(x\) linear interaction.

**Notes**

The presentation was highly graphical and readers are advised to download either the interactive Mathematica notebook at [https://www.dropbox.com/s/xyk1f0na76w2q08/whatLearnedRev.nb](https://www.dropbox.com/s/xyk1f0na76w2q08/whatLearnedRev.nb) (requires Mathematica’s free CDF player and a Dropbox account) or the static pdf version at [https://www.dropbox.com/s/9cvfzy45g5drf1p/whatLearnedRev.pdf](https://www.dropbox.com/s/9cvfzy45g5drf1p/whatLearnedRev.pdf). All the papers on which the presentation was based are available by emailing gary.mcclelland@colorado.edu.

---

### Student’s Corner

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APAGS–DSRN Representative</th>
<th>Awards</th>
<th>Fellowship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nazia Rahman</td>
<td>Patricia Simon</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:narahman@fordham.edu">narahman@fordham.edu</a></td>
<td><a href="mailto:pasimon@eden.rutgers.edu">pasimon@eden.rutgers.edu</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td>Membership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg Converse</td>
<td>Patricio Simon</td>
<td>Deborah Casper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:lxa465@hotmail.com">lxa465@hotmail.com</a></td>
<td><a href="mailto:pasimon@eden.rutgers.edu">pasimon@eden.rutgers.edu</a></td>
<td><a href="mailto:dccasper@email.arizona.edu">dccasper@email.arizona.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentor: Ginger Calloway</td>
<td>Mentor: Eun-Young Mun</td>
<td>Mentor: Noel Card</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public &amp; International Affairs</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Website</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shuyan Sun</td>
<td>Joshua Polanin</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:sunen@mail.uc.edu">sunen@mail.uc.edu</a></td>
<td><a href="mailto:jpolanin@luc.edu">jpolanin@luc.edu</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentor: Leigh Wang</td>
<td>Mentor: Julie Lockaff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### The Requisite Column: A Discussion on the Dissertation Process*

*With help from PhD Comics*

Joshua R. Polanin

When I was six years old, I attended the University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign’s Graduate School commencement ceremony. My father received an EdD, completing his doctoral dissertation only a few weeks prior. Although the memories now are mostly hazy, I remember two distinct things from that day: 1) sprinting through the mezzanine section of Assembly Hall, and 2) being told it was a big, important accomplishment.

That previous year my father utilized a routine common to most
receiving a graduate degree. Attend classes after work, commute home just in time to put me to bed, explain to me for the umpteenth-time how bread companies make bread (don’t ask me why), and retire to his office to write and work on his dissertation. At the time, I never realized that my father continued to work long after I feel asleep.

Fast-forward twenty-three years to the present. I no longer enjoy the freedom of youth and now endure the responsibilities of (full-time graduate student) adulthood. Although little of my current daily routine resembles that of my father’s past, one thing is now lockstep: I am writing my dissertation.

Yes, the dreaded A.B.D. (All But Dissertation) acronym follows my name. Are there three letters in the graduate school dictionary that haunt the doctoral candidate more? Maybe G.R.E., but that was long enough ago that I’ve mostly forgotten about memorizing words like arduous, onerous, or ponderous: Three words that succinctly describe the dissertation process for most students.

Hence, the Student’s Corner column should require me to write about the dissertation process. Little more we will complete as graduate students speaks to the work we have completed (and will complete) than this venerable, and seemingly insurmountable, manuscript. Yet, more times than not, students struggle to complete, let alone start, the process—

OK then—I just started a doctoral program, when should I start thinking about a topic?

Wait a minute, who are you?? Where did you come from?

Never mind me, can you help me with my dissertation or not?

Well, yes, I guess, but I only just defended my proposal.

That’s much further along than I think I ever will be! Of course, you can help me!

OK then, what was your question again?

I just started a doctoral program; when should I start thinking about a topic?

Short answer: Finish reading this column, then start!

Longer answer: “Don’t underestimate the amount of time it takes to finalize a topic. It is by far the most time consuming and difficult aspect,” says my wife, who is also working on her dissertation. I couldn’t write it better so I’ll quote her. Even if you think you have the idea just as you like it, some aspect you hadn’t considered will present itself or some confounding variable will be reconsidered.

More than two years ago, I started a “dissertation idea board.” I basically carried around blank notecards and wrote every idea, big or small, and hung it on my window frame. Although my finalized dissertation topic never looked out my first-floor Chicago window-pane, the process required me to cognitively attend to the looming project. One of the ideas led me to consider another idea, which ultimately led me to my topic.

The important thing to remember is that the idea should excite you. It should intellectually stimulate you. You should want to wake up in the morning just to start working on it again (at the least, it is a goal to shoot for). Keep this in mind when selecting a topic.

OK, let’s say I have a topic—do I need to consult with someone in my department?

Yes, first consult your advisor. Hopefully, your topic will coincide with your advisor’s interest and he/she can provide you helpful critiques and literature to consider. Including this person in your thoughts and ideas will only benefit the project. Your advisor will be your confidante, your editor, and your crutch. Take pains to thank them for their services; I will thank mine again now.

After you consult your advisor, the next task will be to create a dissertation committee. These vary by university, but generally you will be required to include 3-4 professors from your school or college. Choose these individuals wisely. They will ultimately critique your work and determine the project’s fate. Best case: They provide helpful feedback that leads you to completion. Worst case: They make you rewrite your proposal repeatedly until finally asking you to reconsider your career as a graduate student. Consider this aspect paramount.

Should I just start writing after I finalize a topic and consult my advisor?

Short answer: No, read more about your topic. Then find related research and read that.

Longer answer: One mistake I think a lot of doctoral students make is not considering the scope of the literature available. Unless you are working on a very recent idea, you are not the first person to have ever considered at least some aspect of your study. Search databases outside your discipline. Consult your librarian for possible other terms that represent your construct. Contact the expert researchers within your area of interest. Never consider your literature search “complete.” Always look for more research. This is starting to sound like a lot of work. How do I organize all of this research I theoretically will find?

Start by finding a solution that works for you. Someone likes to print a hard copy of every article they read. This has its advantages; you never forget where an article is located and you can write notes to yourself for later usage. It also has its disadvantages. If you are like me, then you hate the thought of having paper pileup. Mainly because I think it is wasteful (I’m a closet environmentalist) but also because it can be hard to organize and not feel like you own a printing press.

Another option is to grab a program like Mendeley or Endnote. These reference managers will make your life easier by organizing citations automatically. Mendeley has a nice feature that allows you
to keep notes directly on the PDF; Endnote’s graphic user interface and customer service are top-of-the-line. The major benefit to both of these programs comes when you start writing. Instead of having to keep track of each citation, create a reference list, and tediously format each citation, reference programs can be installed directly into Word (or any word processor) and will create these lists for you. Repeat: If you use a reference manager, you will never again have to create a reference list.

Keep going, what’s next?

Start writing.

That’s it, just start writing?

Mostly. My advisor and mentor (TDP) reminds me that she has been told by multiple editors that the key to publication is to just start writing. Same rule applies for dissertations. If you can just start the process, and then force yourself to work on it a little at a time, you will finish. It’s the starting that is the problem for a lot of people.

Isn’t there a format to follow? I sort of remember taking a research methods class ...

Correct, you will most likely follow the “five-chapter” model (see Johnson & Christensen, 2010 among others). Before you collect any data, you will first write the proposal. This is the first three chapters of the dissertation and outlines what you plan to do. The first chapter is an introduction to the topic and includes an overview of the research questions and hypotheses. The second chapter is the literature review; it’s purpose is to provide context for the study (there are many great resources for this section, start by reading the article by Boote & Beile, 2005 ). The third chapter outlines the methodological aspects of your study.

And I have to “defend” the proposal, correct?

Yes, prior to interacting with any participants or collecting any data, you will need to defend the proposal. At this stage your committee critiques, prods, probes, and otherwise investigates all angles of your proposed study. They usually last between 1 and 3 hours and each member of your committee has to sign off on the project.

Before you send the proposal to your committee, make sure your dissertation chair approves of all aspects. One of his/her purposes during the defense is to help you gain approval from the committee. Ensure that you are on the same page with your chair, and it will go a long way to improving your likelihood of success.

This process sounds stressful ...

It is. Be prepared to lose some sleep the weeks leading up to it. And bring doughnuts for your committee; my father taught me that trick.

Doughnuts always help. Can I finally start collecting data?

Yes! If you are working with human participants, you will need Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval, however.

There can’t be much left, correct? When do I start to analyze my data?

Make sure all data are collected before you start to analyze. My guess is that this audience doesn’t need help at this stage.

Well I am in APA’s Division 5, so I should hope not! Anything else I need to know?

Only that after you finalize your results you will have to defend the entire dissertation in a process similar to the proposal defense.

Great, I can’t wait to start ...

Now wait a minute. This process most certainly is a grueling, cumbersome task; however, the challenge of completing something so large and vast engenders rewards far greater than imagined. After I successfully defended my dissertation proposal, I felt an effervescent relief and sense of accomplishment simultaneously. And that was only the proposal! For most doctoral students, defending the doctoral dissertation is tantamount to their wedding day.

Fine, you convinced me. You can stop talking to yourself now!

I don’t want to: If I stop, I have to start working on my dissertation again ...

The embedded links forward the reader to PhD Comics, (http://phdcomics.com/comics.php). The authors take no credit for the comics and would like to thank the website creators for their endearing and never-ending humor.

Josh is a fifth-year doctoral student and realizes that defending his dissertation was not nearly as fulfilling as his wedding day. He can be contacted at jpolanin@luc.edu ●

Three Questions With a Scholar: Elizabeth Tipton

By Joshua R. Polanin

Dr. Elizabeth Tipton is an Assistant Professor of Applied Statistics in the Human Development Department at Teachers College, Columbia University. She earned a PhD in Statistics from Northwestern University in 2011, where she studied under Larry Hedges. Her previous training includes an MA in Sociology from the University of Chicago and a BA in Mathematics from Transylvania University in Lexington, Kentucky. At Northwestern, she was a fellow in the Multidisciplinary Program in Education Science (MPES), an IES funded pre-doctoral program participant, and a Graduate Fellow
1. During your graduate program, how did you balance the need to publish (in journals, book chapters, or conference presentations, etc.) with the responsibilities of your program?

In statistics, like in economics, publishing while in graduate school is fairly uncommon. Additionally, most of the first two years of my program involved coursework that made it difficult to start doing research. I knew that I wanted to one day have a position in an education school, so during my third year I shifted my focus towards research. Honestly, I found this transition to be difficult—I’d grown used to completing problems sets and studying difficult math, and found the unstructured nature of research and of finding an important question much more difficult. In my third year, though, I became involved in a couple of projects with my advisor, and this work ultimately led to my dissertation research. I started doing conference presentations in my fourth year and found that I was actually more productive as my responsibilities increased. I think becoming involved in the field, meeting other scholars, and getting feedback on your work at conferences is invigorating.

2. Would you recommend, or have you ever recommended, compromising the study’s academic significance in order to complete the project in a timely manner?

I don’t think you have to choose between significance and timeliness. There’s no point in spending your dissertation time studying something that you think is insignificant—if you don’t believe in your topic, you’re in trouble later, since part of publishing is convincing readers and editors that the work is important! Instead, choose a topic that is significant and pull off a smaller part of that for your dissertation that can be completed in a timely manner. Of course, figuring out a smaller and significant question is difficult. As a graduate student I found this to be the hardest part—it’s definitely where you need to turn to advisors and mentors for guidance. Additionally, when I started doing research I had really ridiculously high standards for what was considered important—over time I learned that progress in science often involves several smaller steps.

3. What advice do you give to graduate students in the process of writing their dissertation?

The best advice I received was to choose a topic that is significant and interesting and that you can continue to research after your dissertation is complete. At a broad level, my research is about how we generalize; for my dissertation I wrote three papers that approached this problem in different ways, and I was able to leave graduate school with plans for several other papers on the same topic that I looked forward to writing. My second piece of advice would be to use conference presentations as mini-deadlines. Usually there is between 3-6 months between when a proposal is due and when the conference occurs. You can make considerable progress on the topic in that amount of time, and the deadline is much “harder” than any you make for yourself. And my final advice is to write your chapters like papers, so that when you complete your dissertation you can easily send the papers off to journals without too much revision.

I would like to thank Dr. Tipton for her time and willingness to participate in the interview. Beth has a bright future and I look forward to working with her as much as possible.

Advertise in The Score

*The Score* is the newsletter of the American Psychological Association’s Division 5—Evaluation, Measurement, and Statistics. Division 5 is concerned with promoting high standards in both research and practical application of psychological assessment, evaluation, measurement, and statistics. Approximately half of the Division 5 members are university faculty members in quantitative psychology, psychometrics, educational psychology, or industrial-organizational psychology and half are engaged in careers in industry, including the areas of individual and large-scale assessment. More than 1,000 Division 5 members receive *The Score* each quarter.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Display Ad Price</th>
<th>Job Announcement Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full page</td>
<td>7.125” × 9.5”</td>
<td>$235</td>
<td>Not available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Half page</td>
<td>7.125” × 4.75”</td>
<td>$175</td>
<td>$120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third page</td>
<td>4.75” × 4.75”</td>
<td>$125</td>
<td>$90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixth page</td>
<td>2.375” × 9.5”</td>
<td>$90</td>
<td>Free/$55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Insertion orders for four consecutive issues receive a 15% discount. First sixth page job ad each year free, thereafter $55.
Have you published a new psychological test or testing product; a book on advanced statistics, measurement, or evaluation; an interesting website or other Internet group related to measurement, statistics, or evaluation; or a computer program useful to Division 5 membership?

If so, we would like to include an announcement of about 100 words in this column. We would also appreciate any suggestions, or feedback, on how this section of the newsletter can better serve the Division 5 membership. Please take the opportunity to share information with colleagues through your contributions to this column.

Please send announcements and/or product literature to Associate Editor Michael Edwards: edwards.134@osu.edu

Qualitative Media Analysis, Second Edition  
By: David L. Altheide & Christopher J. Schneider  
Published in October, 2012 by Sage Publications, Inc. ($26 paperback)

In order to prepare a successful research project, a qualitative researcher often must consult media documents of various types. Author David L. Altheide shows the reader how to obtain, categorize, and analyze these different media documents in this entry in the Qualitative Research Methods series. The book looks at traditional primary documents such as newspapers and magazines, but also at more recent forms—television, newscasts, and cyberspace. The use of student examples of research protocols makes this book a useful primer for deriving meaning from the bombardment of media documents a qualitative researcher faces.

Methods of Randomization in Experimental Design  
By: Valentim R. Alferes  
Published in September, 2012 by Sage Publications, Inc. ($18 paperback)

This book provides a conceptual systematization and a practical tool for the randomization of between-subjects and within-subjects experimental designs in social, behavioral, and health sciences. The author adopts a pedagogical strategy that allows the reader to implement many randomization methods by relying on the materials given in the appendices and using the common features included in any word processor software. In the companion website (www.fpce.uc.pt/niips/randmethods/), along with other supplementary materials, the reader can freely download IBM SPSS and R versions of SCRAED, a package that performs simple and complex random assignment in experimental design, including the 18 randomization methods presented in Chapters 2 and 3.

The Psychology of Assessment Centers  
Edited by Duncan Jackson, Charles Lance, & Brian Hoffman  
Published in June, 2012 by Routledge Academic ($84 hardback)

Research on the reliability and validity of assessment centers (ACs) has been ongoing for at least 50 years and continues to this day. The assessment center method is a technique or process that assesses individual performance and potential. One of the most heavily researched topics over the last 30 years has been the internal structure of AC ratings that assessors make on rating dimensions after the completion of each exercise. This volume, with contributions from experts from around the world, looks at Dimension-Based Assessment Centers, Task-Based Assessment Centers, and Mixed-Model Assessment Centers. All three perspectives are presented in different sections, and a summary of these diverse perspectives is given at the end of the book.

Confidence Intervals for Proportions and Related Measures of Effect Size  
By Robert G. Newcombe  
Published in September, 2012 by CRC Press ($89.95 hardback)

Confidence Intervals for Proportions and Related Measures of Effect Size illustrates the use of effect size measures and corresponding confidence intervals as more informative alternatives to the most basic and widely used significance tests. The book provides the reader with a deep understanding of what happens when statistical methods are applied in situations far removed from the familiar Gaussian case. Drawing on his extensive work as a statistician and professor at Cardiff University School of Medicine, the author brings together methods for calculating confidence intervals for proportions and several other important measures, including differences, ratios, and nonparametric effect size measures generalizing Mann-Whitney and Wilcoxon tests. He also explains three important approaches to obtaining intervals for related measures. Many examples illustrate the application of the methods in the health and social sciences. Requiring little computational skills, the book offers user-friendly Excel spreadsheets for download at www.crcpress.com, enabling the reader to easily apply the methods to empirical data.
June 3–7, 2013

1. Structural Equation Modeling: Foundations and Extended Applications (Todd D. Little & Noel A. Card, instructors)
2. Randomized Controlled Trials (RCT) for Clinical and Behavioral Settings (Amber Watts & Chantelle Dowsett, instructors)
3. Statistical Literacy (Patricia H. Hawley, coordinating instructor)
4. Data Analysis with R (Paul E. Johnson & Pascal R. Deboeck, instructors)

June 10–14, 2013:

5. Longitudinal Structural Equation Modeling (Todd D. Little, instructor)
6. Foundations of Meta-Analysis (Noel A. Card, instructor)
7. Applied Bayesian Data Analysis (William P. Skorupski and Paul E. Johnson, instructors)
8. Advanced SEM (Wei Wu, Mijke Rhemtulla, Kristopher J. Preacher, & Alexander Schoemann, instructors)
9. Applied Latent Class Analysis and Finite Mixture Modeling (Katherine Masyn, instructor)

June 17–21, 2013

11. Item Response Theory (William P. Skorupski, instructor)
12. Social Network Analysis with Siena (Christian E. G. Steglich, instructor)
13. Mediation and Moderation: Modern Methods and Approaches (Paul Jose & Alexander Schoemann, instructors)
14. Structural Equation Modeling and Data Analysis with Mplus (Rens A. G. J. van de Schoot, instructor)
15. Dynamical Systems Methodology for Modeling Intrindividual Observations (Pascal R. Deboeck, instructor)

All courses eligible for APA-approved CE Units!!

REGISTER ONLINE TODAY: crmda.KU.edu

Register by April 30 and receive an early bird discount on the institute fee.

Sign up for consecutive courses and receive a discount to offset the weekend hotel costs.

Stats Camp occurs every June. Go to crmda.KU.edu for ongoing information and to sign up.

~ A Guilford Press Book on this topic is included in the tuition rate

* For all courses Friday afternoons are reserved for consulting on projects and participants are welcome to depart for travel.*

Comments from Past Participants:

“I would like to take a minute to write a quick note to thank you for a wonderful class. I really learned a tremendous amount. Great workshop, nicely paced, good balance between theory and the practicalities of doing SEM. Definitely worth the cost and, more important to me, worth my time.”—Megan R. Gunnar, Distinguished McKnight University Professor, Institute for Child Development, University of Minnesota

“Although I have been involved with structural equation modeling (SEM) for many years now, I am still an inveterate SEM course taker. Without question, of all the courses I have ever taken, the courses presented at the KU Stats Camp have to be the best ever—hands down! Virtually everything about them is superb—material presented is thorough and well documented, allotment of time for questions and extended discussion is generous, assistance with application of statistical techniques is ongoing, and, as if that were not enough, participants are provided with an abundance of supportive resources by way of key references, computer input/output files, visual and audio copies of the presentation, important reading materials, and guides to understanding critical statistical and SEM concepts. In my view, the Summer Stats Camp at KU is an absolute gold mine of information.”—Barbara Byrne, School of Psychology, University of Ottawa

“Wow. Simply superb—the instructors, the materials, the blue shirts. Each course I’ve taken has been excellent and worth it! I will recommend Stats Camp to all my friends and colleagues.”—Anonymous comment from a past participant
Call for Nominations for the 2013 AERA Division D Early Career Award in Measurement and Research Methodology

Quantitative Methods and Statistical Theory (Section 2)

Division D of AERA welcomes nominations for the 2013 Early Career Award in Measurement and Research Methodology. This annual award recognizes emerging scholars in the field of educational research and methodology. The award rotates annually among the three sections of Division D. The 2013 award will be in Quantitative Methods and Statistical Theory (Section 2). The winner will be announced and honored at the 2013 Division D luncheon and business meeting with a plaque and a $1,000 award.

Eligibility
To be eligible for the 2013 Early Career Award in Quantitative Methods and Statistical Theory, an applicant must have received the doctorate after April 1, 2007. The nominee must also have two or more unique papers as sole or first author either accepted for presentation at the AERA annual meeting or published in AERA journals since 2007 that address educational research and methodology issues with a focus on statistical methods.

Application Procedure
A complete nomination will consist of the following four items:

1. A letter of nomination from a professional colleague who is an AERA Division D member.
2. An additional letter of support that addresses the nominee’s contribution to the field and the reasons why the nominee’s work represents a significant contribution to the field.
3. Two papers presented at any of the last six AERA annual meetings or published in an AERA journal. The research must address educational research or methodological issues. The AERA annual meeting papers may be a revised version for publication. Candidates must be the first or sole author on these papers.
4. Nominee’s curriculum vita.

Submit the complete nomination electronically by November 30, 2012, to: Marilyn S. Thompson, Early Career Award Committee Chair, School of Social and Family Dynamics, Arizona State University, m.thompson@asu.edu.

New 2012 Division 5 Fellows Announced

The 2012 Division 5 Fellowship Committee is comprised of Deniz Ones (Chair), Wayne Camara (Incoming Chair), Greg Meyer (Past Chair), and Sarah Semmel (Student Member). The committee solicited applications for Fellow status from Executive Committee members and the membership at large (via an announcement in The Score, as well as APA’s website devoted to Fellowship). Initial eligibility for Fellowship includes being a member of APA and Division 5 for at least a year and being at least 5-years post PhD. Fellowship in Division 5 is more specifically based on (1) outstanding contributions to evaluation, measurement, and statistics; (2) current engagement in teaching, research, or application in these areas, or in supervision of activities related to these areas; and (3) service to the division.

The Committee received numerous eligible nominees for Fellow status. We are pleased to announce that the following Nominated Fellows who were already Fellows in other APA divisions are now granted Fellow status in Division 5: Robert McGrath, Lou Primavera, Dan Putka, Jeffrey Smith, and Nancy Tippins. New APA Fellows through initial Fellowship in Division 5 as approved by the APA Council in August are Fred Oswald and Beverly Jean Vandiver. Congratulations!

Respectfully Submitted,
Deniz Ones
Chair, 2012 Fellowship Committee
APF Winners Announced

The American Psychological Foundation (APF) is pleased to announce the recipients of the 2012 APF Visionary Grant and the Drs. Rosalee G. and Raymond A. Weiss Research and Program Innovation Grant. These grants support innovative research, education, and interventions in:

- Understanding and fostering the connection between behavior and health;
- Reducing stigma and prejudice;
- Understanding and preventing violence;
- Addressing the long-term psychological needs in the aftermath of disaster.

This year’s recipients are:

**E. Scott Geller, PhD**, Director of the Center for Applied Behavior Systems in the Department of Psychology at Virginia Tech University. Dr. Geller will use his $19,800 Visionary Funds Grant to implement the *Actively Caring for People* anti-bullying program in three middle schools in Montgomery County, VA. The project also includes teaching evidence-based principles to 30 undergraduate psychology students at Virginia Tech.

**Tamara L. Newton, PhD**, an Associate Professor of Psychology at the University of Louisville, received $19,550 in APF Visionary Funding to develop a new approach to the problems of how traumatic stress is changed into compromised mental and physical health, and why some people are more stress-vulnerable than others. This project may have important implications in stress recovery following interpersonal trauma.

**David Vogel, PhD**, of Iowa State University is utilizing his $19,000 Visionary Funds Grant to develop Internet-based interventions that can reduce stigma and increase the likelihood of seeking mental health services among military personnel in the ultimate hope of decreasing unnecessary suffering.

**Rezarta Bilali, PhD**, of the University of Massachusetts–Boston, received $5,000 from the Drs. Rosalee G. and Raymond A. Weiss Research and Program Innovation Fund and $19,000 from the Visionary Fund to develop and test strategies to target the denial and justification of harm-doing by a group of individuals against another (such as mass violence), while at the same time fostering the conditions that lead to acknowledgment of the injustices done to the victim group and the restitution of harm.

Since 1953, APF has been supporting innovative research and programs that launch careers and seed the knowledge base on critical issues around the globe. For more information, please visit the APF website at [www.apa.org/apf](http://www.apa.org/apf).
President’s Message

continued from page 1

my hope is that each of the interest areas of the Division—now evaluation, measurement, statistics, assessment, and qualitative inquiry—will have a voice in our new Division 5 and will share in the opportunities while being respectful of the other interest areas. Historically, in the years since the Assessment Section joined Division 5, members of each of the then old and new areas have held offices in Division 5 governance and have shared in the Division’s APA convention program. I will shortly appoint a committee representing each of the interest areas of the Division to facilitate the transition.

One of the most important activities of the Division is the annual convention. The success of this year’s convention in Orlando was due to program chair Carol Wood and her committee. The challenge of mounting a strong program that serves each of the areas of interest of our division becomes more challenging each year. The American Psychological Association increasingly allots convention hours to a central committee for general programming rather than to divisions. As with all other divisions, Division 5’s allotment of hours has fallen over the years, making it more challenging to mount a strong and balanced program. I thank Carol and her committee for their hard work. Next year’s convention will be held in Honolulu, Hawaii, July 31-August 4, 2013. The call for proposals is approaching fast with a very early deadline of Friday November 16, 2012—yes, that is mid-November! Information is available at [http://www.apa.org/convention/call-for-programs.pdf](http://www.apa.org/convention/call-for-programs.pdf). Division 5’s program chair will be Krista D. Mattern, PhD, 661 Penn St., #B, Newtown, PA 18940-1801; (215) 867-4616; kmattern@collegeboard.org. As at recent conventions, we invite proposals for posters and symposia. I especially encourage potential submitters to consider proposing posters or symposia that integrate multiple interest areas of our Division or which link to other APA divisions and illustrate the value of quantitative or qualitative methods for other substantive areas (e.g., the interplay of design, measurement, and statistical modeling or the interplay of mixed quantitative and qualitative methods in solving a problem).

I will initiate a Division 5 effort to garner a small amount of extra convention time for workshops on popular methodological topics at future APA conventions. These workshops have appeal for graduate students, early career professionals, and long-time members, not only for the membership of Division 5 but also members of many of the other scientific divisions within APA.

One important change associated with the passage of the bylaws is a change in the roles of two important people in Division governance. Like several other APA divisions, Division 5 has recognized the key role served by the Coordinating Officer and Financial Officer. Presidents and committee chairs serve for a single year, but the Coordinating Officer and Financial Officer provide the continuity of the Division. Under the new structure, both officers serve three-year, renewable terms and have increased roles. We are fortunate that Jim Bovaird has agreed to serve as Coordinating Officer and Jodi Casabianca has agreed to serve as Financial Officer. Their increased roles reflect the wonderful job that these individuals have performed in their previous service for Division 5. Both Jim and Jodi are outstanding young career professionals and I look forward to working with them.

An issue that continues to affect the Division is how to attract young people to our field. There are several aspects to this issue. First, it appears that among the specialty areas of our Division members are ones in which there are more job opportunities in universities and the private sector than there are qualified candidates. Yet, most undergraduate students are not aware of our field and talented students and even sometimes advised away from it. At many universities, too many advisors can be heard to say, “Isn’t it wonderful that you have completed your basic math requirements and your introductory statistics course. Now you do not need to do anything more.” Several years ago, the APA Task Force on quantitative methods did valuable work, establishing a useful website informing students about quantitative psychology and quantitative programs: [http://www.apa.org/research/tools/quantitative/index.aspx](http://www.apa.org/research/tools/quantitative/index.aspx). The website has been helpful and has introduced many students to quantitative psychology. Division 5 members also need to continue to work locally at our universities and nationally through the Division and APA to further increase this gain in the visibility of our field. And we need to look to our graduate student leaders like Nazia Rahman who has been highly creative in developing ideas for increasing student involvement in the Division and organizing activities through APAGS.

Second, our field needs to increase its inclusiveness and diversity. Our field has made great strides over my lifetime of bringing women into the field. Graduate programs are no longer male bastions; over the decade preceding my term, four of the presidents of Division 5 were distinguished women. We have not been so successful in attracting minorities to our field. Past President Lisa Harlow and Herb Eber have sought to change this through their annual Quantitative Training for Underrepresented Groups Conference. Their efforts are bearing fruit as some of their attendees are entering major graduate programs. Within Division 5, the Diversity Committee headed by incoming chair Beverly Vandiver continues to work on this issue. At the same time, members in university settings need to think locally—what can we do to encourage promising minority students? Some promising efforts exist such as the work of Oswaldo Morera at the University of Texas, El Paso.

Third, as part of our integration of our new section, we need to identify qualitative training programs and career opportunities for students interested in qualitative inquiry and mixed method research and make this information available through our websites.

In my role as president, I welcome your suggestions and concerns relevant to the Division. Please feel free to communicate them to me: sgwest@asu.edu. Please put “Division 5” in the subject line of the email so I will not miss it.●