On behalf of the National Standards Working Group, I would like to thank you for the feedback you provided in 2007 at the beginning of the second revision of the *National Standards for High School Psychology Curricula*. The National Standards Working Group (Amy Fineburg, Chair, Oak Mountain High School, Birmingham, AL; Debra Park, West Deptford High School, Westville, NJ; Hilary Rosenthal, Glenbrook South High School, Glenview, IL; James Freeman, PhD, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, VA; and David Myers, PhD, Hope College, Holland, MI), with consultation from the National Standards Advisory Panel (see Attachment A), reviewed and considered all feedback that was initially provided at the beginning of this revision process, and noted that the majority of the feedback was related to the performance indicators. Performance indicators were provided in the 2005 document as examples of potential ways that a student could demonstrate mastery of the material. The National Standards Working Group has decided to provide these indicators separately from the revised document, to allow for greater flexibility and continual revision. Information on how groups can contribute to the newly designed performance indicators will be provided at a later time.

The current revision of the *National Standards* has been comprehensive, and the current draft is significantly different from the previous version. Please see Attachment B for a timeline of the revision process to date. The comments related to the 2005 version prompted the Working Group to make these comprehensive revisions, making feedback to specific comments difficult. However, we have tried to incorporate much of the feedback originally provided in 2007. We welcome feedback if your group believes that some of their original comments have not been adequately addressed.

In accordance with Association Rule 30-8.3, the revised Standards document will go forward to all APA Boards and Committees again this Spring on the Cross-Cutting Agenda, as part of the 90-day public comment period. The revised *National Standards* will be posted to the Education Directorate Public Comment website at http://apaoutside.apa.org/EducCSS/Public/; all comments must be submitted electronically via this site. **Comments may be submitted March 1 - May 31, 2010.** Following the 90-day public comment period, additional feedback will be considered and addressed. Our hope is that the revised document will go forward to APA governance groups this fall with the request to recommend that Council adopt the revised document as Association policy.

The *National Standards* document promotes quality instruction of psychology as a scientific discipline and provides guidance for high school psychology teachers and others responsible for development of psychology curriculum at the secondary school level. It is a critically important document that has
enormous implications for the teaching of high school psychology. Again, please accept our sincere thanks and appreciation for your feedback and support of the National Standards.

Attachment A

National Standards Advisory Panel

Methods Domain

Morton McPhail, PhD, Valtera Corporation, Houston, TX, *Nominated by the Board of Professional Affairs*

Pat Puccio, PhD, College of DuPage, Glen Ellyn, IL, *Nominated by Psychology Teachers at Community Colleges*

Biopsychological Domain

James Kalat, PhD, North Carolina State University, Raleigh, NC, *Nominated by the Board of Scientific Affairs, the Committee of Psychological Tests and Assessment, and the Committee on Animal Research and Ethics*

Cheryl Luis, PhD, Roskamp Institute Memory Clinic, Tampa, FL & Nova Southeastern University, Fort Lauderdale, FL, *Nominated by the Committee of Women in Psychology.*

Developmental Domain

David B. Mitchell, PhD, Kennesaw State University, Kennesaw, GA, *Nominated by the Committee on Aging*

Susan Krauss Whitbourne, PhD, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, MA, *Nominated by the Policy and Planning Board and the Committee on Aging*

Cognitive Domain

Elizabeth Bjork, PhD, University of California Los Angeles, Los Angeles, CA, *Nominated by the Board of Scientific Affairs, the Committee of Psychological Tests and Assessment, and the Committee on Animal Research and Ethics*

Daniel Reisberg, PhD, Reed College, Portland, OR, *Nominated by the Board of Scientific Affairs, the Committee of Psychological Tests and Assessment, and the Committee on Animal Research and Ethics*

Variations in Individual and Group Behavior Domain

Joan C. Chrisler, PhD, Connecticut College, New London, CT, *Nominated by the Committee of Women in Psychology*

Jeffery Scott Mio, PhD, California State Polytechnic University, Pomona, CA, *Nominated by the Policy and Planning Board*
The following steps have been taken to start the revision process:

1) In the fall of 2006 and spring of 2007, APA Boards and Committees were invited to nominate individuals to serve on the National Standards Working Group and National Standards Advisory Panel.

2) In 2007, all APA Boards, Committees, Divisions, and State, Provincial, and Territorial Psychological Associations (SPTAs), were invited to submit feedback on the National Standards. A call for comments was also posted in the APA Monitor, the American Psychologist, and in the Psychology Teacher Network newsletter, encouraging APA members and teacher affiliates to provide feedback on the document.

3) The National Standards Advisory Panel experts were each asked to review the National Standards and provide feedback on the entire document, focusing on the specific domain they were assigned to. Feedback was collected by September 2007.

4) The National Standards Working Group met in November 2007 to review all feedback to the document from all APA constituents and from the Advisory Panel.

5) A joint meeting of the National Standards Working Group and the National Standards Advisory Panel was held in September 2008, so the ten Advisory Panel experts could meet face-to-face with the Working Group. The joint meeting was an opportunity for the experts and Working Group members to discuss the document and its revision, to better ensure that the document represents the science of psychology to be taught in secondary schools.

6) In 2009, a revised draft of the document was provided via the Spring Cross-Cutting Agenda to APA Boards and Committees for feedback. Feedback was also solicited from APA Divisions and SPTAs.

7) In the fall of 2009, the National Standards Working Group reviewed all submitted feedback and responded to each comment. The National Standards Advisory Panel reviewed all submitted feedback and Working Group responses.

8) The revised document underwent legal counsel review in February 2010. At this time, feedback is being shared with those groups that provided earlier feedback.

Next steps:

The revised document is being put forward for public comment March 1 – May 31, 2010. The National Standards Working Group, with input from the National Standards Advisory Panel, will review all submitted feedback and make additional changes to the draft document as appropriate. The Working Group will then provide the draft document to the Office of General Counsel for a second legal review and determination of whether further public comment is required. Subsequent to the second legal review, the National Standards will be provided to the BEA.
Executive Committee, with a request to place the item on the cross-cutting agenda. With approval from BEA, APA governance groups will receive an action item recommending that Council approve the *National Standards* as association policy.
HI TOPEC - attached is the VERY thorough and thoughtful response to the standards from the working group I formed to look at them. I (and the EB) would love any input you have on this document or the standards in general. We would like to begin discussion on Thursday so that we can finalize our comments and forward them early next week.

Thanks for your input

Your Still trying to figure out what I am doing VPRRPR
Diane
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Membership

The GSTA members at UNH launched the same membership drive we did in the previous year. This year’s drive was conducted under the leadership of Rick Trinkner, associate-chair. The GSTA contacted 358 graduate psychology departments with information about STP and GSTA with the request to print and hang a small flyer in their department.

The membership drive was very successful. To date in 2010, there are 354 paid members. Of those, 137 are new members.

A goal from the previous year was to recruit and increase our relationship with Regional Representatives. The GSTA has 10 new Regional Representatives this year. The chair maintains contact with them through email and the GSTA Facebook page.

Promotional Materials

GSTA members created an updated promotional poster. The poster is intended to be shown at teaching conferences over the year and was made available to regional representatives to take to teaching of psychology conferences.

The GSTA used the newly made GSTA logo on promotional buttons that were ordered for distribution. The buttons are intended to be distributed at conferences and sent to the regional representatives to distribute as well.

Technology

The GSTA listserv was successfully launched in fall 2009. The STP-GSTA listserv is moderated by the Society for the Teaching of Psychology and hosted by Kennesaw State University. Jennifer Stiegler and Rick Trinkner are moderators for the STP-GSTA Listserv. All GSTA members are automatically subscribed to the listserv.

The primary use of the list is to announce GSTA related information, but it will also focus on topics such as general instructional questions (strategies for teaching a specific course, resource materials, etc.), discussions related to classroom issues (e.g., using technology in the classroom, handling academic dishonesty, etc.), and announcements related to teaching in general (TV programs related to a specific course, specific Internet resources, etc.).

The GSTA Clearinghouse for Information on Teaching has been available all year. It consists of a collection of resources for new teachers, as called for by the Graduate Student
Education and Training in Teaching Ad Hoc Committee in 2006. This year, we added new resources for graduate students that are transitioning into careers in academia. The Clearinghouse website provides a forum for transitioning students to access information and to receive feedback from individuals who have recently gone through the same changes. The Clearinghouse resources have been accessed by 321 members in the past year. This year Joshua Dobias collected and organized new resources and monitored the site for the GSTA.

GSTA maintained the Facebook page that was launched early in 2009. The Facebook page links GSTA members to one another as well as to faculty members. It provides an easy forum for communication and access to the society’s resources such as the GSTA Clearinghouse and STP WebPages.

Conference Presence

The GSTA continues to host one programming hour at the annual APA convention in San Diego, CA this year. Dr. Regan Gurung (Department of Psychology, University of Wisconsin, Green Bay) will be our guest speaker. He will share a talk entitled: “Adrenalize Your Teaching: Using and Doing Pedagogical Research?”

Dr. William Buskist was the GSTA program hour speaker at the 2009 convention in Toronto. His talk was well attended and well received.

Goals for 2010-2011

- The GSTA has a number of goals for the remainder of the current year.
  - Find a new host institution for the GSTA and assist in the transition of the GSTA
  - Repeat the membership drive with Graduate Psychology Departments
  - Order and disseminate promotional material
  - Maintain close relationships with Regional Representatives
  - Continue to add resources to the Clearinghouse Web site
  - Maintain the GSTA listserv
  - Expand the post-graduation guide (resources for graduating students) on the Clearinghouse Web site and request their contact information for their new positions

GSTA Steering Committee (2009-2010)
Members from University of New Hampshire, Department of Psychology

GSTA Chair
Jennifer Stiegler

GSTA Associate Chairs
Rink Trinkner (Associate Chair, Membership Drive)
Joshua Dobias (Associate Chair, Special Initiatives)

GSTA Communications Editor
Jacqueline Hembrook
GSTA Membership Drive Committee
Rachel Rogers
Matthew Ramsey
Catherine Overson
Heather Hussey
Rhyannon Bemis

Faculty Advisor
Victor Benassi

Regional Representatives
Amanda Brouwer, University of Wisconsin
Carrie Brown, St. Louis University
Elizabeth Browning, University of New Mexico
Nick Freeman, University at Albany, State University of New York
Marnie Kohler, Missouri Baptist University/Walden University
Rebecca Latellier, Strayer University
Sadie Leder, University of Buffalo, SUNY
Jared McGinley, Virginia Tech University
Rebecca Schwartz, West Virginia University
Lyra Stein, Rutgers University

Facebook:
The Facebook group continues to be strong in terms of numbers although activity is sporadic. Bob Wildblood has volunteered to monitor activity.

Working Groups:
Three working groups have been formed. Two groups are looking at membership issues in terms of renewing members and new faculty members. They will not complete their work until late summer.

The WG to review the National High School standards complete their report which formed the basis of the comments by STP. The group was chaired by Barney Beins of Ithaca College and included Kerry Baker of Cedar Crest College and Ken Weaver of Emporia State.

Other:
Promotional materials have been ordered for use at APA and regional conferences. A call for interested volunteers generated a list of over 20 members eager to get involved.
1a. Overall, pursuant to Recommendation 1 in Chapter 5 of *Undergraduate Education in Psychology: A Blueprint for the Future of the Discipline* (APA, 2010, pp. 88-89), change “psychology” to “psychological science” everywhere except where psychology is used in conjunction with words such as “curricula” or “course.” This change has occurred in a few places but is not pervasive. Keeping psychology in places like the title is an indication of continuity to those who do not understand psychology very well, such as state and local board of education members and state department of education officials, who will be making important decisions on psychology’s inclusion in the curriculum and how high school psychology should be prepared. This appearance of continuity bodes well for psychology as it is still a popular elective—its popularity may well be the only reason it continues to be offered in some school districts.

1b. Overall, the word “research” is not mentioned at all after the first domain. The content in the remaining six standards seems untethered from its research underpinnings. Should the most seminal research that is grade appropriate for high school students be explicitly mentioned in any of the other 6 domains?

2. p. 1: “Each standard area refers to a major topic or unit representing a subdivision of psychology.” I am not familiar with the term “subdivision” used to refer to an area in Psychology. Divisions of psychology, areas of specialization, areas of subspecialization, fields of psychology, subfields, major subfields are terms I have heard (subfields and major subfields appear on p. 3). Is there a better term to use in this sentence than subdivision?

3a. Look at p. 3 as an example: The content standards appear twice—once as a group under each Standard Area and again in a distributed fashion as a structure to present performance standards. Suggest a different nomenclature to avoid this repetition.

3b. How user friendly is this document, Part 1. Background—for whom is this document crafted? Initially, was it more for high school psychology teachers than those in policy positions like state and local board of education members and state department of education officials so that there was a common baseline of quality content and performance expectations to guide teachers whose backgrounds in psychology were not strong? Is it appropriate to think that 11 years later, the more important of these two constituencies has become the latter, as psychology seeks to continue as an important and relevant part of the high school curriculum around the nation in this time of budget cuts, growing importance of other electives, and continued lack of clarity about psychological science and its importance to society?

Why do content standards have to have a label IA-1 and why do performance standards have to be referred to as IA-1.1? If someone were only to see IA-1.1, that expression would have no meaningfulness, thus there appears to be no getting around having terminology to clarify for the audience what is being referred to. What about the expression “Performance Standard IA-1.1”? Even this expression is not very meaningful. It would still require those unfamiliar with the standards, which would be most state and local board of education members, to find out more
information. Another example—what is VIIC-1.2 and is this expression intrinsically meaningful in identifying sections of the standards. VIIC looks like 93 mis-written in Roman numerals.

Could the standards be viable if all the numbering is removed? I think so, because most of the constituencies using this document will be using it wholistically to plan courses and curriculum rather than discussing or writing about pieces of it where sections might need to be numbered for easier reference.

3c. How user friendly is this document, Part 2. Does the document overuse the term “standard”? Are the standards clear and accessible to those who are not familiar with psychology? Are both “content” and “performance” standards necessary? Think that the document can be more user friendly and more focused to highlight only performance standards. These and these alone are the core of this document—not the domains, the standard areas, or the performance indicators (which are removed in this revision)—but to the uninitiated, there is a lot of noise to have to sift through to get to the standards.

Recommendation to address 3a, b, and c:

Instead of

I. SCIENTIFIC INQUIRY DOMAIN
Standard Area IA: Perspectives in Psychological Science

Content Standards
After concluding this unit, students understand:
IA-1. Development of psychology as an empirical science
IA-2. Major subfields within psychology

Content Standards With Performance Standards
CONTENT STANDARD IA-1: Development of psychology as an empirical science
Students are able to (performance standards):
IA-1.1 Define psychology as a discipline and identify its goals as a science.
IA-1.2 Describe the emergence of psychology as a scientific discipline.
IA-1.3 Describe perspectives employed to understand behavior and mental processes.
IA-1.4 Recognize the evolving nature of psychology as a scientific discipline.

Change to:

SCIENTIFIC INQUIRY DOMAIN: Perspectives in Psychological Science

1. Students are able to define psychology as a discipline and identify its goals as a science.
2. Students are able to describe the emergence of psychology as a scientific discipline.
3. Students are able to describe perspectives employed to understand behavior and mental processes.
4. Students are able to recognize the evolving nature of psychology as a scientific discipline.

In the words of a great friend of these standards, “simplify, simplify, simplify.”

4. On p. 3, we like addition of IA-2.3 identifying the important role psychology plays in addressing the public interest
IA-1.3 Describe **history and major** perspectives employed to understand behavior and mental processes.  (Add history and major to sentence)

IA-2.3 Identify the important role psychology plays in addressing the public interest.  (Not sure of what “addressing the public interest” means.)

5. p. 4: Should “Explain other inferential statistics, including statistical significance.” be tightened to focus only on independent samples $t$ test so that it is clear that descriptive stats, correlation, and two-sample $t$ test should be taught to correspond to IB-1.2 Describe and compare descriptive, correlational, and experimental research methods?

pp. 3-4: IB-1.4 why is the phrase “non-human animal” used?  Seems redundant?

IB-2.2 again, the phrase “non-human animal” is used. Can animal be switched to “participant”?

IB-3.4 Explain other inferential statistics, including statistical significance (Don’t agree with including that standard here for high school students.  This seems advanced and would take much time for the instructor to teach).

6. Same comment about use of term “non-human animal”

On p 6: IIA-4.1 What are the “tools” that are referred to here?  EEG?  I think another term should be used or give the instructors examples of these tools.

Does IIA 4.3 Discuss issues related to scientific advances in neuroscience and genetics subsume IIA.4.2 Describe advances made in neuroscience, making IIA. 4.2 unnecessary?

IIB.-2.1 List forms of energy for which we do and do not have sensory receptors.  (What does this mean?  What are these forms of energy?  Not clear at all)

On p. 7: IIB-3.5 Describe the nature of attention (again, what does this mean?  Not clear at all)

7. On p. 6: IIB-2.5 Describe other important sensory systems.  Are there sensory systems that are not important?  Recommend deleting “important.”

8.  p. 7: IIB-3.5 Describe the nature of attention.  This seems to warrant greater coverage but not sure how to accomplish that.  Seems located in appropriate place.

9.  p. 8: IIC- 4.1 Describe meditation and relaxation and their effects.  Unclear what effects will be referred to.  Will it only be effects like mood and muscle changes or will it also include endocrine system and biopsychological effects (brain changes).  Does this need to be more explicit?

On p. 9: IIIA-1.2 Explain issues of continuity/discontinuity and stability/change (What does this mean?  Not clear)

On p. 10: IIIA-7.4 (Add standard- Describe the reactions to death.)

On p. 11: IIIB-3.1 Describe the principles of observational learning and **cognitive learning** (Add cognitive learning to include cognitive maps and latent learning concepts)

10. pp. 9-10:  I like splitting the lifespan into segments with performance standards for each segment

11. pp. 13-14: Good idea to give Social its own domain with culture and gender as a content standard
IVA-2- Include terms obedience, compliance, and conformity

12. On p. 15: VA-1.1 This first one should say “Describe the major system or structure of memory.” Then continue with current 1.1

On p. 16: VA-3.6 Discuss the different types of memories (Add this item to include discussion of flashbulb, false memories, etc.) Or are these types of memories imbedded in VA-2.3? It is not clear...if they can be part of VA-2.3, then these examples should be listed there.

VB-1.1 Define processes involved in the manipulation and understanding of information. (This item is definitely vague and would not be understood by instructors.)

p. 17: VC-1.2 Discuss and compare alternative models or conceptualizations of intelligence. Recommend revising the wording

VC-2.2 What does “contemporary” mean in this item?

VC-3.3 Discuss differential results on intelligence tests, based on gender and race. (Add this item?)


14. p. 21: Rename the Psychological Disorders content standard in Domain 6 to be Psychological Disorders and Treatment. I see no rationale for splitting this content across two domains.

VI-2.2 Identify Psychological treatments (can this be changed to identify types of psychological therapies?)

15. p. 22: Domain 7: Unsure why health warrants its own section and not, for example, industrial-organizational. Suggest revising to give students expanded perspective on the application of psychology to issue relevant to them—why are their rules in school, what’s the purpose of sound a tone to change classes, why have student organizations, what’s the point of not being allowed to do student activities unless you have a certain GPA, why are dances/proms/formals popular, internet addiction, identifying a postsecondary interest

16. p. 22: I like the addition of the careers section; however, recommend that the two content standards be reversed in order. Identify the careers and then identify the degree requirements and resources to prepare for that career. Recommend the addition of preference tests as a psychologically appropriate method for helping a student identify career interests (and another explanation of application).

OTHER COMMENTS

1. An important element is the performance indicators. These performance indicators are supposed to appear in a separate document. These performance indicators, or examples of potential ways that a student could demonstrate mastery of the material, are extremely important and necessary. Without the provision of such performance indicators, the National Standards for High School Psychology Curricula will not be useful and applicable to educators in the field. Consequently, we want to emphasize the importance of these indicators, and hope that they will be well-written, extensive, and serve as a useful resource.
2. It would be useful to consider adding a section on Recent Trends in Psychology (e.g., Positive Psychology). This could be added in Section VIIC or in a separate section at end.