Differing Perspectives on the History of Larry P.
April 19, 8:30 – 11:30 am, Capitol Salon C & D.
Betty Henry, PhD

I. Overview: What was it like in 1992-1994?

April 4, 1993 was the 25th anniversary of the MLK assassination

The Bell Curve (1994), by Charles Murray and Richard Herrnstein linked race, class, and success with IQ scores, suggesting that whites were “naturally” smarter.

II. Overview: Where was CASP in 1992-1993?

Simple answer: Millbrae, but…

Hot topics in school psychology

• Anticipation of a $2 billion-plus cut in educational financing in CA for 93-94
• Efforts to change the focus from eligibility to intervention, despite Prop 13
• Severe discrepancies, using the regression formula or charts
• Beginning of Medicaid billing in schools
• Doomsday predictions that school psychology would not survive (Tom Fagan: School psychology is an important but small ship on the sea of education…comprising ½ of 1% of public school employees.

There was a real concern that school psychology could be eliminated, just as school counselors, school social workers, and school nurses (none of whom had protection in the Ed Code) had been decimated with Prop 13. We were well aware that our only protection was through cognitive assessment.

III. Timeline, mostly 1986 – 1995, with personal memories

1986 – Alternative Assessment Task Force. I flew to San Diego. We knew:
Can’t do A
What is B?

This was followed by focus group meetings in the north and south. CASP members were invited to present ideas and to develop them.

We picked the most prominent non-IQ alternatives out there and wrote up what they would look like. We did not address the question: Is it better?
**Summer 1987** – CASP members wrote committee reports outlining various approaches to alternative assessment (CBA, Piagetian, etc.). No evidence was presented within these that their use would impact disproportionate placement.

**1989.** CDE Larry P Task Force met several times. Members included SELPA directors, CDE administrators, and others; I represented CASP. The task force report recommended in-service training, selection of alternative assessment measures (developmental, ecological, neuropsychological, and skills within subjects), general education responsibilities, and the development of state and local norms, including ethnic representation. It seemed targeted for school psychology and school psychology supervisors.

One discussion was: *What constitutes Black?* The King Kamehameha rule from HI was offered: 1/32. I waited for "one drop" to be said. I objected, saying educators should not be doing this. It was agreed that parent statement would stand. There was discussion about what to do if a parent checked a race that did not look correct—parent selection would not trump responsibility to follow the Larry P guidelines.

**Summer 1991.** The CDE announced that it intended to ban the use of intelligence tests throughout the state. Superintendent of Public Instruction, Bill Honig, expressed doubt the intelligence tests are particularly useful or necessary. They “don’t help you decide what to do with kids…they cost $1200 to $1400 to administer…(their) primary use..is to obtain an IQ score to make eligibility decisions for special education…(they) are biased against minorities…alternative techniques are equally valid…more and more states are moving away from (their) use...(parents can pay for an IQ test privately) but we don’t have to use state funds to pay for that.”

**September 6, 1991.** Letter from Jerome Sattler, “I have reviewed over ten thousand research studies in the last 30 years and I know of not one research study that shows there are better ways of measuring vocabulary, reasoning, conceptual thinking, and visual/motor organization than standardized intelligence tests. This is a serious issue involving thousands of jobs in CA and the profession as a whole.”

Dan Reschly (past President of NASP and director of the school psychology program at Iowa State University) agreed that the use of IQ tests should be the prerogative of the individual professional, not state bureaucracy. “Intelligence tests are not the cause of, nor will a ban…be a solution for overrepresentation of minority students in special education classes.” He supported alternative techniques as better for identifying students and defining intervention techniques.

**September 1, 1992.** Judge Peckham overturned the six year ban on IQ testing. The CDE and school districts were free to develop new policies for the assessment of A-A students for placement as long as it wasn’t into the substantial equivalent of the 1979 EMR programs. The CDE had 30 days to appeal the ruling. Since EMR classes were no longer in existence, there would be a follow-up hearing to determine the meaning of “substantial equivalent” in current special education programs.
Undated. CDE considered substantial equivalent to be: no core curriculum, <20% return to general education, disproportionate A-A representation.

November 1992. CASP prepared a form that could be used for parents to provide informed consent for the use of IQ tests.

January 1993. A parent group in Fairfield/Suisun challenged the form. Interpretation of comments made by the CDE suggested that the form needed to make a specific connection between use of tests and the resulting possibility of placement in special education. Additionally recommended: “However, no intelligence test will be used for pupils suspected of being educable mentally retarded.” CASP continued to recommend alternative assessment for “pupils for whom standardized tests may not be appropriate.”

Jan-Feb, 1993. Sometimes You Need a Hammer (handout)

February 1993. CDE would not provide a category for collecting data about multi-racial children because it would constitute a state mandated cost.

Presidential Address, Convention 1993: “I am not going to devote my professional passion to anything that supports a paradigm suggesting that determining eligibility for special education (which the current SE branch of the CDE actually phrased as ‘determining eligibility for ‘dead-end’ programs) is the most important goal for school psychology. I can understand a passion to understand a child better…to identify curriculum that works with a child…help meet children’s needs…But I do not understand a passion to ‘sort and place’ to determine who should fairly be tossed into ‘dead-end programs’ and kept unfairly from the core curriculum. If there just ain’t enough of this very expensive, dead-end program stuff to go around, let’s put our energies into nuking it rather than finding more egalitarian methods for dumping kids into it.”

January 1993. Pat Hewitt, our lobbyist, left CASP. Her accomplishments: creating the Ed psych. License, codifying our role and function in Ed. Code, amending Rodda Act to permit school psychologists to have separate bargaining from teachers, eliminate teacher credential requirement to be a school psychologist, restricted IQ testing to school psychologists.

July 26, 1993. Barry Zolotar (deputy general counsel, CDE) wrote “neither the court nor the State have issued guidance on the interplay between consanguinity and the court’s rulings…(if the student) is the product of an inter-racial marriage, I do not believe that the prohibition would be either technically or implicitly violated”

August 1993. CASP filed a complaint in US District Court requesting declaratory and injunctive relief from the CDE interpretation of the Crawford ruling.

September 1993. CASP representatives and Jane Slenkovich met with an attorney from the Civil Rights Division of the DOJ. They had sided with the plaintiffs in the initial
Larry P (against IQ tests) and with the plaintiffs in Crawford (for the civil right to use IQ tests for sld. Five hour meeting. I believe they did not file an amicus brief following our meeting (they had planned to, but didn’t know what position they would take).

Fall 1993. CASP Legal Defense Fund collected $8000 for Larry P related costs of $20,000.

October 1993. Leo Sandoval (CDE Assistant Sup for SE) and I presented Larry P perspectives to the CASP Affiliate Leadership Conference in Palm Desert. “Mr. Sandoval seemed startled to hear that achievement test results show the same racial differences as intelligence tests.”

October 1993. CASP asked Psych Corp and Riverside to provide validity and standardization data for Stanford-Binet and Wisc-III. They didn’t.

October 1993. The CDE responded to CASP’s legal complaint, requesting the court to dismiss the complaint with prejudice.

October 1993. CASP adopted a position statement and consent form for the use of IQ tests with A-A students. Four conditions for use:

• Professional judgment that test will contribute valid and important information to referral/assessment questions
• Test will not be used to diagnose EMR or place a student in the substantial equivalent of the 1979 EMR classes
• You have informed consent
• You have administrative support

1993 - CASP board members were highly aware of the emotions attached to IQ testing. We never discussed data, referred to research, or conferred with others. The majority were practitioners, not university trainers. Those I remember who wanted CASP to move away from support for using IQ tests were practitioners; my sense was that they were highly conscious that the tests are offensive to some and they didn’t want to perpetuate a controversial behavior. It was reactive and specific, and came from a place of caring.


March 1994. Invited address CASP. Larry P: Worthwhile investment, misguided effort or black hole?

1994? Willie Brown, when threatened by term limits, had a brief stint as a talk show host for a cable news in Sacramento. I was a guest, to talk about Larry P. He asked if I would give an IQ test to his child if he requested it. To make a point, I said it would depend upon whether his child was Black. He was speechless. I believe the show never aired.
1995. Claude Steele and stereotype vulnerability. Tell A-A’s they are taking a test of intellectual potential do worse. The whisper of inferiority is enough to make a person a less effective test taker.

June 1998 – National surveys suggest that 20% of whites still believe blacks are genetically less intelligent than whites; as many as 35% of whites believe blacks are less intelligent for other reasons.

IV. Reflections: I contributed to the mess.

What I wish I had done:

• Build more relationships with the A-A psychology groups; if we could have seen ourselves as part of a bigger tent (people committed to better educational outcomes) we might have had a different outcome.
• Address the challenges: racist history, testing as protection, professional judgment
• Capture the essence rather than bury everyone in detail

September, 1981 – (Nadine Lambert, American Psychologist) “The history of psychological measurement was on trial in Larry P…The adversary process in a courtroom is poorly suited to the careful, scholarly examination of the theoretical and empirical evidence produced by psychologists in their attempt to measure individual differences…Research, not rhetoric, is the tool of psychology.

V. Conclusions

I believe the ban should be lifted for the following reasons.

1. Too broad. Psychologists should have the right to select their approach and instruments according to specific circumstances. Everyone who identifies as African-American (in California) is covered by the IQ test ban, without differentiation. This prioritizes race above all other factors and is a form of racial profiling. It is the responsibility of the psychologist and the primary role of training to ensure that measures are selected and interpreted according to their relevance for the individual, including the impact of cultural influences. Whenever race is considered as a global and “one size fits all” variable, we all lose.

2. Sidestepped central concerns.

“Single test score” issue. The original Larry P ruling addressed an educational placement made by a single test score, which should never have been done anyway. No single test has been, ever will be, or should be validated for placement. A psychological test is a sample of behavior that, if carefully selected, administered, and interpreted, can contribute to a better understanding of a child’s behavior or learning. It can contribute to “how” questions, but does not answer “why”. A sphygmomanometer
may be a good analogy; it can identify a concern (that has demonstrated racial and ethnic differences), but does not explain the cause. It is the responsibility of the psychologist to use multiple sources of data to draw conclusions. It is a violation of professional ethics for any psychologist to use one score for placement.

“Dead end placement” issue. The original Larry P ruling addressed a “dead end” placement made by a test score; any assessment used to justify segregation and a reduction of access to education is a violation of professional ethics. Psychologists have responsibility to promote the welfare of those they serve; there is no reasonable justification to place a child of any race in a poor quality “dead end” class. Professional ethics require that psychologists use assessment to facilitate the welfare of the client.

3. **Let psychologists take blame for education failures.** The ban allowed others to place a good deal of the responsibility for unequal education in our society upon the backs of school psychologists. Asa Hilliard has been quoted as saying school psychologists are the “gatekeepers to segregation”. Rather than joining other stakeholders in a legitimate fight to base our practice upon what we know about learning, behavior, development, and individual differences to support better practice and a better definition of our role, we rolled over. *Note:* if psychologists walk away from assessment, we have no protection for our jobs in the Ed. Code. Nurses, social workers, and counselors were decimated in CA without Ed Code protection.

4. **Backward, not forward.** Larry P was and is a distraction from our primary mission as school psychologists, which is to promote the ability of children to become competent and independent. We should teach psychologists and educators how to help all children get a world-class education. Rather than assume that special education is bad, we need to look forward and promote actions and programs that contribute to a positive future for all individuals and groups.

5. **Hasn’t worked.** The focus on the IQ test-disproportionate representation correlation has not made a difference. Disproportionate representation in special education reflects a racist history and a horrible outcome. There is racial disproportion in grades, blood pressure, UC acceptance, math proficiency (no African-American students scored proficient or advanced in the Algebra 2 CST in 2010. It has varied between 0 and 10% over the last decade). The alternatives to IQ testing (developmental, dynamic, ecological, information processing, neuropsychological, psychological processing, skills within subjects) were not selected because of greater validity and have not demonstrated greater validity.

6. **Takes longer, with no better validity.** The developmental, dynamic, ecological, information processing, neuropsychological, psychological processing, skills within subjects approaches that have substituted for IQ tests have not been shown to be more valid for providing information about individual differences and student learning styles. Some of these approaches have reified a dependence upon
numbers or opinion rather than a careful consideration of careful interpretation and hypothesis testing.

7. **Wrong focus.** The role of analytic thinking vs. knowledge acquisition in educational assessment and practice has been woefully ignored in almost all *Larry P* discussion. IQ tests reflect a combination of both approaches, but with test item differences most pronounced with analytic items. Group racial differences in IQ disappear when certain environmental process variables (e.g., reading to children, playing games, having interactive discussions) are controlled; these are practices that are more available, but not exclusively, within families which have a greater amount of time for active parenting. These practices promote and support analytic thinking; they have more explanatory power in IQ test studies than race, class, income, neighborhood, and education. Some educators would argue that analytic thinking should not be an educational goal or value (traditionalists, for example, may promote memorization and rote learning). This should be the debate, not racial test bans.

8. **Too simple.** “Tests are bad; ban the tests” was an easy solution; promoting easy solutions (that don’t make a difference). When you reduce complexity, we downgrade our quality. Much of the *Larry P* case and the decisions that followed usurped psychological knowledge in favor of political, legal, administrative, emotional, and reductionist conclusions. This was for a variety of reasons, including a history of discrimination, an educational system that prioritized the education of whites, newly energized professional organizations for Black psychologists who chafed (legitimately) against “race science” that stigmatized African-Americans as “inherently dumb”, and certain CDE employees (not psychologists) who wished to make a strong statement (and outsource the responsibility). The potential benefits of IQ tests for students with TBI, language disorder, learning style differences were ignored.

9. **Reduces options for decision-making.** The ban reduces information that can contribute to decision-making. The ideal vision of special education is to provide additional support and services that are selected according to the individual needs of a student who has a documented learning need. More parents request eligibility (especially for learning disabilities) than request to be removed from eligibility. Parents can have their children assessed privately, but IQ information, which they may have found to be helpful, cannot be considered by the schools.

10. **Only here.** Although large in its impact on California school psychologists, the ban is not (and has not been) applied to others. California psychologists who do not work for schools are not subject to the ban. Regional Centers, county services, clinics, and others continue to use IQ tests. Other states are not impacted by the ban.
V. Where do we go from here?

Assessment, including the use of tests of intelligence, is an important component of our practice, as long as it is done responsibly and with the goal of supporting the individual needs and potential of our clients.

- Help psychologists define their role as promoting competence and independence (or some equivalent) and work to ensure that all psychologists have the training and support they need to base their practice on this role.

- Choose assessment instruments according to the needs of the referral questions and with careful consideration of the individual characteristics of the student, which will include, but not be limited to race.

- Work to ensure that all school psychologists are highly trained in issues of test selection, validity, administration, and interpretation. Having a particular population included in a norming group does not ensure that the test will be valid for a particular individual. If a student’s “group” is not included, the test may still provide important information, but there is a responsibility for the psychologist to consider carefully the implications for that student of not being included in the norms.

- Address the role of analytic and critical thinking skills vs. memorization and rote learning skills in assessment, education, classroom curriculum, and parenting practices. Consider these factors when assessing students who are experiencing school and learning challenges to determine what has been emphasized, what is present (or lacking), and whether a shift in focus is appropriate or necessary for success. Always incorporate the following in assessment: problem solving, reasoning, and concept mastery.

- Pay attention to non-cognitive factors, as well. These include optimism, motivation, the ability to play on a team, executive functions, empathy, and responsibility.

- Play better with others. Form coalitions with groups such as AB Psi to ensure that our common commitment, to make education responsive to all, is carried out to the best extent possible.

- Pay close attention to test interpretation, both what we write and how others may view it. Ensure that the dignity and potential of the individual is maintained. This does not mean that students will not be identified as Intellectually Disabled; it does mean that no one will be determined to be “less than” others as an important and valued person. Assessment should identify a path towards a more effective future.

- Keep our focus on what can (or needs to) change to make students more competent and independent, with compassionate consideration of existing realities and constraints. Help teachers, administrators, parents, and colleagues initiate
specific, measurable, and realistic ways to move forward. A working alliance that makes baby steps forward is better than excuses, resentment, or perpetuation of the worst aspects of our history.

- When faced with someone who relies on or promotes racist history, ask how it will help us move forward to better practices. It won’t, and it’s just hurtful.

- Help widen the circle of whom we view as “like me”. We will not move forward if we see similarity only within a narrow group. Consider a narrow focus on “people who are kind”, “people who act with moral intent” and “people who value learning”.

- Be kind to each other. Usually when we see a person or behavior that drives us crazy, we are seeing something of ourselves.

- Listen more.

“If you want to move people, it has to be toward a vision that’s positive for them, that taps important values, that gets them something they desire, and it has to be presented in a compelling way that they feel inspired to follow.”

Martin Luther King, Jr.
I’m an African American mother of three bi-racial children. My middle daughter is visually impaired. She started receiving services when she was a few months old. I remember well the day that her service provider shyly warned me that if I checked the African American box on an education form that she would not be IQ tested. When I picked my jaw off the floor, she explained that because the test was deemed racially biased someone in their great wisdom decided that instead of making the test not racially biased, the state of California would further underserve African American children by not working to access their intelligence. As a professor of African American Studies, I was appalled to be put in that position and I remember well the day that I decided my child’s racially identity as an erasure of half of her. I checked that white box because I knew at the end of the day that it would be to her advantage. And those tests have proven that she is of above average intelligence despite her disability—information that would have been denied us if I had checked that other box.

I am not an expert in your field, but it seems to me that in this day and age we need a more nuanced understanding of racial bias and the implications of such legislation as Larry P. There are many factors that go into one student being disadvantaged in our education system. There are African Americans who have had the opportunities that would allow them to do well on an IQ test and they should be allowed to take it. This is not simply a question of class in terms of money. Growing up, I had very little money but I happened to have had a single mother who not only valued education but had the wherewithal to create a learning environment (from good schools and extra-curricular programs to a safe environment to fortunately having the time, which not a lot of low-income parents have, to work with me on her own). This allowed me to succeed and I eventually went to Yale, got a PhD and am now a full professor at UCSD (I was tenured at 31 and was promoted to full professor at 39). I say this not to brag but knowing that if I were in California (I grew up in New Jersey) after Larry P that that might not be the case. It might. But it might not. There are many many many factors that go into the systemic and institutionalized environments of disadvantage that leave many children behind. Biology is not one of them. Any one of any race can be anywhere along an intelligence spectrum and if your test cannot determine them then they are defective tests. We should question the intelligence that has gone into an intelligence test that can’t be colorblind. And because we put so much weight on these tests and what we call the intelligence that it is measuring, it seems to me that it is set up to further disenfranchise African American children. (Even if there are other means by which they can succeed.)

I know the details of Larry P. are around special education and the classification of “mental retardation” so one might argue that my daughter is not the optimal example. However, the broadness of this legislation reaches her and would have affected her had I not checked that box.
Perhaps a solution would be to allow these tests to be opt-out or opt-in. But the idea that the state has separated a race from something that could have important implications smacks of the dangerous slippery slope of inequality.

Better yet, fix the test! I have absolutely no doubt that these tests can be used to shuttle African American kids into programs where they should not be. Testers can be racially biased, as can questions or the testing environment, to think of a few mitigating factors. We clearly need to have better rubrics for assessing intelligence that are not racially biased and these tests cannot be the sole determinate of mental capacity. But don’t lump all African Americans in together and deny the whole race something that other races use for many reasons.

So, in the eyes of California, my older son is African American and my middle daughter is white. My youngest daughter is four years old and not yet in the system. I have half a mind to check Chinese and see where that gets us.

I hope you take these thoughts as there are meant—as one mother’s small attempt to voice deep concern at what she sees as the continued disenfranchisement of African Americans.

**Nadine George**
Professor, UCSD
African-American Studies
Background/Support

Mel Levine was keynote at the fall conference: Children on the Edge.
Before his infamy, he was a “non-labeler”
Facilitate individual growth vs. sort, categorize and label

Registration: $115; hotel $85. Some things change, some don’t.

CASP was in Millbrae

My 1st President’s Column: Can a school psychologist be P.C.?
Can we demonstrate that the range and impact of SP is > “just testing”?
Ed Code 49424: SP applies scientific principles of learning and behavior
To ameliorate school-related problems and facilitate learning and dev
of children in CA public schools.
“Have you ever heard a child say, “I have a low IQ so I have to study real
hard in order to be successful?”
“When, fairly or not, school psychologists are perceived as performing activities
which put a limit to children’s potential (or suggesting that intelligence is a
fixed, single number which on its own determines eligibility for special
education), the emphasis moves away from facilitating appropriate and
beneficial services and towards the risk of labeling children in order to
justify not providing them with the same educational opportunities as
other, non-identified children.
We cannot afford to be perceived primarily as gatekeepers.
Testing is an important component of what we do, but it must always be put
within the context of using tests as part of an effort to develop more
individualized and appropriate services, not to limit or track.
Our goal is…to help children to become empowered to see themselves as
learners and to help schools to become more responsive to the mental
health needs of children.”
Knowledge about development, learning, curriculum, individual differences,
counseling and consultation combine to form an important core of skills

Are school psychologists number crunchers?

Tom Kampwirth, Mike Goodman, and Jeff Braden got into it about severe vs.
regression discrepancies: would a 68 IQ and a 63 achievement (z
difference of 1.7) enough for eligibility, or must it be 22 points?
Jeff Braden wrote: I quite agree that CASP and the CDE SE Division need to
meet and agree on procedures about regression discrepancy applications.
“However our invitations to do so have been politely declined by the CDE.
The CDE does not want the resp. for taking an official position…they will
do nothing that might be construed as endorsing the use of IQ in CA…a
position advocating the calculation of aptitude-achievement discrepancies
would be inconsistent with the current political Zeitgeist, even if it is irresponsible (i.e. you must identify them but we won’t tell you how).

Breaking into general education: A primer
Based on workshop with Allan Gold, looked at the variety of service roles.

Pat Hewitt was legislative advocate.
Barbara Thomas was Professional Standards Chair and a SELPA director.
Shirley Thornton was Deputy Sup for Specialized Programs
“Instead of using valuable and scarce resources to determine who is SE eligible and who is not, schools are to be redesigned to coordinate all available resources to find effective strategies to ensure that all students succeed in school”

Mike Furlong: Get informed about reform
Obtain hard data about local special education ID rates for racial/ethnic backgrounds. Is your district over or under identifying. How long do students remain in SE classes. “The next step in the Crawford case will be to try and operationally define what a ‘dead-end’ SE program is like.”

Dan Reschley (1988): A reformist’s perspective for SP in the ‘90s. De-emphasize or eliminate the need for labels for service, behavioral assessment, behavioral consultation, and more prevention.

SB 663 (Hart): authorized the first major change in the CA Assessment Program (CAP) in almost 20 years. The revision of CAP provides an exciting opportunity for SPs to help in the improvement of a critical component of the ed process through application of their expertise in assessment, measurement, curriculum, learning, and development within the gen ed sphere. Testing in grades 4, 5, 8, and 10. “authentic…common performance standards…alignment with state curriculum frameworks…comprehensive…valid..reliable.

Pres Column, November-Dec. Pass the Roles, Please.
The “kid sorting” role which emphasized eligibility decisions sometimes to the exclusion of other services has become a trap that threatens our future. This role served a function, but just like all rolls, it has gotten stale.”
SPs funded exclusively through SE: trained to perform a wide variety of roles, funded according to one role, eval negatively for having a narrow focus.
Documenting: Does it work? We have training in meas and eval, but if SE is the only available service, it may be continued even when not effective.
CASP Position Statement (November 1992): The Use of Intelligence Tests with A-A Students. The 4 conditions: professional judgment that IQ test will add valid and important info, the test will not be used to diagnose mild MR or place an A-A child in the substantial equivalent of the 1979 EMR classes, you have parent consent (form provided), you have administrative support.

- It is the position of CASP that IQ tests when administered and interpreted by properly trained and credentialed individuals, can yield valuable info regarding skills and learning processes, which provides an understanding of cog and emot factors which can affect school performance.

- CDE non-binding advisory: IQ tests have a build-in cultural bias and should not be used for any purpose with a child from any cultural or ethnic minority background (related to disproportionate)

- CASP shares concerns about disproportionality. Good psych ass, using the most valid and reliable measures can promote objectivity, caring, understanding and perspective.

Concepts:

Accountability – what kind of data transforms students into learners?

Analytic Thinking

Achievement, suspension, school to prison pipeline

Did overrepresentation change without tests?

Tests are samples of behavior

CASP let legislators and administrators make decisions about psychological practice

Intimate family culture: reading books, playing games, conversation.

Results Driven Accountability (RDA): process vs. data approach to learning.

U.S. Department of Education (ED): goal to move education from strict issues of placement (LRE) to responding to the needs of children. Create measureable objectives and then target efforts and resources to meet these. Move from compliance base to student growth and achievement. Goal: improve outcomes, close achievement gaps, increase equity, and improve instructional quality. (Special Edge, Winter 2013).
Tests “must be validated for placement in EMR classes or their substantial equivalent”

Which is more important: ending over-representation of A-As in special education or providing a good education for each child in whatever placement?

Opinion (the worst challenge, the most important issue, etc.) vs. fact.

History of Larry P from the CASP perspective might suggest that better tests would have solved the challenges.

How can we support parents’ efforts to understand their rights and responsibilities in raising their children? Let’s support research on A-A challenges, achievement gap, over-representation in special education, and limited access to quality mental health services. We need to create alliances with A-a organizations. (Brandon Gamble)

Build relationships and trust vs. use data in arbitrary ways.
Ignore the emotional certainties of the oppressed vs. listen and learn.
AB Psi (Association of Black Psychologists), National Alliance of Black School Educators, NAACP: we never reached out.

Q: Why did the CDE choose to say it’s programs were dead-end? They had two options: change the classes (improve or eliminate) or target the tests. A: it was the Black psychologists who targeted the tests.
Support and Background

Other Speakers

Fred Balcom (hs & ms teacher, district administrator for special ed and student services, visiting educator at CDE, State Director of SE in Idaho, assistant superintendent Yolo COE, Director for the District and School Improvement Division in March 2008, CDE special education director for CDE). Topic: state point of view re: initial reasoning for the decision and historical actions, expansion of the ban, Crawford v Honig, Larry P task forces, current status of IQ testing with A-A students, alternate determinations and future actions.

Alnita Dunn (using intervention data to decrease disproportionate referral and placement of CLD students in special education)

James Hiramoto (DC-N efforts with informal assessment)

Doug Siembieda (CASP Legislative chair; current cases related to the Larry P decision and over-representation of CLD students).

Removed: Behavior can change; race does not. As psychologists we should help people prioritize and promote things that can change vs. things that cannot.

Psychologists need to know how to use test data to help educators, families, and students become more successful learners.

A person can change how s/he parents, teaches, and studies; changing race is not going to happen.

Approaches: developmental, dynamic, ecological, information processing, neuropsychological, psychological processing, skills within subjects.