

A NATIONAL SURVEY OF INTERSTATE RECIPROCAL  
CERTIFICATION AGREEMENTS AND RECIPROCITY  
PROCEDURES IN THE UNITED STATES CON-  
CERNING SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGISTS

By

JAMES WARREN VAN VELZER, JR.

Bachelor of Science

Northwestern Oklahoma State University

Alva, Oklahoma

1969

Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate College  
of the Oklahoma State University  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements  
for the Degree of  
MASTER OF SCIENCE  
December, 1976

Thesis  
1976  
V284n  
cop. 2



A NATIONAL SURVEY OF INTERSTATE RECIPROCAL  
CERTIFICATION AGREEMENTS AND RECIPROCITY  
PROCEDURES IN THE UNITED STATES CON-  
CERNING SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGISTS

Thesis Approved:

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Thomas S. Parish".

Thesis Adviser

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Paul B. Warden".

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Norman D. Durbin".

Dean of the Graduate College

968411

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost I would like to gratefully acknowledge the assistance given to me by my parents, James and Virginia Van Velzer, Sr. As a school psychologist I deal every day with parents, who look to me for advice on raising their children. How much easier my job would be if I could only say to them act toward your children as my parents have acted toward me.

Although all the assistance and support that I received was important, none was more steadfast nor more meaningful than that given to me by my attache, Gloria Trout.

I would also like to thank my friend and the chairman of my committee, Dr. Thomas S. Parish, whose positive reinforcement had its inevitable result. I would further like to acknowledge Dr. Paul G. Warden for his efforts as a member of my committee to motivate me to do my best. I would also like to acknowledge the technical assistance of Linda Blair and Mrs. Anna Gleason.

Finally, I would like to thank Dr. Douglas Brown and the National Association of School Psychologists without whose support and financial assistance this project would not have been completed.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE . . . . .	4
III. METHODOLOGY . . . . .	13
IV. RESULTS . . . . .	15
V. DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS . . . . .	38
BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	49
APPENDIXES . . . . .	51
APPENDIX A - COVER LETTER . . . . .	52
APPENDIX B - QUESTIONNAIRE . . . . .	54
APPENDIX C - LIST OF INDIVIDUALS AND AGENCIES . . . . .	58
APPENDIX D - INTERSTATE AGREEMENT ON QUALIFICATION OF EDUCATIONAL PERSONNEL . . . . .	68
APPENDIX E - INTERSTATE AGREEMENT ON QUALIFICATION OF EDUCATIONAL PERSONNEL CONTRACT . . . . .	74
APPENDIX F - NASDTEC POSITION PAPER . . . . .	82

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Responses Concerning Existence of Interstate Reciprocal Certification Agreements . . . . .	16
II. State by State Listing of Reciprocal Certification Agreements . . . . .	19
III. Responses Concerning Task Forces, Committees, or Individuals at Work on Reciprocal Certification Agreements . . . . .	21
IV. Responses Concerning Informal or Unwritten Reciprocal Certification Agreements . . . . .	24
V. Responses Concerning Procedures for Certifying Applicants Under Provisions of Reciprocal Certification Agreements . . . . .	27
VI. Responses Concerning Reciprocal Certification Agreements Between States and Universities or Colleges Within the States' Own Borders . . . . .	30
VII. Responses Concerning Reciprocal Certification Agreements Between States and Universities or Colleges Outside the States' Own Borders . . . . .	32
VIII. Responses Concerning Plans in Regard to Interstate Reciprocal Certification Agreements . . . . .	35

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

In order to begin practice as a school psychologist in the public schools, the single most important requirement that must be met is to obtain a certificate from the state board of education or equivalent agency. In order to transfer as a practicing school psychologist from a position in the public schools in one state to a position in the public schools of another state, again, the single most important requirement to be met is to obtain a certificate valid in the state to which the school psychologist wishes to transfer. This is true for all states except New Mexico and Louisiana. New Mexico and Louisiana are the only remaining states, according to the latest available information (Sewall and Brown, 1976) in which the state department of education or an equivalent agency does not issue certificates allowing the practice of school psychology in the public schools.

In the past, the necessary information was difficult to obtain without actually going through the process of seeking certification because the certification requirements were not published in any readily available publication. This problem was resolved by the publication of The Handbook of Certification/Licensure Requirements in 1976 by Sewall and Brown (Sewall and Brown, 1976).

Although the handbook is helpful and provides for comparisons among states and its importance should not be minimized, the authors,

as they should, indicate that the approval of anyone's credentials is at the discretion of the certifying agency. Speaking on behalf of school psychologists past, present and future, something surely needs to be done to reduce the anxiety, ambiguity and difficulty we face when attempting to become certified in more than one state.

Although helpful, this handbook did not completely answer the question of eligibility requirements for every state's certification. There is a divergency among the states in all areas of certification requirements. Two areas present particular problems to prospective applicants for certification. These are in terms of specific course requirements and field experience. Sewell and Brown (1976) indicate that the biggest problem in terms of specific course requirements has been in terms of matching specific course requirements and university course titles. They further warn prospective applicants that the length of the field experience is specified in various ways. Another area of difficulty is that various states may or may not specify the setting in which the field experience must be done and if they do specify the setting, then the setting is not explicitly defined. Given these problems, the most reasonable way to resolve the difficulties surrounding certification of school psychologists would appear to be through some solution involving interstate reciprocal certification agreements concerning school psychologists.

The obvious answer lies in the direction in which the educational profession is searching. The need to provide for freedom of movement of teachers has been apparent since the 1890's (Stinnett, 1967). Within the educational profession, the movement to achieve this has been through some type of reciprocal agreement among states. The



need to reduce the discrepancies in certification practices concerning school psychologists was evident as long ago as 1941 (Cornell, 1941). The United States Office of Education has sponsored research that concluded by recommending the establishment of a national program of interstate reciprocity regarding licensing and certification of school psychologists formulated by national professional groups together with state departments of education (Farling and Hoedt, 1971). While this need has been previously documented, no subsequent efforts have been made, to date, to achieve this; therefore, the purpose of this research is to describe the existence and status of interstate reciprocal agreements and procedures concerning school psychologists with the hope that individual school psychologists, the National Association of School Psychologists and members of Division 16 of the American Psychological Association will use this data as the first step toward interstate reciprocal certification agreements and eventually national certification.

## CHAPTER II

### REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Since 1946 at least 10 different studies have been conducted in an effort to determine state requirements for school psychologist certification. Each of these studies (i.e., Clayton, 1950; Graff and Clair, 1973; Gray, 1963; Gross, Bonham and Bluestein, 1966; Hall, 1949; Horroek, 1946; Hodges, 1960; Newland, 1958; Sewall and Brown, 1976; Traxler, 1967) clarified state certification requirements. These studies were virtually identical. Each of them was concerned with ascertaining information concerning state requirements for certification as a school psychologist in four general areas, titles, levels and grade of certification, academic requirements, and field experience. Almost without exception, these sought to discover trends in requirements for certification. There are some exceptions. Newland (1956) inquired into the number of states required by law to certify school psychologists, as well as those that provided for certification. Traxler's (1967) study to a slightly greater extent, concentrated on standards for professional training. Although, obviously, there are differences in these studies, the fact remains that they all bear an extremely strong resemblance to each other. The reasons for this strong resemblance of these studies to each other are that they all had primarily the same goals. Description of requirements and trend analysis were the major goals. Why the need

for so many descriptive studies on one topic? The major reasons for the relatively high number of these studies becomes clear if we are first aware that during the 30 years between 1946 and 1976, 41 states developed and instituted certification requirements for the first time. Another reason for this plethora of studies on this topic is that state requirements change rapidly. Sewall and Brown (1976) indicated that at the time of their study, at least 17 states were in the process of changing their requirements or planning to do so in the near future. Hodges in 1960 reported that 23 states had provisions for revising their standards and eight states had plans for either revising their requirements or establishing new ones.

The results of these studies, almost without exception, indicate a certain amount of general consensus among state certification standards. Generally, from the results of these studies cited above, it can be concluded that virtually all states have appeared to accept certain requirements. They are that school psychologists should have: (1) an advanced degree; (2) specialized training in both psychology and education; and (3) supervised field experience. Within these general areas, however, there is little or no agreement. Sewall and Brown (1976) report that at least 65 different course descriptions are used by different state departments to ascertain whether an applicant for certification as a school psychologist has the necessary specialized training (i.e., course work).

Besides the conflict or ambiguity relating to specific coursework requirements, another major problem area regarding school psychologist certification mentioned in the introduction concerns the requirements surrounding the necessary field experiences. Sewall and Brown (1976)

reported that required field experience is expressed in clock hours, semester hours and in months. Further, the different states may specify practicum, laboratory experience, internship or any combination of these.

With respect to trend analysis mentioned earlier, these studies (e.g., Clayton, 1950; Graff and Clair, 1973; Gray, 1963; Gross, Bonham and Bluestein, 1966; Hall, 1949; Horrock, 1946; Hodges, 1960; Newland, 1958; Sewall and Brown, 1976; Traxler, 1967) were again very similar. For the most part, they concentrated on the levels and types of certification, the improvement of standards and the changes in the types of criteria used. The results of the Sewall and Brown (1976) study are representative of the type of trends found. They found a declining trend toward multilevel certification, whereas an increasing trend toward this was found earlier. They found a continuing trend toward higher standards and a continuing trend toward the requirement of field experience. They also reported for the first time, a trend toward the institution of competency based requirements. Although the results of these studies varied they all investigated the same general types of trends.

Although each of these studies mentioned so far were valuable and necessary, they failed to investigate the issue of reciprocity. One reason for this is that as long as only a few states certified school psychologists there was really no need for reciprocity agreements. Further, there were few school psychologists in practice and the demand for school psychological services was not, in the early days of the profession, as great. Usually, however, these studies did take notice of the impact state certification requirements have

on upgrading and maintaining professional training standards. Graff and Clair (1973) indicate that these studies were helpful in delineating professional training standards. Citing other investigators, they also pointed out that a lack of clear role definition prevents the school psychologists from making effective educational interventions and obstructs his communication with other professionals. Hodges (1960) wrote that he believed certification requirements to be crucial to the insuring of high standards. The committee on Training and Standards and Certification, Division 16 of the American Psychological Association (1963) wrote:

There is perhaps no other specialty within psychology which is so largely determined by influences outside of psychology itself. Where state certification standards do not exist, the determination of the school psychologist's title, role, and standards of practice may very well be made by local boards of education or by school administrators. In those states having state department of education certification for school psychologists, credentials for supervised experience and course credits are often evaluated by department personnel who are not trained in psychology. This state of affairs contributes in no small measure to the problems of role definition, training standards, and acceptance of school psychologists as full-fledged members of the psychological community (p. 711).

Further, they concluded:

It is clear that agreement on minimum training and certification standards can contribute importantly to the improved quality of performance of school psychologists (p. 711).

Ralph H. Tindall (1965) further acknowledged the relationship between state certification standards and the role and training of school psychologists. Tindall (1965) also emphasized that certification standards should be fairly uniform in order to avoid limiting the personnel in any given state. Tindall (1965) also pointed out that by

insistence on purely local requirements, e.g., a course in the school law relating only to a particular state or a given number of years of teaching experience, individual states may shortchange themselves by unreasonably limiting the number and quality of personnel available to fill positions in their own states.

The logical extension of Tindall's (1965) ideas concerning states limiting their selection of qualified school psychologists through enforcement of local requirements is eventual spot shortages of school psychologists. This evidently has come to pass. Farling and Hoedt (1971) concluded that relatively high psychologist-student service ratios suggest a critical manpower shortage in school psychology of national scope. If such a national shortage exists, then it logically follows that even greater shortages within local areas must exist.

Although these divergent state requirements create problems for the profession of school psychology, they are not without logical basis. Tindall (1965) mentions use of a course in school law as a possible local requirement that might restrict the movement of school psychologists from one state to another. This requirement, although it would cause difficulties, would not be without logical foundation. Dr. Charles C. Mackey, Jr. (1972) in the proceedings of the Institute for Higher Education and State Departments of Education noted that "certification is a function delegated by state legislatures under education law or other statute to the respective state education departments" (p. 35). There is, without doubt, an interface between the school psychologist and both state and federal law.

As noted earlier in the introduction, the education profession has preceded school psychology and thus encountered in years past,

some of the same problems that school psychology is encountering today. One resolution is the problem of certification of teachers across states was accomplished as early as 1890 when the education profession sought to establish reciprocal relationships between states regarding teacher certification.

Inasmuch as there is a great deal of similarity between the two professions of school psychology and education with respect to the professional environment within which they operate, some of the literature on teacher certification is believed to be applicable to school psychologist certification, too.

The responses of the educational profession to this need has been a movement toward reciprocal agreements among states. Stinett (1967) reports that by 1921, 38 states were party to exchange-of-certificate agreements. After 1921, use of the exchange of certificate agreements declined until it disappeared about 1952. Stinett (1967) further stated, however, that "since about 1930, there have been constant and vigorous searches for a workable plan for reciprocity between states concerning teacher certification" (p. 9). Initially, reciprocal agreements were generally confined to regional agreements inasmuch as teacher migration was primarily to adjoining states or within a geographical region (Stinett, 1967). More recently, however, demographic habits have changed from regional migration to national migration. This shift has resulted in the virtual abandonment of regional certification agreements, Stinett (1967) stated that if the problems was not resolved by professional educators that it would eventually be resolved by other groups or the United States Office of Education in regulations as conditions of financial aid to the states.

Basically, there are three organizations working on various types of nation-wide certification for teachers (Keller, 1972). They are The Interstate Certification Project, The National Council on the Accreditation of Teacher Education, and The National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification. The Interstate Certification Project, according to Keller (1972) has resulted in a model law delegating power to the state agency to

. . . enter into compactual agreements for certification, which provides for interstate contracts to be made by designated state officials when certification standards are sufficiently comparable between the states making the agreement (p. 41).

This model law has been expanded by the addition of the Interstate Agreement on Qualification of Educational Personnel Contract covering school supported professionals to include school personnel who are required to hold at least a baccalaureate degree, with the exception of teachers, superintendents of schools or associate assistants or deputy superintendents on either the state or local level. The original model law covered only teachers until the addition of codicils which brought principals and vocational technical teachers under its provisions.

The National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education accredits or approves institutions of Teacher Education according to its standards. Although Keller (1972) states that according to the 1971 Annual List of National Council of Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), there were 28 states which granted reciprocal privileges to graduates of NCATE approved programs, there is no formal agreement to do so. In fact, reciprocity as defined by the Manual on Certification for School Personnel in the United States, 1967 edition means



. . . the mutual recognition of approved programs of teacher preparation in other states for certification of teachers--acceptance at face value of applicant's credentials toward full certification--does not refer to validation of certificates issued in other states (p. 9).

The third organization listed by Keller (1972) is the National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification (NASDTEC). As reported by Keller (1972), this organization is working toward establishment of a national system of reciprocity by setting up nationally recognized standards. According to the Chairman of the NASDTEC, Gerald Sughroue (1976), standards for school psychology were not approved by NASDTEC until January, 1976. He reported that 32 states utilize NASDTEC standards; however, there is no binding agreement to do so. Keller (1972) concluded that "a little cooperation among the three organizations and the fifty states would soon make nation-wide accreditation a reality" (p. 7). Stinnett (1967) concluded that among the necessary procedures to bring about a workable plan for national reciprocity in certification of teachers would be a concerted effort by NASDTEC, a national professional accrediting proceeds and establishment of the teaching profession to assume more responsibility in the certification process.

Richard K. Sparks (1971) has written that the Interstate Agreement on Qualifications of Educational Personnel "clearly suggests that a firm foundation is now available for the formulation of a nation-wide certification program" (p. 4). While the reciprocity arrangements between states or teacher certification seems to be clearly established, it will be the aim of the present study to see if a similar foundation currently exists for nation-wide reciprocity arrangements for school psychologist certification.

The specific research questions for the present study are as follows:

1. Which states have reciprocal agreements with each other?
2. Are these agreements official or unofficial?
3. What task forces, committees, or individuals in different states are working on reciprocal agreements with other states concerning school psychologists?
4. What states could easily create reciprocal agreements?
5. What changes in standards would need to be implemented in order to accomplish this?
6. Which of these changes would need legislative action by the respective legislatures in order to be implemented?
7. What states would have greater difficulty in developing interstate reciprocal certification agreements and why?
8. Which, if any, existing agreements could be combined to enlarge the number of states included in one agreement?
9. What changes in these agreements would be necessary in order to accomplish this?

## CHAPTER III

### METHODOLOGY

A questionnaire was mailed to the certifying agencies of the 50 states and the District of Columbia during the first week of June, 1976. A follow-up letter and questionnaire were mailed to those states not responding by the first week in July. The questionnaire was designed to gather detailed information on interstate reciprocal agreements and reciprocity procedures concerning school psychologists.

Briefly stated, the questions that appear on the questionnaire pertained to the existence of such agreements, the states subscribing to these agreements, the relationship of college and university training programs to these agreements, procedures for obtaining certification under such agreements, work in progress on interstate reciprocal certification agreements, future plans concerning such agreements and informal or unwritten reciprocal agreements.

Both the questionnaire and the cover letter that were sent to the various certifying agencies appear in Appendixes A and B, respectively. In addition, Appendix C presents a list of those agencies which received and hopefully responded to these materials listed above. For the sake of computational ease, the questionnaire was originally designed to have a forced-choice format. It became clear, however, that use of a forced-choice format exclusively would create two problems. First, the questionnaire in the total forced-choice format

was judged to be too long. Secondly, it did not provide the necessary flexibility in responses. Accordingly, the format was modified to allow for varied responses and to reduce the length. The forced-choice format was retained for use wherever possible. Provisions for explanation of the response was provided for by open-ended questions on those items which the forced-choice format was used. Basically, there was no difficulty in formulating the questions inasmuch as the topic had not been investigated previously. Attempts were made to formulate the questions as clearly and precisely as possible. Terminology and definitions as presented in The Handbook of Certification/Licensure Requirements for School Psychologists was utilized.

The mailing list utilized was that of Sewall and Brown (1976). This list was used because it was the result of a two-year effort on their part and is considered by this writer to be the most accurate list of sources on the topic available. The complete list of addresses is presented in Appendix C. Data analysis was accomplished through simple frequency count and categorization.

## CHAPTER IV

### RESULTS

Although the present study attempted to survey the certification requirements and reciprocity arrangements of all 51 states and the District of Columbia, the results to date have fallen short of that goal. Sixteen states and Washington, D.C., have not responded in time to be included in this paper. In view of the absence of data from these respondents, this study's findings must be considered incomplete. Before this document is published for national dissemination at a later date, however, every effort will be made to have all of the data from all of the respondents tabulated in those results.

Item number one on the questionnaire (see Appendix B) was designed to answer the question of which states have reciprocal agreements with each other concerning school psychologists. Of the 34 states responding, eight of the 34 indicated that they have reciprocal agreements with other states (see Table I). The response of one state, Vermont, was not interpretable. The states indicating that they have reciprocal agreements are Alaska, Mississippi, New York, New Hampshire, Ohio, Massachusetts, Idaho, and Delaware. Of these states Idaho, New York, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Ohio, and Delaware all indicate that they are party to the Interstate Agreement on Qualification of Educational Personnel. One state, Mississippi, indicates that it has reciprocal agreements with 23 other states through the National Council on

TABLE I  
 RESPONSES CONCERNING EXISTENCE OF INTERSTATE  
 RECIPROCAL CERTIFICATION AGREEMENTS

States	Yes	No	No Response	Response not Interpretable
Alabama			X*	
Alaska	X			
Arizona		X		
Arkansas		X		
California		X		
Colorado		X		
Connecticut			X*	
Delaware	X			
Florida		X		
Georgia		X		
Hawaii		X		
Idaho	X			
Illinois			X*	
Indiana			X*	
Iowa		X		
Kansas		X		
Kentucky			X*	
Louisiana		X		
Maine			X*	
Maryland		X		
Massachusetts	X			
Michigan			X*	
Minnesota		X		
Mississippi	X			
Missouri		X		
Montana		X		
Nebraska			X*	
Nevada		X		

TABLE I (Continued)

States	Yes	No	No Response	Response not Interpretable
New Hampshire	X			
New Jersey			X*	
New Mexico		X		
New York	X			
North Carolina			X*	
North Dakota			X*	
Ohio	X			
Oklahoma		X		
Oregon		X		
Pennsylvania		X		
Rhode Island			X*	
South Carolina		X		
South Dakota			X*	
Tennessee			X*	
Texas		X		
Utah			X*	
Vermont				X
Virginia			X*	
Washington		X		
West Virginia		X		
Wisconsin		X		
Wyoming			X*	
District of Columbia			X*	

\* In all cases where no response at all has been received from a particular state that is marked with an asterisk. States in the "No response" column without an asterisk did not respond only to the stated item.

Accreditation of Teacher Education. The response from Alaska indicates that it has reciprocal certification agreements with only two other states, Utah and Washington without identifying the agreement. All other states responding--Arizona, Arkansas, California, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana, Maryland, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, New Mexico, Nevada, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Texas, Vermont, Washington State, West Virginia, and Wisconsin--indicated that they have no reciprocal agreements with other states. Table II presents exactly which of the states are involved with other states in certification agreements (see Table II). Finally, it should be noted here that New Mexico and Louisiana are the only two remaining states that do not certify school psychologists. These two states indicated this in their responses to the questionnaire; and therefore, all of the results will include these two states as responding in the negative mode.

Item six on the questionnaire (see Appendix B) was designed to answer the following question: What task forces, committees, or individuals are working on reciprocal agreements with other states concerning school psychologists? Eighteen of the 34 states responding indicated that they have no task forces, committees, or individuals working on reciprocal agreements with other states or agencies concerning school psychologists. Two states, California and Mississippi, indicated that if they had anyone working on reciprocal agreements, it was unknown to the person filling out the questionnaire. Seven states did not respond to the item concerning this issue. Of these, four--Texas, Arkansas, South Carolina and Oregon--do not have reciprocal agreements. Two of these seven states, Delaware and



TABLE II

STATE BY STATE LISTING OF RECIPROCAL CERTIFICATION AGREEMENTS

	ALABAMA	ALASKA	ARIZONA	ARKANSAS	CALIFORNIA	COLORADO	CONNECTICUT	DELAWARE	DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	FLORIDA	GEORGIA	HAWAII	IDAHO	ILLINOIS	INDIANA	IOWA	KANSAS	KENTUCKY	LOUISIANA	MAINE	MARYLAND	MASSACHUSETTS	MICHIGAN	MINNESOTA	MISSISSIPPI	MISSOURI	MONTANA	NEBRASKA	NEVADA	NEW HAMPSHIRE	NEW JERSEY	NEW MEXICO	NEW YORK	NORTH CAROLINA	NORTH DAKOTA	OHIO	OKLAHOMA	OREGON	PENNSYLVANIA	RHODE ISLAND	SOUTH CAROLINA	SOUTH DAKOTA	TENNESSEE	TEXAS	UTAH	VERMONT	VIRGINIA	WASHINGTON	WEST VIRGINIA	WISCONSIN	WYOMING		
ALABAMA																																																					

1. STATES IN THE LEFTHAND COLUMN CLAIMING A RECIPROCAL AGREEMENT WITH THE INDICATED STATE IN THE TOP ROW ALTHOUGH NO AGREEMENT IS ACKNOWLEDGED
2. STATES IN THE LEFTHAND COLUMN CLAIMING A RECIPROCAL AGREEMENT WITH THE INDICATED STATES IN THE TOP ROW AND THE AGREEMENT IS ACKNOWLEDGED
3. STATES IN THE TOP ROW CLAIMING A RECIPROCAL AGREEMENT WITH THE INDICATED STATE IN THE LEFTHAND COLUMN ALTHOUGH NO AGREEMENT IS ACKNOWLEDGED
4. STATES IN THE TOP ROW COLUMN CLAIMING A RECIPROCAL AGREEMENT WITH THE INDICATED STATES IN THE LEFTHAND COLUMN AND THE AGREEMENT IS ACKNOWLEDGED
5. STATES NOT RESPONDING
6. RESPONSE UNINTERPRETABLE

New Hampshire, do have reciprocal agreements. Vermont's response as to whether or not they have reciprocal agreement was not interpretable and Vermont did not respond to this item. Four states indicated that they do have someone working on reciprocal certification agreements. In Ohio, Dr. Paul W. Hailey, Director, Division of Teacher Education and Certification, Ohio State Department of Education was reported as working on reciprocal certification agreements. Although Massachusetts' response to this item was unclear, it appears that there is at least one individual, David Fitzpatrick, at work on reciprocal certification agreements in that state. New York's response to this item cites Dr. Helen A. Hartle, Project Director, Interstate Certification Project and Dr. Charles C. Macken, Jr., Co-Director, Interstate Certification Project as working on interstate reciprocal certification of school psychologists. In Wisconsin, Leonard Pennington, Psychologist Consultant, State Department of Public Instruction is reported as being the individual at work on interstate reciprocal certification agreements (see Table III).

Item Number eight on the questionnaire was designed to answer the following question: Are the certifications now in use informal or formal? In response to the item concerning informal or unwritten agreements, only one state, Montana, indicated that it has any informal or unwritten agreements. Four other states did indicate, however, that they do have informal procedures for certifying out-of-state applicants as school psychologists. California responded that graduates from out-of-state institutions which have approved programs are accepted for the initial credential, which is preliminary, and they must meet the institutional requirements in California. California's response

TABLE III  
 RESPONSES CONCERNING TASK FORCES, COMMITTEES,  
 OR INDIVIDUALS AT WORK ON RECIPROCAL  
 CERTIFICATION AGREEMENTS

States	Yes	No	Unknown	No Response
Alabama				X*
Alaska		X		
Arizona				X
Arkansas		X		X
California		X	X	
Colorado		X		
Connecticut				X*
Delaware		X		X
Florida		X		
Georgia		X		
Hawaii		X		
Idaho		X		
Illinois				X*
Indiana				X*
Iowa				X
Kansas		X		
Kentucky				X*
Louisiana		X		
Maine				X*
Maryland		X		
Massachusetts	X			
Michigan				X*
Minnesota				
Mississippi		X	X	
Missouri		X		
Montana		X		
Nebraska				X*
Nevada		X		

TABLE III (Continued)

States	Yes	No	Unknown	No Response
New Hampshire				X
New Jersey				X*
New Mexico		X		
New York	X			
North Carolina			X*	
North Dakota				X*
Ohio	X			
Oklahoma		X		
Oregon		X		
Pennsylvania		X		
Rhode Island				X*
South Carolina				X
South Dakota				X*
Tennessee				X*
Texas				X
Utah				X*
Vermont				X
Virginia				X*
Washington				X
West Virginia				X
Wisconsin	X			
Wyoming				X*
District of Columbia				X*

\* In all cases where no response at all has been received from a particular state that is marked with an asterisk. States in the "No response" column without an asterisk did not respond only to the stated item.

did not specify the agency which must approve the program. Alaska indicated that although they have no agreement, that they will certify applicants who are graduates of programs which meet National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification standards. North Carolina reported a procedure in use of evaluating programs for individuals certified in other states who did not complete a program approved by National Council on Accreditation of Teacher Education. According to the response on the questionnaire, such individuals are usually certified. The procedure was not specified. Although the response on this item received from Minnesota was very vague, it appears that there is some sort of informal agreement that involves the National Council on Accreditation of Teacher Education. From the response to the questionnaire, apparently, Montana will certify an out-of-state applicant provided that they have completed a program that is approved by the National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification. Five states did not respond to the item concerning this issue (see Table IV).

Additional results that were considered to be important are presented in the following paragraphs. Sixteen of the states responding to item number five on the questionnaire indicated that they had no procedure for certifying someone as a school psychologist under provisions of a reciprocal certification agreement to which they were party. This is as might be expected because all but two of these states had previously in the survey indicated that they had no reciprocal agreements. Although Alaska and North Carolina indicated earlier in the questionnaire that they had reciprocal agreements concerning school psychologists, they later indicated that they have

TABLE IV  
 RESPONSES CONCERNING INFORMAL OR UNWRITTEN  
 RECIPROCAL CERTIFICATION AGREEMENTS

States	Yes	No	No Response
Alabama			X*
Alaska		X	
Arizona		X	
Arkansas			X
California		X	
Colorado		X	
Connecticut			X*
Delaware			X
Florida		X	
Georgia		X	
Hawaii		X	
Idaho		X	
Illinois			X*
Indiana			X*
Iowa		X*	
Kansas		X	
Kentucky			X*
Louisiana		X	
Maine			X*
Maryland			X
Massachusetts		X	
Michigan			X*
Minnesota		X	
Mississippi		X	
Missouri		X	
Montana	X		
Nebraska			X*
Nevada			X

TABLE IV (Continued)

States	Yes	No	No Response
New Hampshire			X
New Jersey			X*
New Mexico		X	
New York			X
North Carolina			X*
North Dakota			X*
Ohio		X	
Oklahoma		X	
Oregon		X	
Pennsylvania		X	
Rhode Island			X*
South Carolina			X
South Dakota			X*
Tennessee			X*
Texas		X	
Utah			X*
Vermont			X
Virginia			X*
Washington		X	
West Virginia			X
Wisconsin		X	
Wyoming			X*
District of Columbia			X*

\*In all cases where no response at all has been received from a particular state that is marked with an asterisk. States in the "No response" column without an asterisk did not respond only to the stated item.

no procedures for certifying someone under these reciprocal agreements. Six states did not respond to this item which is understandable, inasmuch as they had indicated earlier in the questionnaire that they had no reciprocal certification agreements. Vermont made no interpretable response to the earlier item and did not respond to this item.

The 11 remaining responding states all indicated that they have procedures for certifying personnel under provisions of a reciprocal certification agreement. It should be noted here that only seven of these 11 states indicated in response to item number two on the questionnaire that they had interstate reciprocal certification agreements concerning school psychologists.

Of these states, three of them indicated that their procedure consisted of essentially a transcript evaluation. These three states (i.e., Montana, Oklahoma, and Pennsylvania) indicated in response to an earlier item that they were not party to any interstate reciprocal agreement concerning certification of school psychologists. One state, Montana, which had previously on an earlier item indicated that it was not party to any interstate reciprocal certification agreement concerning school psychologists, indicated that it did have procedures for certifying personnel as school psychologists under such agreements according to National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification guidelines. All other responding states indicated that they were party to the Interstate Agreement on the Qualification of Educational Personnel and certified applicants under the provisions of the agreement (see Table V).

Seventeen of the 34 states responding indicated that they have agreements to accept candidates for certification as school



TABLE V  
 RESPONSES CONCERNING PROCEDURES FOR CERTIFYING  
 APPLICANTS UNDER PROVISIONS OF RECIPROCAL  
 CERTIFICATION AGREEMENTS

States	Yes	No	No Response
Alabama			X*
Alaska		X	
Arizona	X		
Arkansas			X
California		X	
Colorado		X	
Connecticut			X*
Delaware	X		
Florida			X
Georgia		X	
Hawaii		X	
Idaho	X		
Illinois			X*
Indiana			X*
Iowa		X	
Kansas			X
Kentucky			X*
Louisiana		X	
Maine			X*
Maryland		X	
Massachusetts	X		
Michigan			X*
Minnesota			X
Mississippi	X		
Missouri		X	
Montana	X		
Nebraska			X*
Nevada			X

TABLE V (Continued)

States	Yes	No	No Response
New Hampshire	X		
New Jersey			X*
New Mexico		X	
New York	X		
North Carolina		X*	
North Dakota			X*
Ohio	X		
Oklahoma	X		
Oregon		X	
Pennsylvania	X		
Rhode Island			X*
South Carolina			X
South Dakota			X*
Tennessee			X*
Texas			X
Utah			X*
Vermont			X
Virginia			X*
Washington		X	
West Virginia		X	
Wisconsin			X
Wyoming			X*
District of Columbia			X*

\* In all cases where no response at all has been received from a particular state that is marked with an asterisk. States in the "No response" column without an asterisk did not respond only to the stated item.

psychologists with colleges or universities within their own borders (Appendix B, Item 5). Fourteen states reported that they have no agreement of this type. Three states did not respond to this item. They were Arkansas, South Carolina, and Vermont (see Table VI).

Six of 34 states responding indicated that they have agreements with colleges or universities outside their own borders to accept candidates for certification as school psychologists. Twenty-four states indicated that they do not have any agreements of this type. Four states did not respond to this item.

Eight states indicated that although they had no agreements to accept such candidates, they would accept them if they received their education in programs that were approved under various standards and guidelines. West Virginia and Washington State did not specify the agency responsible for approving these programs, the programs approved or the standards used to approve these programs. Massachusetts and Idaho reported that although there was no official binding agreement that they would accept graduates of programs approved by the various state departments of education under the provisions of the Interstate Agreement on the Qualification of Educational Personnel. Massachusetts, Alaska, and Montana all indicated that although they have no agreements with other states, they will accept graduates of programs meeting National Association of State Director of Teacher Education and Certification Standards. Massachusetts along with Mississippi will accept graduates from programs having approval from the National Council on Accreditation of Teacher Education (see Table VII).

TABLE VI  
 RESPONSES CONCERNING RECIPROCAL CERTIFICATION AGREEMENTS  
 BETWEEN STATES AND UNIVERSITIES OR COLLEGES  
 WITHIN THE STATES' OWN BORDERS

States	Yes	No	No Response
Alabama			X*
Alaska		X	
Arizona	X		
Arkansas			X
California		X	
Colorado	X		
Connecticut			X*
Delaware			X
Florida	X		
Georgia	X		
Hawaii		X	
Idaho	X		
Illinois			X*
Indiana			X*
Iowa	X		
Kansas		X	
Kentucky			X*
Louisiana		X	
Maine			X*
Maryland	X		
Massachusetts	X		
Michigan			X*
Minnesota	X		
Mississippi		X	
Missouri			X
Montana		X	
Nebraska			X*
Nevada	X		

TABLE VI (Continued)

States	Yes	No	No Response
New Hampshire		X	
New Jersey			X*
New Mexico		X	
New York	X		
North Carolina	X*		
North Dakota			X*
Ohio	X		
Oklahoma		X	
Oregon		X	
Pennsylvania	X		
Rhode Island			X*
South Carolina			X
South Dakota			X*
Tennessee			X*
Texas		X	
Utah			X*
Vermont			X
Virginia			X*
Washington	X		
West Virginia	X		
Wisconsin		X	
Wyoming			X*
District of Columbia			X*

\* In all cases where no response at all has been received from a particular state that is marked with an asterisk. States in the "No response" column without an asterisk did not respond only to the stated item.

TABLE VII

RESPONSES CONCERNING RECIPROCAL CERTIFICATION AGREEMENTS  
 BETWEEN STATES AND UNIVERSITIES OR COLLEGES  
 OUTSIDE THE STATES' OWN BORDERS

States	Yes	No	No Response
Alabama		X*	
Alaska		X	
Arizona		X	
Arkansas			X
California		X	
Colorado		X	
Connecticut			X*
Delaware	X		
Florida		X	
Georgia		X	
Hawaii		X	
Idaho		X	
Illinois			X*
Indiana			X*
Iowa		X	
Kansas		X	
Kentucky			X*
Louisiana		X	
Maine			X*
Maryland	X		
Massachusetts		X	
Michigan			X*
Minnesota		X	
Mississippi		X	
Missouri		X	
Montana		X	
Nebraska			X*
Nevada	X		

TABLE VII (Continued)

States	Yes	No	No Response
New Hampshire			X
New Jersey			X*
New Mexico		X	
New York	X		
North Carolina	X*		
North Dakota			X*
Ohio		X	
Oklahoma		X	
Oregon		X	
Pennsylvania		X	
Rhode Island			X*
South Carolina			X
South Dakota			X*
Tennessee			X*
Texas		X	
Utah			X*
Vermont			X
Virginia			X*
Washington		X	
West Virginia	X		
Wisconsin		X	
Wyoming			X*
District of Columbia			X*

\*In all cases where no response at all has been received from a particular state that is marked with an asterisk. States in the "No response" column without an asterisk did not respond only to the stated item.

New York, Nevada, North Carolina, Delaware, and Maryland all state that they have reciprocal agreements with universities and colleges outside their own borders (see Appendix B, Item 4). New York and Delaware indicated that they would accept graduates from university and college programs in school psychology, approved by the National Council on Accreditation of Teacher Education. New York also indicates that it will accept graduates of institutional programs that come under the provisions of the Interstate Agreement on Qualification of Educational Personnel. Nevada did not respond with any specifics concerning the agreements it has to accept graduates of programs in school psychology at universities and colleges outside its own borders except to say that they must be approved. Maryland indicates that it will accept for certification, graduates of any program in clinical or school psychology approved by the American Psychological Association.

The individuals responding to the questionnaire were asked to describe any plans their state might have in regard to interstate reciprocal certification agreements in the area of school psychology (see Appendix B, Item 7). Nineteen states indicated that they had no plans in this area. Six states reported that they did have such plans. New York State reports that it plans to work toward extension of the Interstate Agreement on Qualification of Educational Personnel. Kansas indicates that it hopes to extend instate program approval to institutions in bordering states. Arizona is introducing reciprocity enabling legislation to the Arizona State Legislature in January, 1977. Montana is considering the Interstate Agreements on the Qualification of Education Personnel. Washington State reports that it is in the process of revising its regulations concerning out-of-state applicants



and will probably be issuing initial certificates to those who have completed an accredited or approved masters degree program rather than the temporary certificate. Massachusetts is interested in seeing the Interstate Agreement on Qualifications of Educational Personnel expanded. The individuals who filled out the questionnaire from California and Mississippi reported that plans in regard to reciprocal certification agreements were unknown to them at this time (see Table VIII).

TABLE VIII  
RESPONSES CONCERNING PLANS IN REGARD TO INTERSTATE  
RECIPROCAL CERTIFICATION AGREEMENTS

States	Yes	No	No Response
Alabama			X*
Alaska	X		
Arizona		X	
Arkansas			X
California			X
Colorado		X	
Connecticut			X*
Delaware			X
Florida		X	
Georgia		X	
Hawaii		X	
Idaho			X
Illinois			X*
Indiana			X*
Iowa		X	

TABLE VIII (Continued)

States	Yes	No	No Response
Kansas		X	
Kentucky			X*
Louisiana		X	
Maine			X*
Maryland		X	
Massachusetts		X	
Michigan			X*
Minnesota	X		
Mississippi		X	
Missouri		X	
Montana	X		
Nebraska			X*
Nevada		X	
New Hampshire		X	
New Jersey			X*
New Mexico		X	
New York	X		
North Carolina		X*	
North Dakota			X*
Ohio		X	
Oklahoma		X	
Oregon		X	
Pennsylvania			X
Rhode Island			X*
South Carolina			X
South Dakota			X*
Tennessee			X*
Texas		X	
Utah			X*
Vermont			X

TABLE VIII (Continued)

States	Yes	No	No Response
Virginia			X*
Washington		X	
West Virginia		X	
Wisconsin	X		
Wyoming			X*
District of Columbia			X*

\*In all cases where no response at all has been received from a particular state that is marked with an asterisk. States in the "No response" column without an asterisk did not respond only to the stated item.

## CHAPTER V

### DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The primary purpose of this study was to investigate the existence and status of interstate reciprocal certification agreements concerning school psychologists. A questionnaire was designed, constructed and distributed. Responses were collected and analyzed essentially through simple frequency count.

The results of this study indicate that most (26 of 34) states responding do not have reciprocal certification agreements concerning school psychologists. A few states indicate that they do (eight of 34). The responses of those that do have such agreements indicate that three agreements are in operation, with a fourth being unspecified. Two of the agreements that were specified were Interstate Agreement on the Qualification of Educational Personnel and an untitled agreement connected with the National Council on Accreditation of Teacher Education. The third untitled agreement was specified as being connected with NASDTEC.

Exactly one-half of the states responding have agreements to accept candidates for certification with colleges or universities within their own borders.

Only six of the states responding have agreements to accept candidates for certification with states outside of their own borders. The data concerning this question is very conflictive. The only

clearly defined data with respect to this question indicates that five states have agreements to accept candidates from institutions outside their own borders. These five have further indicated that these agreements are connected with the National Council on Accreditation of Teacher Education. Although 24 of 34 states responding indicated that they have no such agreements, eight of these indicated that they did have local provisions for certifying applicants from out-of-state colleges and universities. Two states indicated these local provisions were based on the Interstate Agreement on Qualification of Educational Personnel. The other states in this category use either NCATE or NASDTEC standards as a basis for these local provisions.

Sixteen or almost one-half of the states responding do not have procedures for certifying someone as a school psychologist under the provisions of a reciprocal certification agreement. It was expected that those states that they had no interstate reciprocal certification agreements, would not have procedures for certifying professionals under such an agreement. It is interesting to note that of these 16 states, two of them responded that although they had reciprocal agreements, they had no procedures for certifying people under these agreements. Further, one state that is not party to an interstate reciprocal certification agreement does have procedures for certifying someone under the provisions of such an agreement. Among the states that are party to an interstate reciprocal certification agreement, most of them follow the procedures laid out by the Interstate Certification Agreement on Qualifications of Educational Personnel.

One of the most clearly defined results of this study is that more than half of the responding states are not engaging in any effort to

establish interstate reciprocal certification agreements. Only four of the states responding indicated that there is any group or individual at work on interstate reciprocal certification agreements concerning school psychologists.

Not only are most of the states that responded to the questionnaire not working on interstate reciprocal certification agreements, but also very few states (six of 34) of those that responded have any plans to do so. The data also reveals that in half of the states responding that do have plans concerning reciprocal agreements and with respect to school psychologists, these plans are in connection with the Interstate Agreement on Qualifications of Educational Personnel. Almost without exception, the states responding do not have informal or unwritten interstate reciprocal certification agreements concerning school psychologists.

The findings of this study can be summarized as follows. The great majority of states that responded to the questionnaire are not party to any interstate reciprocal agreement. Most states responding to the questionnaire do have agreements with colleges and universities within their own borders to accept graduates for certification as school psychologists. A great majority of the states responding to the questionnaire do not have any agreements to accept graduates from out-of-state colleges and universities. Most of the states responding do not have established procedures for dealing with the certification of school psychologists under interstate reciprocal certification agreements. Only a few of the states responding have anyone at work on reciprocal certification agreements concerning school psychologists. Most of the states responding have no plans with respect to interstate

reciprocal agreements. Finally, the vast majority of the states responding have no informal or unwritten reciprocal agreements with other states concerning school psychologists.

Through the examination of some of the individual responses to the questionnaire in light of some further information which will be presented, there are some further conclusions which may be added to the findings of this study.

Alaska, Delaware and Mississippi all indicated that they are party to an interstate certification agreement concerning school psychologists in connection with either NASDTEC or NCATE. Gerald Sughroue, Chairman of the Standards Committee of NASDTEC (1976) has stated that although NASDTEC is interested in promoting interstate reciprocity agreements, NASDTEC is not involved with any agreement of this type. Rolf N. Larson, Director of NCATE (1976) has stated that although NCATE is involved with the development and implementation of an interstate reciprocal certification agreement based on NCATE accreditation of programs, this agreement covers only personnel at the undergraduate level and as such, does not include school psychologists. One conclusion that may be drawn from this is that it is possible that at least some states think that they have a reciprocal certification agreement covering school psychologists when in fact they do not. This is not to say that these states could not have reciprocal certification agreements based on NCATE and NASDTEC standards.

On the questionnaire, the respondents were asked to indicate with which states they had reciprocal certification agreements covering school psychologists. Mississippi indicated that it has a reciprocal certification agreement with 23 other states. The most

probable explanation of this glaring anomaly in the data is that adherence to NCATE or NASDTEC standards and/or practices and policies has at least, in this case, been mistaken to be in effect a reciprocal certification agreement or agreements. What makes this single piece of data important is that no other of these 23 states which responded to the questionnaire indicated that they have a reciprocal certification agreement with Mississippi. A possible conclusion from this is that at least some states believe that they have reciprocal certification agreements with certain other states, when in fact they do not.

The biggest limitation of this study is the relatively large number of states that did not respond in time to be included. Another difficulty encountered in this study was that responses to the questionnaire were often difficult to interpret. The response from North Carolina was specifically, that yes, it does have an interstate reciprocal certification agreement with another state or states without naming the other states. However, in a note added to the questionnaire, it was stated that reciprocity concerning school psychologists was based on NCATE approved programs and not to individual states. This is an example of the conflicting nature of the responses that was often found during the analysis of the data. Since the note stated specifically that reciprocity was not extended to individual states, this particular response was counted as being a negative response to the item, rather than a positive one as it appears to be.

The open-ended format and the instructions to the respondents did allow ambiguity and confusion to cause data analysis to be at times extremely difficult and at times impossible. This problem reached its zenith with the questionnaire returned from the state of



Vermont which was answered so incorrectly as to render its responses totally uninterpretable. Of course the inclusion of open-ended items contributed to this problem. This difficulty may also be partially attributed to failure of the respondents to understand and fill out the questionnaire properly. It must be noted, however, that there were mistakes made in the development of the questionnaire. In terms of the questions regarding states and universities or colleges, the term reciprocity agreement should not have been used and probably contributed to the confusing nature of some of the results. Finally, the use of the reciprocal agreement, as interpreted by the respondents, may also have contributed to the confusion.

A number of questions that this study originally set out to answer have not been answered. The unanswered questions are discussed in the following. The remaining questions are as follows. What state could easily create reciprocal certification agreements? What changes in standards would need to be implemented or to accomplish this goal? Which of these changes would require legislative action? What states would have greater difficulty in developing reciprocal certification agreements and why? Which, if any, existing agreements could be combined to enlarge the number of states included in one agreement? What changes in these agreements would be necessary in order to accomplish this? These questions will be dealt with individually. The answer to the question pertaining to the ease or difficulty with which states could create reciprocal certification agreements appears to be in the Interstate Agreement on Qualification of Educational Personnel Enabling Act and Contract developed by the Interstate Certification Project. Through the enactment of the Interstate

Agreement on Qualification of Educational Personnel and the signing of the Interstate Agreement on Qualification of Educational Personnel Contract covering school support personnel, any state could, with relative ease, develop reciprocal certification agreements covering school psychologists with any other state that certifies school psychologists. The enabling act and contract are presented in Appendixes C and D, respectively. Keller (1972) states that these agreements would be based on minimum standards. These minimum standards would be those already in force in the individual states. Although this study has in reviewing the literature pointed out the diversity of certification requirements, these requirements would not appear to prohibit the enactment and implementation of this agreement and contract. At the time of this writing, according to Gerald Sughrue (1972), chairman of the NASDTEC Standard Committee, 31 states utilize NASDTEC standards in matters involving certification of educational personnel. Thirty-one states, according to Rolf W. Larson (1972), director of the National Council of Accreditation of Teacher Education, utilize NCATE standards in matters involving certification of education personnel. Altogether, 38 states subscribe to one or both of these sets of standards. The Interstate Agreement on Qualification of Educational Personnel specifically allows designated state officials to enter into contracts with other states requiring only that the designated official deem the other states to have acceptable qualifications assuring preparation or qualification of education personnel on a basis comparable, even though not identical to that of his/her own state. Dr. Charles C. Mackey, Jr. (1976) has stated that as of July, 1976, 12 states had enacted the enabling legislation and had signed contracts

covering school psychologists.

The question concerning possible needed changes in standards can be answered in the following manner. Under the provisions of the Interstate Agreement on Qualification of Educational Personnel, no changes in standards would be required except possibly in cases of the most extreme difference in standards between two states. A case of this type would be most rare inasmuch as 38 states subscribe to either NASDTEC or NCATE standards or both which in and of itself indicates that most states already have sufficiently comparable standards.

With regard to the question pertaining to standard changes requiring legislative action, it can be said that under the provisions of the Interstate Agreement on Qualification of Educational Personnel, few or no changes would be required; and hence, since few requirements are specified by law, no changes are likely to require legislative action. It must be noted that the Interstate Agreement on Qualification of Educational Personnel is itself intended to be both a contract and a state statute. In order to avoid making any more changes that would require legislative action than necessary, the passage of the Interstate Agreement on Qualification of Educational Personnel by the respective state legislatures would be required.

The answer to the states having greater difficulty creating reciprocal agreements is that under provisions of the Interstate Agreement on Qualification of Educational Personnel, no state need have any greater difficulty than any other state, depending, of course, on the nature and inclination of the respective legislative body and designated officials. A note of caution must be sounded here. If it is the inclination of the legislators, they may, for whatever

reason, refuse to pass the enabling legislation. It is further pointed out that even should the enabling legislation be passed the official designated by the legislature may at his discretion refuse to sign any operational agreements. Simply stated, the caution is this, that provincialism or personal beliefs may, in this as any other human endeavor, halt progress.

In relation to the question on the possible combination of agreements, it can be stated here that as reflected by the results of this study and all resources available to this author, that the only binding agreement in existence is the Interstate Agreement on Qualification of Educational Personnel.

Dr. Charles C. Mackey, Jr., as quoted in the Proceedings of the Institute for Higher Education and State Departments of Special Education Personnel (1972):

Having served Rhode Island as State Director of Teacher Education and Certification from 1963 to 1966, I am familiar with the many compacts, contracts or gentlemen's agreements that have existed among the many states prior to the implementation of the Interstate Certification Project. . . . When I was one of the facilitators of these agreements, the major problem I encountered was that as individuals in the respective certification chairs in the other states changed, so did the policies regarding these agreements change (pp. 24, 25).

Insofar as this author could determine, no other proposed or implemented agreement, compact, or contract concerning reciprocal certification had as its foundation a law to be enacted by every state that would be party to the agreement.

Given the probability that only one official reciprocal certification agreement covering school psychologists exists, the final question dealing with the changes that would be necessitated by

combining reciprocal certification becomes irrelevant.

At one point in the development of this document, an attempt to discover which of the states might reasonably develop regional reciprocal certification agreements concerning school psychologists was considered. In the face of the availability of the means to establish a nation-wide system of reciprocity, the fact that the available means have been accepted by almost one-quarter (24%) of the states and the fact that there is evidence that the educational profession has tried the regional approach and found it not to be the final solution, this writer believes that any attempt to develop regional reciprocal certification agreements would be fruitless, a waste of effort and in fact might impede the development of a national system of reciprocal certification.

This writer believes it appropriate at this time to offer some recommendations. The first of these is in reference to the Interstate Agreement. One particular problem with the agreement is that it provides no method for the redress of grievances. This writer would recommend that methods for the redress of grievances be established and further, that penalties of some type be established to be used in the event that one or more of the states fail to meet the provisions of their agreements.

The second recommendation is that the profession should establish a system of national certification or licensure based on its own standards. As great as an improvement a national system of reciprocity would be, it is not the final solution. It would still be based on requirements set up primarily by agencies other than those within the profession. Further it would for the most part be administered by

educators rather than school psychologists. The important arguments for a national system of certification or licensure are that it would provide a means for the profession to police itself and to maintain consistently high standards. Another recommendation is that in view of the confusion surrounding reciprocal agreements with respect to school psychologists and the differences in requirements for certification as a school psychologist, each state department of education should have a school psychologist as a consultant. It would be the role of this consultant to advise administrators on just such matters as have been discussed in this study. Finally a suggestion to trainers of school psychologists is deemed to be in order. Adherence to standards of NCATE, NASDTEC, APA Division 16 and the National Association of School Psychologists for the training of school psychologists represents at this time in the opinion of this writer, the best means to assure your students the greatest possible opportunities for certification in the various states.

Further research might inquire as to the reasons for the confusion within the states for the confusion surrounding this topic. Another area open to further research could be along the lines of movement in the direction of national certification administered by the profession based on standards developed by the profession rather than some other group.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- American Psychological Association, Division 16 Committee on Training Standards and Certification Proposals for State Department of Education Certification of School Psychologists. American Psychologist, 18 (1963), 711-714.
- Blankenship, M. Elise and E. Milo Pritchett. Reciprocity, Certification of Special Education Personnel. Washington, D.C.: Bureau of Education for the Handicapped (DHEW/OE), 1972, 23-27.
- Clayton, M. P. "State Certification Requirements for Public School Psychologists." Journal of Psychology, 29 (1950), 390-396.
- Dunn, James A. "On the Growth of School Psychology." Psychology in the Schools, 2 (2) (1965), 110-112.
- Farling, William H. and Kenneth C. Hoedt. National, Regional, and State Survey of School Psychologists. Washington, D.C.: Office of Education (DHEW), Bureau of Research, 1971, vii-ix.
- Graff, M. P. and T. N. Clair. "Requirements for Certification of School Psychologists: A Survey of Recent Trends." American Psychologist, 8 (1973), 704-709.
- Gray, S. W. (ed.). "The Internship in School Psychology." Proceedings of the Peabody Conference, March 21-22, 1963. Nashville: Department of Psychology, George Peabody College for Teachers, 1963.
- Gross, F. P., S. J. Bonhna, and V. W. Bluestein. "Entry Requirements for State Certification of School Psychologists: A Review of the Past Nineteen Years." Journal of School Psychology, 4 (1966), 43-51.
- Hall, M. E. "Current Employment Requirements of School Psychologists." American Psychologist, 4 (1949), 519-525.
- Hodges, W. "State Certification of School Psychologists." American Psychologist, 6 (1969), 346-349.
- Horrocks, J. E. "State Certification Requirements for School Psychologists." American Psychologist, 1 (1946), 399-401.

- Keller, William D. "Certified to Teach Everywhere: Progress on Three Fronts Toward Uniform Teacher Certification." Journal of Teacher Education, 22, 1 (1972), 210-242.
- Larson, Rolf W. Personal Interview. Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, July 29, 1976.
- Mackey, Charles C., Jr. Personal Interview. Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, July 29, 1976.
- Nelson, W. H. "Variations in Patterns of Certification for School Psychologists." Journal of School Psychology, 2 (1963), 17-23.
- Newland, T. E. "Formalized Psychological Services in State Education Programs." American Psychologist, 11 (1956), 136-140.
- Sparks, Richard K. "Are We Ready for National Certification of Professional Educators?" Journal of Teacher Education, 21 (Fall, 1970), 342-346.
- State Education Department. "Taking Your Talents Across State Lines." Interstate Certification Project. Albany, New York: The State Education Department, Division of Teacher Education and Certification, n.d.
- Stinett, T. M. "A Manual on Certification Requirements for School Personnel in the United States." National Education Association, 1967, 10-13.
- Sughrue, Jerry. Personal Interview. Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, July 29, 1976.
- Tindall, Ralph H. "Trends in Development of Psychological Services in the School." Journal of School Psychology, 3 (1) (1964), 1-12.
- Traxler, A. J. "State Certification of School Psychologists." American Psychologist, 22 (1967), 660-666.



APPENDIXES

**APPENDIX A**

**COVER LETTER**

MADISON  
COLLEGE

NATIONAL  
ASSOCIATION  
OF  
SCHOOL  
PSYCHOLOGISTS

The National Certification/Licensure Project is in the process of collecting data from all fifty states with regard to reciprocity procedures for the certification of School Psychologists and other related professions. The results of this survey will be used to aid in the formulation of national accreditation guidelines for School Psychology Training Programs by the National Association of School Psychologists in conjunction with NCATE and COPA.

Enclosed you will find a questionnaire designed to allow you to communicate your procedures to us in some detail. It is of great importance that this questionnaire be completed accurately and factually.

Should you have any questions regarding your responses, please feel free to contact me at any time. Your cooperation in this matter is appreciated and will greatly facilitate the development and accreditation procedures and interstate cooperation in the certification of School Psychologists.

Douglas T. Brown  
Director, National Certification  
Project

James Van Velzer  
Research Associate

**APPENDIX B**

**QUESTIONNAIRE**

## SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGY RECIPROCAL AGREEMENT

## QUESTIONNAIRE

1. The name of my state is \_\_\_\_\_.
2. Does your state have a reciprocal certification agreement concerning SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGISTS or persons in related professions including School Psychometrists, Educational Evaluators, Associate School Psychologists, Psychological Examiners, School Psychological Examiners, Psychological Technicians, or Educational Diagnosticians with any other state or states whether written or otherwise.

YES

NO

If so, please indicate which other state or states by marking the appropriate lines next to the names of the states. Mark the lines with the appropriate letter which identifies the specific agreement. If your state has some other form of reciprocal certification agreement in this area, please mark the lines accordingly and include a description and name of each agreement. (If additional space is needed to complete any questions on this survey, please attach necessary pages.)

- A) National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification (NASDTEC)
- B) National Committee of Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE)
- C) Coordinating Office for Professional Accreditation (COPA)
- D) Other (please specify)

_____ Alabama	_____ Illinois	_____ Nevada
_____ Alaska	_____ Indiana	_____ New Hampshire
_____ Arizona	_____ Louisiana	_____ New Jersey
_____ Arkansas	_____ Maine	_____ New Mexico
_____ California	_____ Maryland	_____ Ohio
_____ Colorado	_____ Massachusetts	_____ Oklahoma
_____ Connecticut	_____ Michigan	_____ Oregon
_____ Delaware	_____ Minnesota	_____ Pennsylvania
_____ Florida	_____ Mississippi	_____ Rhode Island
_____ Georgia	_____ Missouri	_____ South Carolina
_____ Hawaii	_____ Montana	_____ South Dakota
_____ Idaho	_____ Nebraska	_____ Tennessee

<input type="checkbox"/> Texas	<input type="checkbox"/> West Virginia	<input type="checkbox"/> North Carolina
<input type="checkbox"/> Utah	<input type="checkbox"/> Iowa	<input type="checkbox"/> North Dakota
<input type="checkbox"/> Vermont	<input type="checkbox"/> Kansas	<input type="checkbox"/> Wisconsin
<input type="checkbox"/> Virginia	<input type="checkbox"/> Kentucky	<input type="checkbox"/> Wyoming
<input type="checkbox"/> Washington	<input type="checkbox"/> New York	

3. Does your state have any agreements to accept candidates for certification as School Psychologists from colleges or universities within your state?

YES

NO

If yes, please list them below.

4. Does your state have any agreements to accept candidates for certification as School Psychologists from colleges or universities outside of your state?

YES

NO

If yes, please list them below.

5. What are your state's procedures for accepting someone for certification as a School Psychologist, who is certified as a School Psychologist in a state with which your state has a reciprocal agreement?

6. What task forces, committees or individuals, if any, are working on reciprocal agreements with other states or agencies concerning School Psychologists? (Please specify names and addresses)

7. Please outline in detail any future plans that your state has in regards to reciprocal certification agreements in the area of School Psychology.
  
8. Many states have indicated that they have informal or unwritten reciprocal agreements with various states and/or universities regarding the certification of School Psychologists. Does your state adhere to any such informal or customary agreements? If so, please list the agreements and specify procedures.

If additional space is needed to complete any questions in this survey, please attach and forward to the following:

National Certification/Licensure Project  
Department of Psychology  
Madison College  
Harrisonburg, Virginia 22801

**APPENDIX C**

**LIST OF INDIVIDUALS AND AGENCIES**



## Individuals and Agencies to which questionnaire was sent:

## Alabama

Martha N. Hester  
Certification Officer  
Department of Education  
Montgomery, Alabama 36130  
(205) 832-3133

## Alaska

Ms. Josephine Jones, Technician  
Alaska Teacher Certification  
Department of Education  
Pouch F - Alaska Office Building  
Juneau, Alaska 99811  
(907) 465-2857

## Arizona

Donald M. Johnson, Director  
Division of Certification  
Department of Education  
1535 West Jefferson  
Phoenix, Arizona 85007  
(602) 271-4367

## Arkansas

Mr. Austin Z. Hanner  
Coordinator  
Teacher Education and Certification  
Department of Education  
Little Rock, Arkansas 72201  
(501) 371-1474

## California

Mr. Peter L. LoPresti  
Executive Secretary  
Commission of Teacher Preparation and Licensing  
1020 O Street  
Sacramento, California 95814  
(916) 445-7254

## Colorado

Mr. Otto G. Ruff, Director  
Teacher Education and Certification  
State Office Building  
201 East Colfax  
Denver, Colorado 80203  
(303) 892-3075

## Connecticut

Angela Owen Terry, Ph.D.  
Bureau of Teacher Preparation and Certification  
Connecticut State Department of Education  
P. O. Box 2219  
Hartford, Connecticut 06115  
(203) 566-2284

## Delaware

E. N. Daily  
TEPS Office  
Department of Public Instruction  
Dover, Delaware 19910  
(32) 678-4686

## District of Columbia

Solomon J. Kendrick, Chief Examiner  
Board of Examiners  
415 12th Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20004  
(202) 783-5454

## Florida

Mr. John S. Staples  
Teacher Certification Specialist  
State of Florida  
Department of Education  
Tallahassee, Florida 32304  
(904) 488-2317

## Georgia

Richard H. Kicklighter, Coordinator  
School Psychologist Services  
State Department of Education  
Office of Instructional Services  
State Office Building  
Atlanta, Georgia 30334  
(404) 656-2406

## Hawaii

Winona Chang  
Staff Specialist  
Office of Personnel Services  
Department of Education  
P. O. Box 2360  
Honolulu, Hawaii 96804  
(808) 548-5804

## Idaho

Dorcey S. Riggs  
Teacher Certification and Related Services  
Idaho State Department of Education  
Len B. Jordan Office Building  
Boise, Idaho 83720  
(208) 384-3475

## Illinois

Barry H. Weiss  
Director of Certification  
Department of Professional Relations and Services  
100 North First Street  
Springfield, Illinois 62777  
(217) 782-2340

## Indiana

John D. Wertzler  
Assistant Director for Teacher Education  
Division of Teacher Education and Certification  
Room 230 State House  
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204  
(317) 633-4759

## Iowa

Merrill Halter  
Teacher Education and Certification  
Department of Public Instruction  
Grimes State Office Building  
Des Moines, Iowa 50319  
(515) 281-3245

## Kansas

Earl Dungan, Ed.D.  
Director of Certification  
State Department of Education  
Kansas State Education Building  
120 East 10th Street  
Topeka, Kansas 66612  
(913) 296-2288

## Kentucky

Susan Whittle  
Executive Secretary  
State Board of Psychology  
212 Washington Street  
Frankfort, Kentucky 40601  
(502) 564-3757

## Louisiana

Robert G. Crew, Assistant Director  
Higher Education and Teacher Certification  
Department of Education  
P. O. Box 44064  
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70804  
(504) 389-6915

## Maine

J. Wilfred Morin, Director  
Teacher Certification and Placement  
State Department of Educational and Cultural Services  
Augusta, Maine 04330  
(207) 289-2441

## Maryland

John C. Metger  
Coordinator  
Office of Certification  
Maryland State Department of Education  
P. O. Box 8717, BWI Airport  
Baltimore, Maryland 21240  
(301) 796-8300 ext. 266

## Massachusetts

David L. Fitzpatrick  
Director of Certification  
Bureau of Teacher Certification and Placement  
182 Tremont Street  
Boston, Massachusetts 02111  
(617) 727-5726

## Michigan

John H. Braccio, Ph.D.  
Consultant for School Psychology  
Special Education Services  
P. O. B  
Lansing, Michigan 48902  
(517) 373-0923

## Minnesota

Dr. George Droubie  
Department of Education  
Teacher Certification and Placement Section  
State of Minnesota  
St. Paul, Minnesota 55101  
(612) 296-2046

## Mississippi

Dr. Russell J. Crider  
State of Mississippi  
Department of Education  
P. O. Box 771  
Jackson, Mississippi 39205  
(601) 354-6869

## Missouri

Dr. Paul Greene, Director  
Teacher Education and Certification Section  
State Department of Education  
P. O. Box 480  
Jefferson City, Missouri 65101  
(314) 751-4212

## Montana

Dolores Colburg  
Superintendent of Public Instruction  
Helena, Montana 59601  
(406) 449-3095

## Nebraska

Glen E. Shafer, Administrator  
Teacher Certification  
State of Nebraska  
Department of Education  
233 South 10th Street  
Lincoln, Nebraska 68508  
(402) 471-2295

## Nevada

Director of Certification  
State of Nevada  
Department of Education  
Carson City, Nevada 89701  
(702) 885-5700

## New Hampshire

Ms. Jill Gordon  
Teacher Education and Professional Standards  
Division of Administration  
State House Annex  
Concord, New Hampshire 03301  
(603) 271-1110

## New Jersey

Richard W. Brown  
State of New Jersey  
Department of Education  
Division of Field Services  
Bureau of Teacher Education and Academic Credentials  
3535 Quakerbridge Road  
P. O. Box 3181  
Trenton, New Jersey 08619  
(609) 292-4477

## New Mexico

(Mrs.) Helen M. Wescott  
Director of Teacher Certification  
State Board of Education  
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87502  
(505) 827-2892

## New York

Dr. Charles C. Mackey, Jr.  
Division of Teacher Education and Certification  
State Department of Education  
99 Washington Avenue  
Albany, New York 12210  
(518) 474-3901

## North Carolina

J. Arthur Taylor, Director  
Division of Certification  
Department of Public Instruction  
Raleigh, North Carolina 27611  
(919) 829-4125

## North Dakota

R. W. Bangs  
Administrative Assistant  
State of North Dakota  
Department of Public Instruction  
Bismarck, North Dakota 58501  
(701) 224-2260

## Ohio

Paul W. Hailey, Director  
Teacher Education and Certification  
State Board of Education  
Columbus, Ohio 43214  
(614) 466-3593

**Oklahoma**

Billy J. Siler, Administrator  
Teacher Certification Section  
State of Oklahoma  
Department of Education  
State Capitol  
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73105  
(405) 521-3337

**Oregon**

Director of Certification  
State of Oregon  
Teacher Standards and Practices Commission  
942 Lancaster Drive NE  
Salem, Oregon 97310  
(503) 378-3586

**Pennsylvania**

Dr. Ronald Corrigan  
Division of Teacher Certification  
Bureau of Teacher Education and Certification  
Department of Education  
Box 911  
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17126  
(717) 787-5105

**Rhode Island**

Roger J. Aubin, Consultant  
Teacher Certification Section  
Department of Education  
State of Rhode Island  
Hayes Street  
Providence, Rhode Island 02908  
(401) 277-2675

**South Carolina**

John F. Maynard, Director  
Office of Teacher Education and Certification  
State of South Carolina  
Department of Education  
Columbus, South Carolina 29201  
(803) 758-5081

**South Dakota**

Charles R. Logan  
Psychologist III  
Elementary and Secondary Education  
State Capitol Building  
Pierre, South Dakota 57501  
(605) 224-3243

## Tennessee

Dr. Will Bowdoin  
Director of Certification  
State of Tennessee  
State Board of Education  
Nashville, Tennessee 37219  
(615) 741-1644

## Texas

Ms. Magnolia Starks  
Texas Education Agency  
201 East Eleventh Street  
Austin, Texas 78701  
(512) 475-2721

## Utah

Vere A. McHenry, Ed.D.  
Administrator  
Utah State Board of Education  
1400 University Club Building  
Salt Lake City, Utah 84111  
(801) 533-5965

## Vermont

Mrs. Ingrid Wackernagel  
Director of Certification  
State of Vermont  
Department of Education  
Montpelier, Vermont 05602  
(802) 828-3131

## Virginia

Frances H. Gee  
Supervisor of Teacher Certification  
Commonwealth of Virginia  
State Department of Education  
Richmond, Virginia 23216  
(804) 786-2625

## Washington

Anne M. Bunch  
Credentials Assistant  
Professional Education and Certification  
Old Capitol Building  
Olympia, Washington 98504  
(206) 753-6773



**West Virginia**

Carson L. Cottrell  
Certification Specialist  
State of West Virginia  
Department of Education  
Charleston, West Virginia 25305  
(304) 348-2696

**Wisconsin**

Certification Section  
Department of Public Instruction  
126 Langdon Street  
Madison, Wisconsin 53702  
(608) 266-1027

**Wyoming**

Dr. Elmer L. Burkhard, Director  
Licensing and Certification Services Unit  
State Department of Education  
State Office Building West  
Cheyenne, Wyoming 82002  
(307) 777-7291

APPENDIX D

INTERSTATE AGREEMENT ON QUALIFICATION OF  
EDUCATIONAL PERSONNEL

## Article I

### Purpose, Findings, and Policy

1. The States party to this Agreement, desiring by common action to improve their respective school systems by utilizing the teacher or other professional educational person wherever educated, declare that it is the policy of each of them, on the basis of cooperation with one another, to take advantage of the preparation and experience of such persons wherever gained, thereby serving the best interests of society, of education, and of the teaching profession. It is the purpose of this Agreement to provide for the development and execution of such programs of cooperation as will facilitate the movement of teachers and other professional educational personnel among the States party to it, and to authorize specific interstate educational personnel contracts to achieve that end.

2. The party States find that included in the large movement of population among all sections of the nation are many qualified educational personnel who move for family and other personal reasons but who are hindered in using their professional skill and experience in their new locations. Variations from State to State in requirements for qualifying educational personnel discourage such personnel from taking the steps necessary to qualify in other States. As a consequence, a significant number of professionally prepared and experienced educators is lost to our school systems. Facilitating the employment of qualified educational personnel, without reference to their States of origin, can increase the available educational resources. Participation in this Compact can increase the available of educational manpower.

## Article II

### Definitions

As used in this Agreement and contracts made pursuant to it, unless the context clearly requires otherwise:

1. "Educational personnel" means persons who must meet requirements pursuant to State law as a condition of employment in educational programs.

2. "Designated State official" means the education official of a State selected by that State to negotiate and enter into, on behalf of his State, contracts pursuant to this Agreement.

3. "Accept," or any variant thereof, means to recognize and give effect to one or more determinations of another State relating to the qualifications of educational personnel in lieu of making or requiring a like determination that would otherwise be required by or pursuant to the laws of a receiving State.

4. "State" means a State, territory, or possession of the United States; the District of Columbia; or the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

5. "Originating State" means a State (and the subdivision thereof, if any) whose determination that certain educational personnel are qualified to be employed for specific duties in schools is acceptable in accordance with the terms of a contract made pursuant to Article III.

6. "Receiving State" means a State (and the subdivisions thereof) which accept educational personnel in accordance with the terms of a contract made pursuant to Article III.

### Article III

#### Interstate Educational Personnel Contracts

1. The designated State official of a party State may make one or more contracts on behalf of his State with one or more other party States providing for the acceptance of educational personnel. Any such contract for the period of its duration shall be applicable to and binding on the States whose designated state officials enter into it, and the subdivisions of those States, with the same force and effect as if incorporated in this Agreement. A designated state official may enter into a contract pursuant to this Article only with States in which he finds that there are programs of education, certification standards or other acceptable qualifications that assure preparation or qualification of educational personnel on a basis sufficiently comparable, even though not identical to that prevailing in his own State.

2. Any such contract shall provide for:

- (a) Its duration.
- (b) The criteria to be applied by an originating State in qualifying educational personnel for acceptance by a receiving State.
- (c) Such waivers, substitutions, and conditional acceptances as shall aid the practical effectuation of the contract without sacrifice of basic educational standards.
- (d) Any other necessary matters.

3. No contract made pursuant to this Agreement shall be for a term longer than five years but any such contract may be renewed for like or lesser periods.

4. Any contract dealing with acceptance of educational personnel on the basis of their having completed an educational program shall specify the earliest date or dates on which originating state approval of the program or programs involved can have occurred. No contract made pursuant to this Agreement shall require acceptance by a receiving State of any persons qualified because of successful completion of a program prior to January 1, 1954.

5. The certification or other acceptance of a person who has been accepted pursuant to the terms of a contract shall not be revoked or otherwise impaired because the contract has expired or been terminated. However, any certificate or other qualifying document may be revoked or suspended on any ground which would be sufficient for revocation or suspension of a certificate or other qualifying document initially granted or approved in the receiving State.

6. A contract committee composed of the designated state officials of the contracting States or their representatives shall keep the contract under continuous review, study means of improving its administration, and report no less frequently than once a year to the heads of the appropriate education agencies of the contracting States.

#### Article IV

##### Approved and Accepted Programs

1. Nothing in this Agreement shall be construed to repeal or otherwise modify any law or regulation of a party State relating to the approval of programs of educational preparation having effect solely on the qualification of educational personnel within that State.

2. To the extent that contracts made pursuant to this Agreement deal with the educational requirements for the proper qualification of educational personnel, acceptance of a program of educational preparation shall be in accordance with such procedures and requirements as may be provided in the applicable contract.

#### Article V

##### Interstate Cooperation

The party States agree that:

1. They will, so far as practicable, prefer the making of multi-lateral contracts pursuant to Article III of this Agreement.

2. They will facilitate and strengthen cooperation in interstate certification and other elements of educational personnel qualification and for this purpose shall cooperate with agencies, organizations, and associations interested in certification and other elements of educational personnel qualification.

## Article VI

### Agreement Evaluation

The designated state officials of any party States may meet from time to time as a group to evaluate progress under the Agreement, and to formulate recommendations for changes.

## Article VII

### Other Arrangements

Nothing in this Agreement shall be construed to prevent or inhibit other arrangements or practices of any party State or States to facilitate the interchange of educational personnel.

## Article VIII

### Effect and Withdrawal

1. This Agreement shall become effective when enacted into law by two States. Thereafter it shall become effective as to any State upon its enactment of this Agreement.

2. Any party State may withdraw from this Agreement by enacting a statute repealing the same, but no such withdrawal shall take effect until one year after the Governor of the withdrawing State has given notice in writing of the withdrawal to the Governors of all other party States.

3. No withdrawal shall relieve the withdrawing State of any obligation imposed upon it by a contract to which it is a party. The duration of contracts and the methods and conditions of withdrawal therefrom shall be those specified in their terms.

## Article IX

### Construction and Severability

This Agreement shall be liberally construed so as to effectuate the purposes thereof. The provisions of this Agreement shall be severable and if any phrase, clause, sentence, or provision of this Agreement is declared to be contrary to the constitution of any State or of the United States, or the application thereof to any Government, agency, person, or circumstance is held invalid, the validity of the remainder of this Agreement and the applicability thereof to any Government, agency, person, or circumstance shall not be affected thereby. If this Agreement shall be held contrary to the constitution of any State participating therein, the Agreement shall remain in full force and effect as to the State affected as to all severable matters.

APPENDIX E

INTERSTATE AGREEMENT ON QUALIFICATION OF  
EDUCATIONAL PERSONNEL CONTRACT



CONTRACT  
covering school support professionals  
(Prototype, October 1, 1974)

This contract is entered into and shall be in force in accordance with its terms and is between and among the jurisdictions party to the Interstate Agreement on Qualification of Education Personnel and which have subscribed hereto as evidenced by signature pages properly executed by the appropriate officials of the jurisdictions involved. In each instance, such a signature page shall specifically identify this contract in such manner as to make clear that the signatures thereon represent and constitute execution of this contract. The jurisdictions entering into this contract hereby covenant and agree as follows:

1. Consideration and Authority

The consideration for this contract is the mutual implementation of the policy and purpose set forth in the "Interstate Agreement on Qualification of Educational Personnel" and the benefits flowing therefrom as declared in the said Interstate Agreement. The authority for the making of this contract is the "Interstate Agreement on Qualification of Educational Personnel," as enacted by each of the contracting states, and the applicable statutes of each such state in implementation of the Agreement.

2. Incorporation of Interstate Agreement and Definitions

(a) This contract is pursuant to and in implementation of the "Interstate Agreement on Qualification of Educational Personnel." All provisions of that Agreement shall govern, to the extent that they apply to the subject matter of this contract, whether or not such provisions are specifically set forth or referred to herein.

(b) Terms defined in the "Interstate Agreement on Qualification of Educational Personnel," when used in this contract shall have the same meanings as in that Agreement.

(c) As used in this contract:

1. "Support school professional" means any person other than a teacher, superintendent of schools or associate, assistant or deputy superintendent on either the state level or local level, who is required by law to hold a certificate based on the minimum of a baccalaureate degree in order to be employed in a professional capacity in a school system. "Teacher" as used in this definition, means a person whose primary function is to provide instruction to students at the pre-school or kindergarten level or in any one or more grades from Grade 1 to Grade 12 inclusive.

2. "School administrator" means a school professional required to hold a certificate but whose primary duties involve the development, supervision or internal management of a school, school system or school program rather than the furnishing of direct instructional or other services to pupils.

3. Interstate Acceptance: School Professional Preparation Programs

(a) As used in this contract, "program" means the series of combination of courses, related instructional services and practicum or other student experience designed to meet the educational requirements necessary to establish eligibility for certification as a support school professional or school administrator. No such series or combination shall be considered a program for the purposes of this contract if it consists of a minor field of concentration even though one or more states may offer certification or endorsements qualifying the holders thereof to perform in the minor subject or field.

(b) Any applicant for certification as a support school professional who is the holder of a baccalaureate or higher degree and who has completed a baccalaureate or postbaccalaureate preparatory program of an institution in any state party to this contract, shall be deemed to have met all the requirements for initial regular certification in any state party to this contract, if all of the following conditions are met:

1. On or after January 1, 1964 the appropriate education agency of the state in which the institution is located has classified the program as being of sufficient caliber to make it acceptable for interstate purposes pursuant to the "Interstate Agreement on Qualification of Educational Personnel."
2. The program which the applicant completed had an approved status at the time of the applicant's completion thereof, and the applicant offers such proof as may be required of such completion.
3. The originating state accepts completion of the program in satisfaction of its educational requirements for a certificate comparable to or broader in scope than the one being applied for in the receiving state.
4. The applicant meets all noneducational requirements and all requirements not relating to experience of the state to which application is being made.

(c) Anything in subparagraph (b) hereof to the contrary notwithstanding, each state party to this contract reserves the right to refuse acceptance of an applicant pursuant to this paragraph who has completed a school professional preparatory program offered by an institution which was not accredited by the appropriate regional accrediting body at the time of the applicant's completion of the program.

(d) Nothing in this paragraph shall be deemed to waive or permit the waiver of any requirement that an applicant for a certificate be the holder of a master's degree, even if such degree was not required for the certificate from another state.

(e) The states party to this contract agree that in approving programs pursuant to this paragraph they will perform or require the following:

1. Each institution will present evidence satisfactory to the originating state that the preparatory programs being evaluated are systematically planned in a manner reasonably calculated to produce effectively prepared school professionals.
2. Final approval of the programs occur only after an on site visit by the state.
3. Reasonable opportunity is provided for representatives of each state party to this contract, at their discretion, to be present during such an on site visit.
4. The final approval of each program is reevaluated at least once every five years.

(f) The states party to this contract recognize that there are a number of methods which can be employed effectively for the preparation of support school professionals and the individual states reasonably may elect to require or allow any one or more of such methods to be developed, implemented and employed by institutions within their borders. It is hereby declared to be the policy of the states party to this contract that in administering their systems and procedures for the approval of school professional preparatory programs they will give due weight and consideration to standards for professional preparation developed or recommended by generally recognized agencies of the state and Federal Governments having expertise in education for the teaching and related school professions, and to standards emanating from professional organizations in education and related fields. Upon request, the certification agency of a state party to this contract shall make available a copy of its Standards and Procedures for approving programs.

(g) This paragraph 3 shall not apply to school administrators, but school administrators may apply for certificates pursuant to paragraph 4.

4. Interstate Acceptance: Certificates and Experience

(a) Any person who holds an initial regular or advanced certificate issued by a state party to this contract, which certificate is still in force, shall be entitled to a like or comparable certificate at the initial regular level in any other state party to this contract, if all of the conditions set forth in this paragraph are met.

(b) The person applying for a certificate pursuant to this paragraph:

1. Has worked as a certified support school professional in one or more schools or school systems of the states party to this contract for a time totaling at least twenty-seven months during the seven years next preceding the date of application for the certificate. No time shall be counted toward the twenty-seven month requirement unless the work was performed pursuant to an appointment requiring service for fifty percent or more of the school day during fifty percent or more of the school year, and unless the certificate under which the work was done is comparable to or broader than the certificate for which application is made.
2. Meets all noneducational requirements and all requirements not relating to experience of the state to which application is being made.

(c) This paragraph applies only to persons holding certificates issued in whole or in part on the basis of the holding of a baccalaureate or post-baccalaureate degree, but accreditation or approval of the institution or program from which the applicant graduated shall not be material or requisite.

(d) Nothing in this paragraph shall be deemed to waive or permit the waiver of any requirement that an applicant for a certificate be the holder of a master's or other post-baccalaureate degree, or have completed satisfactorily a prescribed amount of post-baccalaureate study, even if such degree or amount of study was not required for the certificate from another state.

(e) The experience referred to in paragraph (b) 1 hereof, shall be only experience of which the administrative or other supervisory authority having charge or direction of the school or school system involved attests to have been satisfactory in quality and manner of performance.

## 5. Special and Ancillary Requirements

Any requirement of a state party to this contract that an applicant for certification as a support school professional or school administrator have completed specific numbers of course credits in particular subjects or fields of study or have taken courses in local customs, institutions or history peculiar to a given jurisdiction shall not apply to any applicant graduated from a program in an originating state, if that applicant meets the requirements for initial regular certification pursuant to paragraph 3 of this contract. However, nothing in this contract shall be construed to prevent the application of any requirements which a state may impose as prerequisites for positions requiring advanced education or training beyond that of which an initial regular certificate is evidence.

## 6. Other Professional Credentials

Nothing herein shall be construed to relieve any person from the necessity to secure a professional license or certificate, other than a teaching or school credential, if such license or certificate is required in order to practice or engage in a particular profession or occupation.

## 7. Publication, Transmittal, and Filing

The designated state official of each state party to this contract shall:

(a) Publish a list of all programs which he has classified as acceptable for the purposes of the "Interstate Agreement on Qualification of Educational Personnel." The subject matter fields for which each program has been classified as acceptable shall be enumerated for each program. If the list required hereby is published by an agency or officer other than the designated state official, he shall secure or reproduce a sufficient supply to meet the requirements of this paragraph.

(b) File or cause to be filed in his office and in the office of the central state recordskeeping agency copies of each list published or received by him covering programs in his own state and all other states party to this and all similar contracts.

(c) Transmit to each designated state official of the other states party to this and similar contracts at least two copies of the list of programs classified as acceptable by the appropriate education agency of his state.

(d) Upon request, make a copy of any list of acceptable programs for his state available to any person. Such copy shall be furnished either without charge or with a charge no higher than necessary to cover the actual cost of furnishing it.

(e) Revise the list for his own state or secure its revision once in each calendar year, and file and transmit each revision, properly dated to show the date of publication, in the same manner as required for an original list pursuant to items (a) - (c) of this paragraph. Revisions shall be as of July 1 of each year.

(f) If at any time in the interim between the yearly revisions of a list, the designated state official finds that a program is newly acceptable or has newly ceased to be acceptable, he shall publish this information and make transmittals and filings thereof, in the same manner as for a yearly revision.

#### 8. Committee of Administrators

The designated state officials or their representatives of the states party to this contract and similar contracts pursuant to the Interstate Agreement on Qualification of Educational Personnel may serve as a contract committee to:

(a) Review, publish and alter (when appropriate) procedures and practices in and among the states party to this contract which will assist in achieving the purposes of the "Interstate Agreement on Qualification of Educational Personnel."

Signature Page

INTERSTATE AGREEMENT ON QUALIFICATION OF  
EDUCATIONAL PERSONNEL

CONTRACT  
covering school support professionals  
(Prototype, October 1, 1974)

The states of \_\_\_\_\_ and \_\_\_\_\_ hereby enter into the contract styled "Interstate Agreement on Qualification of Educational Personnel - Contract covering support school professionals (prototype October 1, 1974)," Paragraph 9 of which reads as follows:

Term--This contract shall be for a term to commence October 1, 1974 or upon its execution, whichever is later. It shall terminate on September 30, 1979. It may be renewed for five years or lesser periods. Withdrawal, except withdrawal by failure to renew, may be on one year's written notice to the designated state official and central state recordskeeping agency of the other party state.

The State of \_\_\_\_\_ is acting by [with approval of the State Board of Education] pursuant to [cite state statute enacting the Interstate Agreement on Qualification of Educational Personnel] and the State of \_\_\_\_\_ is acting by \_\_\_\_\_, [with approval of the State Board of Education] pursuant to [cite state statute enacting Interstate Agreement on Qualification of Educational Personnel].

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Title

\_\_\_\_\_  
Title

Date:

Date:

**APPENDIX F**

**NASDTEC POSITION PAPER**



NASDTEC Position Statement:  
Approval/Accreditation of Programs  
to Prepare Professional Educational Personnel

Adopted February 3, 1976  
St. Louis, Missouri

Each state has the exclusive legal responsibility for the quality and content of professional preparation/certification programs in that state. This responsibility may be vested in or shared by the State Education Agency, a State Standards Commission, or a State Board of Education. Regardless of title, the state agency is the only legally accountable agency in matters concerning approval/accreditation of programs. The individual state cannot abrogate its legal responsibility; nor should any state ignore its obligation to protect the "public interest" and the independence and integrity of the state and its institutions.

The issue of state prerogatives and independence often arises when national or regional accreditation is considered. It is important, therefore, that each state examine and affirm its policy concerning approval/accreditation standards and procedures. National and regional standards facilitate interstate reciprocity and contribute to quality control; however, they can also stifle differences and hamper creative programming as well as infringe upon the authority of the state. The challenge and concern is to maintain the state's prerogatives and independent identity while permitting program uniqueness, encouraging flexibility, ensuring quality, and providing a basis for reciprocity.

The authority of regional and national accrediting associations with respect to professional preparation exists to the extent each state and its institutions subscribe to or grant recognition to such voluntary associations. Given the state's legal authority and responsibility, it is imperative that certain principles serve as guidelines as states work with regional and national accrediting associations:

1. NASDTEC must play a vital role in (a) offering each state guidelines for procedures and standards relevant to program approval/accreditation; (b) providing a key liaison and communication link with various teacher education organizations and regional and national accrediting associations; and (c) serving as an advocate to ensure that each state exercise its prerogatives and independence in matters related to program approval/accreditation.
2. State accreditation/approval standards take precedence over regional or national standards because the state is the single agency having authority, responsibility, and accountability.

3. Each state takes the initiative and asserts its authority in matters related to program approval and accreditation.
4. The state and voluntary regional and national accrediting associations collaborate/cooperate in establishing and implementing procedures and "standards."
5. Each approval/accreditation agency--state, regional, or national--examines how its activities, standards, and purposes relate to those of other agencies and determines how each might complement the other rather than compete with the other.
6. Regional and national accrediting associations consider state approval/accreditation standards and processes and, as appropriate, incorporate such standards in regional and national standards.
7. If a given state elects to carry out its program approval activity in conjunction with a regional or national accrediting organization, the state maintains its independence, authority, and responsibility in decisions concerning state approval/accreditation.
8. The standards of any regional or national accrediting association, including NASDTEC, serve as guidelines or referents for individual states, not as mandates.

VITA

James Warren Van Velzer, Jr.

Candidate for the Degree of

Master of Science

Thesis: A NATIONAL SURVEY OF INTERSTATE RECIPROCAL CERTIFICATION  
AGREEMENTS AND RECIPROCITY PROCEDURES IN THE UNITED STATES  
CONCERNING SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGISTS

Major Field: Educational Psychology

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Unionville, Missouri, June 19, 1947,  
the son of James W. and Virginia Van Velzer.

Education: Graduated from Claremore High School, Claremore,  
Oklahoma, in May, 1965; received Bachelor of Science degree  
from Northwestern Oklahoma State University in the field of  
Biology in May, 1969; enrolled in Master's program at  
Oklahoma State University in January, 1973; completed  
requirements for Master of Science degree at Oklahoma State  
University in December, 1976.

Professional Experience: School Psychology Intern, Edmond  
Guidance Center, Edmond, Oklahoma, 1975-76.

Professional Organizations: Phi Delta Kappa