Join SRCD in Prague, October 23-25, 2014
Lonnie Sherrod, Executive Director

As you know, SRCD started a new venture in 2012. Based on feedback from members and Governing Council’s (GC) interest in furthering pursuit of the Society’s strategic plan, SRCD began holding small meetings (200-300 participants) organized around a particular substantive topic. This new form of meeting is intended to provide members with an alternative to the large, general Biennial Meeting. The Biennial will of course remain one of SRCD’s landmark program activities, but these new meetings offer a different approach. In 2012, meetings were held on developmental methodology, the positive development of minority children, and the transition to adulthood. The first meeting in 2014 focuses on strengthening connections between research and policy. It was held April 2-5 in Alexandria, Virginia (just outside DC). Please click here for additional information.

Another of the meetings for 2014 will be SRCD’s first European meeting, which will be held October 23-25, 2014 at the Corinthia Hotel in Prague, Czech Republic. The theme of the meeting is Positive Youth Development (PYD) in the Context of the Global Recession. It is being organized by Frosso Motti, University of Athens, Greece; Silvia Koller, Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul, Brazil; and Anne Petersen, University of Michigan, USA. Drs. Motti and Petersen are co-chairs of SRCD’s International Committee.

PYD is a relatively new approach to research and policy on youth development. Recognizing that we had several decades of science (the 1980s and 90s) that unsuccessfully tried to prevent problem behaviors such as substance abuse, school failure, or teen pregnancy, PYD offers the view that we should try to promote positive development rather than to prevent negative behaviors. It is based on the idea that youth differ—not in individual qualities, such as resiliency, but in the extent to which their needs are met by the naturally occurring resources in their environments, such as families, schools, or communities. It focuses on both individual and external assets. As a result, it shifts the focus of research and policy from fixing individuals to fixing environments. It provides an ideal approach for examining the impact of global economic context on youth development.

This meeting has two unusual foci: youth in the second and third decades of life and the global economic context of development. Sessions will examine the effects of the global recession on the current and long-term adaptation of youth, identifying the processes that help youth adapt to these economic circumstances and even turn them into opportunities. It will also explore different approaches and interventions that promote personal and social assets which allow young people to move successfully from adolescence to competent adulthood. The most effective research designs and methods for data analysis will be explored, as will the existing datasets for studying PYD in the context of current economic constraints.
Youth have been particularly hard hit by the global economic recession. Many young people are trapped in endless cycles of unemployment, underemployment and/or of being forced back to education because of lack of job opportunities. Alarmingly increasing numbers of skilled young graduates decide to migrate to wealthier countries for a better future. The “brain drain” of less wealthy societies is one of the deep wounds of the current crisis. However, the economic crisis may also have long-lasting and pervasive consequences on the adaptation and development of youth. It thwarts the aspirations and goals for the future of young people, and presents serious obstacles in their professional and personal adaptation. In Europe, the current cohort of young people is actually referred to as “the lost generation”. What are the effects of the economic downturn for the adaptation and development of youth? What makes a difference for those who are able to more successfully navigate through this situation? How can we support youth to become the engines of hope and change in their countries? What can scientists from different countries learn from each other?

Subtopics to be covered include: effects on development of economic recession, youth unemployment, and strategies and interventions that support or promote PYD in this context. Cross-cutting themes include: international and multidisciplinary perspectives, resilience and other positive individual constructs, and cultural and other contextual considerations, including research and researchers outside of the Euro-American world. Because of the complexity of the research designs and statistics required to analyze longitudinal panel data, there will be a special plenary session on this topic, followed by a mini-workshop.

Invited speakers include Rainer Silbereisen: Positive youth development and adaptation in the context of social change; Glen Elder: Effects of economic recession on positive adaptation and development; Hirokazu Yoshikawa: Modeling how the economic crisis affects development; Marlis Buchman: Economic downturn and the transition to adulthood: Comparing different types of welfare regimes in Europe; Paul Gregg: Economic models for understanding effects of economic change on youth behavior; Ingrid Schoon: Effects of social change on future goals; Jeanne Brooks-Gunn: Youth development and community-based programs; Çigdem Kagıtçibasi: Youth development programs; Judith Diers: UNICEF efforts; Manuel Voelkle, Max Planck Institute for Human Development, Germany; and Christiane Spiel, University of Vienna. Paolo Ghisletta, University of Geneva, Switzerland, will lead the methods workshop.

The conference organizers have capitalized on the location in Prague and emphasized European speakers in the invited program. The PYD approach originated in the US. However, European research is very relevant to the question of contextual effects on the adaptation and development of youth, including research on migrants and other kinds of social changes. Hence the integration of the two perspectives in one meeting is highly stimulating.

In addition to the invited speakers, there will be 2-3 invited symposia. As with other SRCD meetings, the program will involve both invited sessions and sessions submitted in response to the call for papers and poster symposia, which closed March 26. However, the program includes a larger invited-to-submitted program ratio than in SRCD’s Biennial Meeting. Total attendance is capped, so I encourage interested members to register early (click here for additional information).

The other two meetings in 2014 are Developmental Methodology, September 11-13, and At-Risk Parenting, November 6-8. Both will be held in San Diego, CA.
OPT Staff: Celia, when early notice was given that the US Department of Health and Human Services was considering changes to the Common Rule for the first time in 20 years, you chaired the SRCD Task Force that focused on how best to preserve and enhance responsible conduct of research involving children. Are there any important updates since the Task Force recommendations were published in an SRCD Social Policy Report and Social Policy Report Brief last year?

Celia Fisher: I think it is an important development that a committee was convened by the National Research Council of the National Academies of Science (NAS) to provide the reactions of researchers across the social and behavioral sciences to the early set of recommendations for revising the Common Rule released in the “Advance Notice of Proposed Rulemaking” (ANPRN). (The reports of the committee and a research brief are available here.)

OPT Staff: If the NAS committee included all social and behavioral sciences, were they receptive to concerns specifically about research involving children?

Celia Fisher: Yes, very much so. I was privileged to be a member of the NAS committee, whose report reflects consideration of many of the recommendations made by the SRCD Task Force.

OPT Staff: That is really welcome news. What do you see as the key implications of the NAS Committee report for research involving children?

Celia Fisher: First of all, some research involving children would no longer require IRB review. The committee recommended that there should no longer be an “exempt” category of research. Instead, research would not be considered human subjects research, and could be conducted without informing an IRB, if it did not involve the collection of data about a living individual directly through interaction or intervention. Research involving the use of public data, and research involving observations of public behavior when there is no anticipation of privacy would not require IRB review, including when the public data or observations involve children.

OPT Staff: Would there be other adjustments to the categories for review relevant to children?

Celia Fisher: Yes. The ANPRN proposed a new category of “excused” research, in which the risks involved are minimal and primarily concern possible disclosure of personally identifiable information. The ANPRN proposed restricting this category to research involving “competent adults.” The NAS committee did not agree with this restriction. It recommended including benign interventions (methods or activities that are very familiar to people in everyday life) such as educational tests and focus groups and surveys. In this category, researchers would be responsible for using appropriate informed consent (including for children, guardian permission and child assent). Researchers would need to register their study using a brief form and would then be able to move forward without IRB approval after one week. A subset of protocols would be periodically audited.

OPT Staff: What about research that goes beyond benign interventions and informational risk?

Celia Fisher: The committee recommended that expedited, rather than full IRB board review, would be the default expectation for studies, including studies involving children, that pose minimal psychological or physical risks but may require consideration of additional ethical protections because of the nature of the population or study characteristics. Prevention and intervention studies would fall in this category. Continuing annual review would not be required for expedited review studies.

OPT Staff: It looks as if the definition of minimal risk is very important in these distinctions. Did the NAS committee recommend any changes to this definition?

Celia Fisher: Yes, the recommendations here are really important. The NAS committee recommended including educational examinations, tests and procedures in the minimal risk definition, which currently only refers to (cont. on p. 4)
routine medical and psychological examinations or tests. It also made the same recommendation as the SRCD Task Force to eliminate regulatory language that identifies certain populations such as children as necessarily “vulnerable to coercion and undue influence.” It recommended that IRBs should consider a study to involve minimal risk irrespective of the characteristics of the population as long as appropriate risk minimizing human subjects protections are in place.

**OPC Staff:** What about informed consent in research involving children?

**Celia Fisher:** There are a number of important elements here. To name a few, while the committee agreed with the general ANPRM recommendation that informed consent forms should be shortened, it did not agree that they should follow a common rubric. Instead, it recommended that informed consent should be more flexible, oral as well as written, and above all, meet the needs of the specific population. It also recommended that the Office of Human Research Protections provide guidance to IRBs to facilitate the waiver of guardian permission, which is particularly important for investigators conducting research on health services for which adolescents are entitled to make independent decisions under state law—one of the recommendations of our Task Force.

**OPC Staff:** What about the recommendation to use HIPAA as a standard for data protection plans?

**Celia Fisher:** Consistent with the recommendations of our Task Force, the NAS Committee soundly rejected HIPAA as the standard for data protection plans.

**OPC Staff:** We are still waiting for the actual proposal for revising the Common Rule (rather than advanced notice with initial recommendations). We hope that the recommendations of this NAS committee cutting across the social and behavioral sciences are given serious consideration as steps are taken towards the actual proposal. Is there anything that SRCD members can do now, even while we are waiting?

**Celia Fisher:** To me, the most important thing SRCD members can do in the interim is to conduct research on what minimal risk involves for children at different points in development. This is critical so that IRBs neither under- or over-estimate risk in research involving children.

**OPC Staff:** Thank you so much for your efforts to make sure that considerations about research involving children are taken into account as we move towards revising the Common Rule.

**Celia Fisher:** I want in turn to thank the members of the SRCD Task Force, who worked intensively to reach a set of recommendations that have now been accorded respect of the broader social and behavioral science community through the NAS committee report.²

---

1 Celia Fisher is the Director, Center for Ethics Education, Marie Ward Doty Endowed University Chair and Professor of Psychology, Fordham University.

2 The members of the SRCD Task Force included also Donald J. Brunnquell, Director, Office of Ethics, Children’s Hospital and Clinics of Minnesota; Diane L. Hughes, Professor, Steinhardt School of Culture, Development, and Education Co-Director, Center for Research on Culture, Development and Education, New York University; Lynn S. Liben, Distinguished Professor, Department of Psychology, Health and Human Development, and College of Education, The Pennsylvania State University; Valerie Maholmes, Chief, Pediatric Trauma and Critical Illness Branch, Eunice Kennedy Shriver National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, National Institutes of Health; Stuart Plattner, Program Officer (retired), National Science Foundation; Stephen T. Russell, Professor, Fitch Nesbitt Endowed Chair and Director, FrancesMcClelland Institute, University of Arizona; and Elizabeth J. Susman, Jean Phillips Shibley Professor of Biobehavioral Health, The Pennsylvania State University.
UPDATE ON THE 2015 SRCD BIENNIAL MEETING

Jeffrey J. Lockman, Tulane University, and
Catherine S. Tamis-Lemonda, New York University

The 2015 SRCD biennial meeting (March 19-21, Philadelphia) may be little less than a year away, but as the Program Chairs for the upcoming meeting, we have been hard at work over the past year planning the invited program.

For the invited program, look for something old, something new, and something tweaked. As in previous years, invited formats will include Master Lectures, Invited Symposia, Views by Two and Conversation Hours. But watch for breakout rooms for follow-up discussion after some of the sessions. The addition of breakout rooms will facilitate dialogue among speakers and interested attendees in a more intimate venue than is possible in the larger conference rooms. In the “Views by Two” format, the goal is to feature complementary rather than contrasting approaches to a topic, such as speakers from different disciplinary perspectives or methodological approaches. New to the invited program in 2015 will be a series of “State of the Art” sessions, which will feature presentations that focus on methods and the “how” of a research area. These sessions will be aimed at the specialist and non-specialist alike, with the goals of examining current accepted practice and recent methodological advances in a given field.

Look for the Call for Submissions to be posted soon. The submission site is scheduled to open late June and close in August.

There is a lot of work ahead, but we are honored and excited to bring you the best and the brightest research in developmental science at the upcoming biennial meeting. We look forward to seeing you in Philadelphia in 2015!

2014 Special Topic Meetings:

- **Strengthening Connections Among Child and Family Research, Policy and Practice**
  Program Co-Chairs: Elizabeth Gershoff and Aletha Huston
  Thank you to those who presented and attended the April 3-5, 2014 meeting in Alexandria, VA.

- **Developmental Methodology**
  Program Chairs: Noel A. Card, Todd D. Little, and Elizabeth Plowmen
  This meeting will be held September 11-13 at the Hilton San Diego Resort and Spa in San Diego, CA and is now accepting submissions! Click [here](#) for more information.
  Submission Deadline: **May 14, 2014 at 8:00 pm (EDT)**

- **Positive Youth Development (PYD) in the Context of the Global Recession**
  Program Chairs: Frosso Motti, Silvia Koller, and Anne Petersen
  SRCD’s first meeting in Europe will be held October 23-25, 2014 in Prague, Czech Republic at the Corinthia Hotel. The submission deadline has passed and the review process is underway. Thank you to all who submitted! Decision notifications will be emailed at the beginning of July. The Jacobs Foundation has generously provided a grant to support international travel to this meeting. The link to the application site will be included with decision notifications. Please click [here](#) for applicant qualifications.
  
  Distinguished scholars have been invited to speak on the important topic of youth having been particularly hard hit by the global economic recession. Please visit the [website](#) for more detailed information about the meeting and its goals. Be sure to follow us on [Facebook](#) and [Twitter](#)(#SRCDPrague) for meeting updates!

- **New Conceptualizations in the Study of Parenting-At-Risk**
  Program Chairs: Douglas Teti, Natasha Cabrera, Pamela Cole, Sherryl Goodman and Vonnie McLoyd
  Join us for the final Special Topic Meeting of 2014. This meeting is scheduled for November 13-15, also at the Hilton San Diego Resort and Spa in San Diego, CA.
  Submissions are currently being accepted. Click [here](#) for more information.
  Submission Deadline: **May 15, 2014 at 8:00 pm (EDT)**
Promoting Reflective Practice in the Teaching of Developmental Science

Dianne Thompson, University of California, Davis, and Diane Harkin, WestEd

Reflective practice can add depth to teaching and learning in academic settings that may be applied to real world settings (Horton-Deutsch, McNelis, & O’Haver Day, 2012). Defined as “an attitude of mind cultivated in relational exchange that enables people to see several levels of interchange from many angles” (Shahmoon-Shanok, Lapidus, Grant, Halpern, & Lamb-Parker, 2005), reflective practice is often thought of as being multidirectional. In addition, reflective practice aligns well with recommendations made by the National Research Council (2000) to include the teaching of metacognitive skills using discipline-based curriculum to further education. The educator’s role as reflective partner is one which facilitates students’ capacity to become “proactive in practice” rather than attending class as a passive listener. However, when teaching reflective practice it is important to address the learner’s interpretation of events and a tendency toward a confirmation bias. As such, simply reflecting on a past event is not sufficient to enhance one’s conceptual and procedural knowledge base. Instead, reflective practice can involve the recognition of taken-for-granted assumptions and the capacity to see them through another lens to expand further interpretation. As such, reflective thinking can suggest a degree of “unlearning” as students reconsider long-held and often unspoken beliefs about the human experience (Thompson & Pascal, 2012).

Teachers can engage students’ pre-existing knowledge to foster the capacity to think critically about conceptual material and its applications to human development. Pre-existing knowledge can include prior experiences, temperament, culture, and assumptions that influence one’s perceptual filters. By incorporating a more ecological perspective, students may learn to recognize that development occurs in a non-linear and dynamic manner, influenced by a variety of contextual elements. Additionally, strengthening students’ reflective functioning capacity can teach them to avoid projection and premature conclusions while fostering tolerance for different points of view (Jindal-Snape & Homes, 2009; Slade, Sadler, & Mayes, 2005). A few key strategies can be used to enhance students’ awareness of personal and cultural assumptions about developmental science. For example, the use of inquiry can facilitate students’ reflective thinking while steering away from polarized right-versus-wrong perspectives. Such inquiries may be in the form of questions or statements such as: “What made you decide that...?”, “Tell me more about...”, or “What do you think would happen if...?” In using these types of verbal prompts, teachers can encourage interpersonal communication in the academic setting while extending students’ inquiry into each other’s thinking and reasoning (Senge, 1990). Another strategy that promotes reflective thinking is the use of case studies. By reading and discussing case examples, students can become familiar with the complex processes that influence development. Additionally, they can be encouraged to take the perspective of different “actors” in the storyline. For example, what might the child’s perspective be? Would it be different from the parent’s or health care provider’s perspective?

Teachers can be effective reflective partners, promoting the critical thinking skills that are a necessary part of scientific study.

References
SRCD and the Human Right to Science: A Report from the SRCD Student Representative to the AAAS Science and Human Rights Coalition
Anna Markowitz, Georgetown University

On January 27-28, 2014, the American Association for the Advancement of Sciences (AAAS) in Washington, DC brought together members of the Science and Human Rights Coalition, of which SRCD is an active member. This meeting was one of two meetings held annually by the AAAS Science and Human Rights coalition, which seeks to unite diverse scientific groups in the mission of advancing Article 15 of the UN’s International Covenant on Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights. This article asserts a human right to enjoy the benefits of scientific progress and its applications. The focus of the Winter 2014 meeting was Disability Rights and Accessing the Benefits of Scientific Progress and its Applications. The keynote speaker, Google’s Vint Cerf, articulated the role of science in building the capacity for persons with disabilities to participate fully in all aspects of society. In addition, SRCD member Dr. Celia Fisher spoke as part of a plenary entitled “Participating in Science and Technology,” which included discussion of ways to ensure ethical collaboration such that persons with disabilities are fully able to participate at all levels of scientific discovery.

Key themes from the meeting included:
- the power of technology to enhance the opportunities for and integration of persons with disabilities;
- the ability of careful application of design, science, and technology to provide inexpensive, but crucial solutions; and
- the inability of technology to solve cultural biases on its own.

As developmental scientists, SRCD members have skills uniquely suited to the work of building bridges such that all people enjoy the benefits of scientific advancement, while at the same time respecting the uniquely important role of human interaction in healthy development. Many SRCD researchers strive to understand the developmental trajectories of disability and the environmental factors that influence these pathways. For students and early career scholars, Article 15 is a reminder that our work and its applications have profound impacts on the 15% of the population globally who have some form of disability. In particular, our work has implications beyond the academy, and there are diverse outlets for allowing our work to contribute to global advancement and individual well-being. Indeed, speakers noted the rapid expansion of opportunities for providing services to both persons with disabilities that persist across the life span and for aging Baby Boomers, as well as the necessity of good science to guide such ventures. Despite the incredible opportunities that technology provides, as noted by Cerf and other speakers, the same solutions are often not workable for everyone. Attention to individual differences and underlying causes will be critical in designing flexible tools and strategies that promote inclusion. In particular, as evidenced by Dr. Fisher’s recent work on ethical standards for research with vulnerable populations, developmentalists will play a crucial role in continuing to respect the role of persons with disabilities in research, as both participants and as collaborators.

Article 15 reminds us of the importance of extending the benefits of our science as far as possible. As technology continues to develop quickly, current students and early career scholars will shape the responsible development and use of technologies in the service of persons with disabilities, and beyond.

The coalition, like many organizations, is particularly interested in forming relationships with students who are excited and passionate about human rights. For more information, please contact Anna Markowitz at ajm267@georgetown.edu.
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Twenty Most Controversial Studies in Child Psychology
Wallace E. Dixon, Jr., East Tennessee State University

In my previous installment, I reported my findings regarding the 20 Most Fascinating Studies published in child psychology since 1960. A number of readers wrote to tell me they found that list illuminating and were pleased to see their own favorites make the cut. I would agree. Although I did not serve as my own research participant, it was somewhat of a relief to find that my personal definition of “fascinating study” was shared by so many of my colleagues.

In this installment, I identify the 20 Most Controversial Studies published in child psychology since 1960. As with the category of “Most Fascinating,” I did not provide an a priori definition of “controversial.” Instead, I left it up to the individual to define the term. As a result, different studies appear to make the list for different reasons. (I will withhold my personal view on the nature of these differences, but I would love to hear from readers about their own hypotheses.)

Below are the studies that survey respondents identified as the most controversial in the field of child psychology. Remember that these folks were themselves scientists in the Society for Research in Child Development, the International Society on Infant Studies, or the Cognitive Development Society. As before, there was surprising agreement among members of the three learned societies about which studies were most controversial.

In future installments, I will report on the 20 Most Important and 20 Most Revolutionary studies. (You can write to me at dixonw@etsu.edu.)

Now, on to the 20 Most Controversial Studies published in the field of child psychology since 1960, in reverse order (note that numbers 19 and 20 were tied, as indicated below):


(cont. from p. 8)


And the #1 Most Controversial Study in Child Psychology published since 1960 is...


---

**SRCD’s Wiley Discount Program**

SRCD and our publishing partner Wiley are pleased to announce an update to Wiley’s Society Discount Program. Through the SDP, SRCD members have historically received a 25% discount on virtually all Wiley books. However, we are pleased to announce an increase in the discount percentage from 25% to 35% for a trial period through the end of 2014. More information can be found at SRCD’s Wiley discount page.

---

**SRCD Book Authors/Editors**

SRCD Members are invited to notify either editor, jonathan.santo@gmail.com or alukowski@uci.edu, about your new publications. These will be listed in the newsletter.
MEMBERS IN THE MEDIA

The SRCD Office for Policy and Communications is interested in highlighting SRCD members and publications featured in the news media. The following are the most recent submissions:

- TV or Radio Interview
- Op-Ed Piece
- News Article
- Blog Post


Kathleen McCartney. Marketplace. Smith College President Talks Affordable Education.


* Indicates media coverage related to an SRCD publication.

We strongly encourage and welcome all members to report recent noteworthy mentions of their research in the media. Information may be emailed to communications@srcd.org.
NEW BOOKS BY SRCD MEMBERS


The book examines sex differences in social interactions from infancy through adulthood. From an evolutionary/adaptive perspective, it examines sex differences in the size of social groups, the function of same-sex peers versus families, flexibility in peer interactions, responses to conflicts, and the content of the two sexes’ interests. It would be of interest to developmental psychologists, as well as professionals in education, medicine and psychology who wish to better understand the sex-typed problems girls and boys must solve as they develop. [Click here for more information.]


The author used SRCD policy products and activities to inform her book! [Click here for more information.]


Where do emotions come from? How do our early lives affect them? Is a happy 5-year-old experiencing the same feeling as a smiling baby? When do we acquire the capacity for emotional deception? This book provides a new understanding of emotional development from infancy through childhood and beyond. Synthesizing decades of influential research, renowned developmental scientist Michael Lewis explores how biology, culture, and consciousness interact to shape the growing child’s increasingly complex emotional life. [Click here for more information.]

Siegel, L. (2013). *Understanding Dyslexia and Other Learning Disabilities*. Pacific Educational Press, Vancouver, BC. [Click here for more information.]


This book describes the ways in which the mentoring terrain in early care and education has changed over the last two decades, and the multiple contexts in which mentoring now occurs. It offers mentors, coaches, and/or technical assistance providers an effective, activity-based way to reflect on, practice, and sharpen skills for working with early childhood practitioners, and it can be adapted to a wide variety of early care and education settings. [Click here for more information.]

Inaugural Alice Honig Asia Early Child Development Honorary Award established

The inaugural Alice Honig Asia Early Child Development Honorary Award was presented recently in Beijing, China, and will be awarded annually in honor of her years of service to the international field of early child development. Pictured with Alice Honig is Richard Feng, the first recipient of this award.

Read more about Dr. Honig [here.](#)
** Visit SRCD’s website (www.srcd.org) regularly. **
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The newsletter publishes announcements, articles, and ads that may be of interest to members of the Society, as space permits.

---

**Developments’ Submission Guidelines**

**Text:** Provide your material in unformatted text blocks only, preferably using “Trebuchet” 10-pt font in Word or WordPerfect. Word limit for a one page article is 775 words. A photo of the author or topic or both to accompany your article would be greatly appreciated.

**Photographs:** 300 DPI, “tif” files only. If you do not have a scanner to produce the photo quality we need, loan us your photo; we will scan it for our use, and then return it to you. Please send materials to Jonathan Bruce Santo, jonathan.santo@gmail.com or Angela Lukowski, alukowsk@uci.edu.

**Ads:** Contact Amy Glaspie, aglaspie@srcd.org; 734-926-0614 for information and an order form. General ad specs:
• 1/8-page display ad is 2” x 3.5” and contains up to 75 words plus a 2-line header
• 1/4-page display ad is 3.5” x 4.5” and contains up to 175 words plus a 2-line header
• 1/2-page display ad is 4.5” x 7.25” and contains up to 325 words plus a 2-line header
• Full-page display ad is 7.25” x 8.75” and contains up to 650 words plus a 2-line header