

A P I C N E W S L E T T E R

VOLUME VIII, NUMBER 2

APRIL 1983

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Remarks from the Chair . . . . .	1
Minutes of the Executive Committee Meeting . . . . .	2
1982-83 Financial Statement . . . . .	6
Accreditation Consultation Available . . . . .	7
Evaluation of Counseling Psychology Interns: A Survey . . . . .	8
Newsworthy Notes . . . . .	11
Comments from the Newsletter Editors	
(a) Adult General Editor . . . . .	12
(b) Forensic Editor . . . . .	13
(c) Postdoctoral Issues Editor . . . . .	14
(d) Setting-Related Issues Editor . . . . .	14
(e) Health Psychology Editor . . . . .	15
Color Coded Inserts at Center:	
(A) Predoctoral Internship Form	
(B) Postdoctoral Training Form	
(C) Call for Nominations	
(D) Dues Notice	

See Enclosed Forms

ASSOCIATION OF PSYCHOLOGY INTERNSHIP CENTERS

Membership Statement

The Association of Psychology Internship Centers (APIC) was formed in 1968 to foster the sharing of information about mutual concerns and to provide a uniform voice with respect to internship training interests within APA.

We publish a newsletter twice per year for our members. We are recognized by APA as the primary organization to consult with respect to internship training. Since our inception, we have maintained a formal liaison with APA's Education and Training Board.

We publish an annual Directory of Internship Programs in Professional Psychology, which is intended in part as a service for students. Approximately 1,000 copies of the directory are now distributed each year. The Directory is updated in late summer. The Directory is free to APIC members.

We also are responsible for establishing for our members a suggested uniform date for the tendering of internship stipend offers. In brief, the policy is: (1) no offers to be made prior to 8:00 A.M. Central Standard Time, the second Monday in February, and (2) students are to be allowed until Tuesday noon CST to respond to initial offers.

Membership is by institution rather than by individual. In order to be a member of APIC, an internship program must be one year full-time or two years half-time, accept only applicants enrolled in a doctoral program in professional psychology, be directed by a licensed professional psychologist, provide training in a range of professional activities, and be willing to provide current descriptions of its program for the APIC Directory.

APIC membership is by institution. Membership dues are \$60.00 per year, which runs from July 1 through June 30. To join, please complete a Directory Information Form and Dues Notice and return it with a check for \$60.00 (dues), made payable to the Association of Psychology Internship Centers.

RETURN TO: Phillip R. Laughlin, Ph.D.  
APIC Treasurer  
P.O. Box 574  
Knoxville, Iowa 50138

ASSOCIATION OF PSYCHOLOGY INTERNSHIP CENTERS (APIC)

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE: (Terms expire as noted by year after name)

CHAIRPERSON

Ronald B. Kurz, Ph.D. (1984)  
Department of Pediatric Psychology  
Children's Hospital National  
Medical Center  
111 Michigan Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20010  
(202) 745-2089

David G. Rice, Ph.D. (1983)  
Department of Psychiatry  
University of Wisconsin - Madison  
Center for Health Sciences  
1300 University Avenue  
Madison, Wisconsin 53706  
(608) 263-6083

SECRETARY

Robert J. Silver, Ph.D. (1983)  
Austin State Hospital  
4110 Guadalupe  
Austin, Texas 78751  
(512) 452-0381

Cynthia D. Belar, Ph.D. (1985)  
Department of Clinical Psychology  
Box J-165, J. Hillis Miller Health Center  
University of Florida  
Gainesville, Florida 32610  
(904) 392-4555

DIRECTORY EDITOR & INTERIM TREASURER

Phillip R. Laughlin, Ph.D. (1984)  
Chief, Psychology Service  
VA Medical Center (116B)  
Knoxville, Iowa 50138  
(515) 842-3101

Michael Flynn, Ph.D. (1985)  
Psychology Service  
Westside VA Hospital  
Chicago, Illinois 60612

APIC NEWSLETTER EDITORIAL STAFF

NEWSLETTER EDITOR

Cynthia D. Belar, Ph.D.  
Department of Clinical Psychology  
Box J-165, JHMHC  
University of Florida  
Gainesville, Florida 32610  
(904) 392-4551/4555

ASSOCIATE EDITOR: FORENSIC PSYCHOLOGY

Arthur A. Kramish, Ph.D.  
West Missouri Mental Health Center  
600 East 22nd Street  
Kansas City, Missouri 64108  
(816) 471-3000

ASSOCIATE EDITOR: INTERNATIONAL ISSUES

Eric Ellis, Ph.D.  
Section of Behavior Science  
Department of Psychiatry  
The University of Manitoba  
700 William Avenue  
Winnipeg, Manitoba R3E 0Z3  
Canada  
(204) 787-3873

ASSOCIATE EDITOR: HEALTH PSYCHOLOGY

Charles P. McCreary, Ph.D.  
Neuropsychiatric Institute  
The Center for the Health Sciences  
University of California, L.A.  
760 Westwood Plaza  
Los Angeles, California 90024  
(213) 825-0054

ASSOCIATE EDITOR: SETTING RELATED ISSUES

Robert H. Goldstein, Ph.D.  
Department of Psychiatry  
University of Rochester  
Medical Center  
300 Crittenden Boulevard  
Rochester, New York 14642  
(716) 275-3562/3112

ASSOCIATE EDITOR: GERONTOLOGY

J. M. Gaffney, Ph.D.  
Psychology Service  
VA Medical Center (116B)  
Knoxville, Iowa 50138  
(515) 842-3101 (x416)

ASSOCIATE EDITOR: POSTDOCTORAL ISSUES

William H. Smith, Ph.D.  
The Menninger Foundation  
Box 829  
Topeka, Kansas 66601  
(913) 273-7500

ASSOCIATE EDITOR: ADULT GENERAL

Charles S. Newmark, Ph.D.  
Division of Health Affairs  
Department of Psychiatry  
The School of Medicine  
University of North Carolina  
Chapel Hill, North Carolina 27514  
(919) 966-3376

ASSOCIATE EDITOR: NEUROPSYCHOLOGY

Linas Bieliauskas, Ph.D.  
Department of Psychology and  
Social Sciences  
Rush-Presbyterian-St. Luke's Medical Center  
1750 West Harrison Street  
Chicago, Illinois 60612  
(312) 942-5932

ASSOCIATE EDITOR: CHILD-CLINICAL

Arthur R. Orgel, Ph.D.  
Division of Psychology  
University of Rochester School of  
Medicine  
300 Crittenden Boulevard  
Rochester, New York 14642  
(715) 275-3603

REMARKS FROM THE CHAIR

This column concerns our oldest and perhaps most heated issue, uniform notification procedures. Many of you may recall the chaos that existed before the uniform notification procedures were instituted. It was largely to rectify the chaos that APIC was originally organized. Despite the episodic calls from some of our members to change the procedures in small ways this way or that, our membership has strongly supported the procedures over the years, and has made good-faith efforts to implement them in their own settings. Although there have been reports each year of violations of the procedures, such reports appeared to become fewer in number in recent years. In fact, last year there were more complaints of interns renegeing on their agreements than internship program violations.

This year it has been a different matter. Perhaps internship directors have become more anxious because the funding situation is tighter and more uncertain. I have received what I consider a large number of complaints from graduate students who felt they were treated poorly by internship directors, and from directors of doctoral training programs who reported that their students had been mistreated. In several instances I have followed up the complaints by requesting a response or explanation of the complaint from the internship directors involved. In most instances the complaint concerned unreasonable pressure on the applicant to respond before our agreed-upon deadline. The internship directors involved have acknowledged that they did panic under the admittedly stressful circumstances of holding onto good alternate candidates while waiting for applicants to respond to firm offers. Little more needs to be said about such violations of the procedures, except to remind ourselves that the process does arouse a considerable amount of anxiety, and that we must use good judgment in persuading applicants to make prompt decisions without coercing them. A level head and a cool demeanor should be the order of the day.

Undue pressure on applicants that comes out of the immediate anxiety and frustration of notification day, although clearly a violation of our procedures, is perhaps understandable and even may be forgivable. After all, some of the applicants are immature and exasperating. However, there are some practices that appear to be creeping into the notification process at some agencies that are not excusable in any sense. One that has come to my attention is the mailing of offers before the second Monday in February and pressuring applicants to respond before the deadline. This is a clear violation. It is unfair to applicants, it is unfair to colleagues who abide by our rules, and it threatens to throw us back to the dark ages before the uniform notification procedures, when year after year offers were made earlier and earlier.

A more subtle, but nevertheless unfair practice, is pressuring applicants to tell whether the internship program is the applicant's first choice. This is usually done on the phone or in an interview. Sometimes it is formalized in the application. For example, one application item reads, "If accepted at all the places you applied to, what would our program's rank be in your order of preference?" I have on my desk several other application blanks with similar questions. It is understandable that programs will want only applicants who are serious about them; however, it is unfair to the applicants to ask for the ranking because it creates a dilemma for them. If they respond truthfully with

Remarks from the Chair Continued

anything less than "1," they may not be considered further, and if they are not accepted by their number one choice, they are out in the cold. The question invites a dishonest answer or reduces the number of an applicant's applications to only one.

The APIC Executive Committee would like to know your thoughts on these matters. How can internship program directors get information that will help them make judgments about the earnestness of their applicants without appearing to pressure them into making premature and possibly irrevokable choices? How can we help our colleagues handle the stress of notification day without falling into panicky coercion? Do we need sanctions against colleagues who openly and willfully cheat on the procedures? What kind of sanctions would be appropriate? Please let me hear from you.

\* \* \* \* \*

Minutes of the Executive Committee Meeting

Washington, D.C.

February 21-22, 1983

I. Executive Committee Election

The Executive Committee terms of Drs. David Rice and Robert Silver expire in September 1983. Dr. Rice is not immediately eligible for re-election, and Dr. Silver expects to resign his incomplete term in April. Therefore, two Executive Committee seats need to be filled in the annual election this Spring. Ballots are to indicate institutional affiliations of candidates. It is hoped that this additional information will meet the needs of individuals who have had concerns with E. C. representation. Nominations will be due by June 1. Ballots will be mailed out by June 15, and will be due back by July 15.

II. Newsletter

APIC Newsletter Editor, Dr. Cynthia Belar, reported that the Newsletter had cost slightly less to publish than had originally been budgeted. She announced the fact that a forthcoming issue will carry a substantive contribution by Dr. Robert Tipton related to an evaluation of performance by interns trained in counseling psychology. The Newsletter welcomes the opportunity to publish original contributions to the field.

III. Directory

Directory Editor, Dr. Phillip Laughlin, reported to the E.C. on the few complaints received related either to non-receipt of the Directory or of failure of an institution to be listed in it. Suggestions related to increased meaningfulness of the Directory were considered. One such suggestion involved indexing the Directory by type of setting. The other suggestion would include the program application deadline and commencement dates in published information.

Minutes of the Executive Committee Meeting Continued

Further discussion included examination of the possibility of listing each center's total number of complete applications received per year. It was decided that the Postdoctoral Program listing would continue in the same form for next year. The E. C. decided to increase the cost of the Directory to \$10.00 per copy for nonmembers of APIC. (Please note the information update forms which appear elsewhere in the Newsletter.)

#### IV. Treasurer's Report

Consistent with a clear commitment to APIC's fiscal self-sufficiency agreed to by the membership at the 1982 annual meeting in Washington, Dr. Silver presented a fiscal year 1984 budget of \$24,800. This would have APIC paying the actual support costs of its activities fully, as opposed to continuing to be dependent upon support by E. C. members' institutions. To meet its actual fiscal responsibilities, Dr. Silver's recommendations of a dues increase to \$60 per year and an increase to \$10 per copy for the Directory (sale copies to nonmembers) were agreed to. (A copy of the budget appears elsewhere in the Newsletter.)

Effective April 30, 1983, Dr. Silver resigns the office of Secretary-Treasurer of APIC. He will be succeeded by Dr. Phillip R. Laughlin. Correspondence regarding the APIC Treasury should be addressed to Dr. Laughlin as follows:

Treasurer  
Association of Psychology Internship Centers, Inc.  
P. O. Box 574  
Knoxville, Iowa 50138

#### V. Clearinghouse

Activities of the APIC Clearinghouse have been shifted to the office of:

Dr. Kenneth S. Solway  
Psychology Department  
Texas Research Institute of Mental Sciences  
1300 Moursund  
Houston, TX 77030

Since the Mid-Winter E. C. Meeting follows too closely this year's common notification date, current data regarding the Clearinghouse operation were unavailable at the time of the meeting.

#### VI. Membership

APIC currently has 391 active members, with 6 new applications for membership pending. Six members have resigned since September 1982, and 9 members are slated to be dropped for nonpayment of dues.

Minutes of the Executive Committee Meeting Continued

VII. Recruiting Complaints

Dr. Kurz reported receipt of a total of three formal complaints against APIC members with regard to recruiting practices. While sanctions have been discussed in the past, this very small number of reported violations of APIC policies seemed to make further consideration of the issue unnecessary at this time.

VIII. Organization of APIC Functions

The possible future need for a central geographic location for conducting APIC business was considered. There did not appear to be sufficient current need for a change in operating structure.

IX. Postdoctoral Training

The E. C. will request a progress report from the task force on post-doctoral training issues, which was formed at the 1982 annual meeting.

X. New V.A. Hiring Policy

The V.A. is in the process of instituting a new policy with regard to qualifications for psychologist positions within the V.A. system. Essentially, the new policy will require that all new hires into permanent psychologist positions have been trained in both APA-approved graduate programs and in APA-approved internships. The potential impact of this policy upon APIC members was considered.

XI. 1983 Annual Meeting

Plans are for the 1983 Annual Meeting in Anaheim to again include a program related to issues in predoctoral field training in psychology. Tentative plans involve a panel discussion---"Psychological Stresses on Psychology Interns: Implications for Training Directors." The program is to be offered in addition to the usual business meeting.

XII. Guidelines for Internship Programs

The need for APIC to offer leadership in the development of some minimal basic guidelines defining the existence of an internship program was discussed. Consideration will be given to adoption of the criteria of the National Register.

XIII. Joint Meeting with Executive Committees of Other Training Groups

A large number of interests which APIC shares with groups representing training in clinical, counseling, school, and community psychology were discussed in a large group forum hosted by the APIC E. C. The following are representative of the issues discussed.

-the nature of the current intern recruitment process



Minutes of the Executive Committee Meeting Continued

- current manpower status
- a uniform application blank
- limiting the number of applications by each candidate
- candidates "sitting on" multiple offers
- the actual level of pressure on candidates
- minimum requirements for internship readiness
- feedback to graduate programs on interns' progress
- placement agreements between directors of graduate training and directors of internship training

In light of the foregoing, it was agreed that APIC would take responsibility for providing the directors of graduate programs with timely information regarding each year's anticipated number of internship slots. It is anticipated that this will take place annually at the APA Meeting.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert J. Silver, Ph.D.  
Secretary-Treasurer

\* \* \* \* \*

Don't forget to update  
your Directory entry.

Association of Psychology Internship Centers

Budget Projection

February 16, 1983

Item of Expense	FY '82		FY '83		FY '84
	ACTUAL	BUDGETED	ACTUAL	BUDGETED	
<u>Directory</u>	\$6,292	\$7,000	\$4,610	\$8,950	
<u>Newsletter</u>	1,200	1,350	631	1,475	
E.C. Travel					
Annual Meeting	1,655	1,500	1,311	2,050	
Mid-Winter Meeting	3,432	3,000	330	3,300	
E & T Liaison	547	100	0	150	
Office Support (sec'y., equip., supplies)	0	0	0	4,875	
Miscellaneous (including legal & CPA fees)	875	2,000	906	2,000	
Reserve	0	50	50	2,000	
<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>\$13,983</u>	<u>\$15,000</u>	<u>\$7,838</u>	<u>\$24,800</u>	

\*\*\*\*\*

Revenue Recommendation

Fiscal Year 1984

Dues increase to \$60 (80% collection rate) . . . . .	\$19,200
<u>Directory sales</u> (increase price to \$10 per copy) . . . . .	5,175
Miscellaneous . . . . .	800
	<u>\$25,175</u>

## ACCREDITATION CONSULTATION AVAILABLE

If directors of doctoral training programs and predoctoral internships in professional psychology are thinking about making application for APA accreditation, the Committee on Accreditation recommends that the following consultation steps be taken prior to formal application:

Step 1: Call the Accreditation Office at (202) 833-7691 and request a copy of the Accreditation Handbook. The Handbook, which is free of charge, provides a detailed description of the accreditation process, and includes as appendices the following: the Procedures (rules by which accreditation is administered), the Criteria for Accreditation (standards with which programs must demonstrate sufficient compliance in order to become accredited), and the necessary application forms for both doctoral and internship training programs.

Step 2: After receipt of the Handbook, responsible program officials should carefully review its contents. Program officials should then call staff of the APA Accreditation Office to seek clarification on any matters in reference to the operation of the accreditation process and the interpretation of specific criteria.

Step 3: The program should complete its own self-study by faculty, students, and administration.

Step 4: The program should complete a draft application.

Step 5: The program is advised at this point to invite a consultant of its choosing to review the program. By contacting staff of the APA Accreditation Office, assistance can be provided the program director in identifying possible consultants from among a large pool of psychologists with accreditation site visit experience. After receipt of the list of such possible consultants, the program makes its own arrangements for the pre-accreditation site visit, including payment of the fee charged by the consultant.

Step 6: If the program chooses to have a consultant site visit, the Committee recommends that the program provide the consultant with a copy of the "draft" application completed in Step 4 above. The Consultant should review the "draft" application, and then conduct an on-site evaluation of the program as if it were a "for real" accreditation site visit. Suggested schedules for site visits are available in Appendix E of the Handbook. After the consultation visit, the consultant should provide the program with a site visit report using the guidelines outlined in the Handbook.

Step 7: After receipt of the consultant's report, the program should contact staff of the Accreditation Office to discuss any matters of concern it may have in reference to its compliance with the Criteria.

Since the consultant's report is the property of the program, it may or may not elect to include the report as an appendix to the formal application for APA accreditation (Step 8 below). If the program decides to include the report as part of its accreditation application, the Committee recommends that a response be prepared which addresses any matters of concern noted by the

Accreditation Consultation Available Continued

consultant. This will provide the Committee with a complete record of information regarding the consultant's visit, and the content and organizational operation of the program. Also, it affords program officials opportunity to fully experience an accreditation "dry-run."

Step 8: The program makes formal application for APA accreditation when it feels it is ready (i.e., it considers itself to be in sufficient compliance with the Criteria, and has prepared the evidence by which to so convince the Committee on Accreditation).

Please remember that consultation is provided by the APA Accreditation Office staff throughout the accreditation process. Such consultation, though, should not be interpreted as bearing APA approval of a program relative to the Criteria for Accreditation of this Association. Rather, it is one part of the process by which doctoral programs and predoctoral internships in professional psychology can become better informed about, and more in compliance with, standard procedures and criteria of accreditation maintained by the American Psychological Association. As a final note, programs should remember that the Committee on Accreditation wants to INCLUDE them in the APA accreditation system, not EXCLUDE them. The initiative for application, however, just as the burden of responsibility for program development and for documenting program compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation, rests ultimately with the program.

\* \* \* \* \*

EVALUATION OF COUNSELING PSYCHOLOGY INTERNS: A SURVEY

Robert M. Tipton  
Virginia Commonwealth University

In 1972 the American Psychological Association stopped making a distinction between counseling and clinical internship programs. One implication of this was that interns would be selected on the basis of the fit between their academic training and experience, and the needs and goals of the internship programs rather than the name of the academic programs. A number of internship sites, however, continue to specify that they will accept applications only from students enrolled in clinical programs. The issue is further clouded by the fact that many of these internship programs that advertise that they will only take clinical students do in fact actually accept students from counseling programs.

At its 1982 winter meeting in Washington, the Board of the Council of Counseling Psychology Training Programs (CCPTP) met with the Executive Committee of the Association of Psychology Internship Centers (APIC) to discuss some matters of mutual concern. One of the key issues addressed in that session concerned the viability of students from counseling psychology programs at the more traditionally clinical internship sites. Although there was much anecdotal input about this issue, no "hard data" were available as to the preparation for internship and effectiveness of the performance of students from counseling

## Evaluation of Counseling Psychology Interns: A Survey Continued

psychology programs at these sites. The outcome of this discussion was that the CCPTP Board would conduct a survey to evaluate students from counseling psychology programs who are doing internships at more traditionally clinical internship sites. These evaluations were to focus on students' preparation for internship as well as their performance in the various programs. For purposes of comparison, interns from a range of internship settings were evaluated.

### The Survey

Program directors of the 49 counseling psychology training programs listed as members of CCPTP were contacted and asked to participate in the survey. The task of the program directors was to contact the training directors at the internship sites at which they had students placed and request that evaluation forms be completed on their students. After receiving the completed evaluations from the internship sites, the program directors were to return them to the survey coordinator.

Twenty-three of the 49 training program directors (47%) participated in the survey (i.e., returned one or more completed evaluation forms). A total of 76 completed evaluation forms were returned for a mean of 3.3 evaluations per program. Based on an average of 6.6 students per academic program on internship in 1981-82 (Alcorn & Nicholas, Note 1), this represents a 50% return rate by internship sites.

The greatest number of interns rated (N=36; 47%) were interning at university counseling centers. V.A. hospitals had the 2nd highest number of evaluations returned (N=15, 20%). A fewer number of interns were rated from what might be considered somewhat more traditionally "clinical" internship sites: CMHC (N=8, 11%); university medical centers (N=8, 11%); private mental hospitals (N=4, 5%); and miscellaneous (N=5, 6%). Based on a comparison with figures from the 1982-83 CCPTP survey (Alcorn & Nicholas, Note 1), it can be concluded that the proportion of interns evaluated from university counseling psychology programs actually doing internships at these sites and students evaluated from V.A. hospitals were proportionately somewhat less well represented. The numbers of students evaluated from the other sites are approximately proportionate to the numbers actually interning at these sites.

The evaluation form required supervisors to rate each intern in terms of his or her ability to perform 21 different professional activities using a seven point rating scale ranging from 1= very poor to 7= outstanding. Examples of professional activities on which interns were rated included short-term counseling/therapy (c/t) (6 sessions or fewer); intermediate term c/t (7 to 15 sessions); long-term c/t (16 sessions or more); marriage c/t, use of objective personality tests, use of projective techniques, etc. To conserve space the results of the ratings of the interns' performance of the 21 professional activities at the 5 types of internship sites will be summarized. Overall there were very few differences on any of the 21 activities among the internship sites with the exception that there was a tendency for students doing internship sites at university counseling centers to consistently receive mean ratings in the range of .10 to .25 lower (across the 21 activities) than students

Evaluation of Counseling Psychology Interns: A Survey Continued

at the other 4 sites. This tendency probably reflects slightly more stringent ratings by supervisors at university counseling centers rather than any overall difference between interns at counseling centers and interns at the other sites. Mean ratings for students' performance of the professional activities at the 5 types of internship sites tended to cluster in the 5.25 to 5.50 range, or somewhere between very good and excellent on the rating scale. The most notable exceptions to this was ratings on neurological assessment which was consistently quite low. The use of projective techniques also tended to receive lower ratings, but these ratings were more variable than the consistently low ratings on neurological assessment. It is noteworthy that students at university counseling centers also were rated considerably lower than students at the other sites on other assessment procedures including use of objective personality tests and use of intelligence tests. One possible interpretation of these findings is that students seeking internships at counseling centers are not interested in assessment and tend not to develop their skills in this area.

In addition to performance ratings on specific activities, the evaluation form also required supervisors to give a global rating, using the same 7-point scale, of each intern's overall performance and a rating of his or her preparation for doing an internship at that particular site. Table 1 indicates that, in terms of "overall performance" and "preparation for internship" interns were generally rated in the very good to excellent range across all five internship settings. It is noteworthy that counseling psychology interns were rated at least as high on overall performance and preparation as the more traditionally clinical internship training sites as they were at the traditional counseling internship sites.

In summary, although the size of intern sample is not large, the results suggest that counseling psychology interns tend to be rated favorably across a broad range of professional activities. The exceptions to this are the ratings of interns' "neurological assessment" and "use of projective techniques." These ratings reflect the fact that training in these areas is often not a part of the counseling psychology curriculum. On the other hand, many counseling psychology students have apparently developed good basic assessment skills prior to internship sometimes including projectives and neurological assessment. These data suggest that many counseling psychology students are prepared to enter internships in a broad range of settings and their readiness should be evaluated on an individual rather than a categorical basis.

Table 1

Mean Ratings of Interns' Overall Performance and Preparation for Internship

	Counseling Centers	Pvt. Mental Hospitals	Vet. Admin. Hospitals	Univ. Med. Centers	CHMCs
Overall Performance	5.57	5.25	5.86	5.50	6.14
Preparation for Internship	4.79	5.00	5.33	5.38	5.86

Evaluation of Counseling Psychology Interns: A Survey Continued

Reference Note

1. Alcorn, J.D. & Nicholas, D. 1982 Survey of Counseling Psychology Programs by the Board of the Council of Counseling Psychology Training Programs, 1982.

\*\*\*\*\*

NEWSWORTHY NOTES

Letter to the Editor:

After finally recovering from my red eyes reviewing a slew of applications, I came away thinking that there must be a better way. While it is flattering to get a number of completed applications, the fact is many interns are applying to 10-15 settings. Obviously the motivation to do so is to relieve anxiety and to feel some security in numbers. However, it is quite expensive for the agencies to process the materials - professional and clinical time, postage and phone calls. I would like to suggest that APIC endorse an application fee of five to ten dollars. The point is not to make money or even break even, but to reimburse some of the costs as well-as to discourage shotgun applications. My suggestion is that this matter be placed on the agenda of a future APIC meeting for discussion.

Jeffrey B. Hersh, Ph.D.  
 Assistant Director  
 Mental Health Service  
 University of Massachusetts/Amherst

The new APIC Clearinghouse Director is:  
 Kenneth Solway, Ph.D.

T.R.I.M.S.  
 1300 Mournsund  
 Texas Medical Center  
 Houston, Texas 77030

Many thanks to Bob Silver, who has served for years in this capacity and whose contributions have been appreciated by centers, applicants, and graduate programs alike.

\*\*\*\*\*

Don't forget to update  
 your Directory entry.

COMMENTS FROM THE NEWSLETTER EDITORS

One of the issues I heard raised at the midwinter meeting of executive committees of training directors concerned what was perceived as a lack of communication between internship centers and training directors. Another issue raised again, and which I had mentioned in last Spring's newsletter, was the question of whether a uniform application would be feasible. Internship centers were also encouraged to make explicit their interviewing policies.

Don't forget your directory update, dues notice, and call for nominations!

\* \* \* \* \*

FROM THE ADULT GENERAL EDITOR:

While the internship notification process seems inherently stressful and time-consuming, the guidelines imposed again this year served to keep these two variables to a minimum. Nevertheless, I was notified by several applicants regarding violations by training directors. These violations primarily involved early phone calls in an attempt to discern whether the applicants would accept if an offer was made. Unfortunately, most applicants are reluctant to report these violations to APIC for fear of retaliation. Perhaps, APIC needs to more actively promote and encourage applicants to report violations without fear of reprisal.

Our internship program has been most impressed by the application procedures followed by Georgia State University. Their policy permits each intern applicant to apply only to four training sites, with no two interns being permitted to apply to the same site. Applicants then are encouraged to visit all four training sites. Following these visits, the applicant discusses with the clinical training director the assets and liabilities of each program. Training sites are ranked and the first choices are informed by both a phone call and a follow-up letter. If the applicant receives an offer on the uniform notification day from the first choice, the offer must be accepted. Then, the other training sites are contacted immediately and informed of the decision. Such a procedure facilitates the completion of the internship notification process in a highly professional and relatively stress free manner, while simultaneously prohibiting applicants from being deceptive with regard to the rankings of each training site. In my opinion, it would be quite beneficial if all graduate school psychology training programs adhered to this model.

The efforts of several colleagues and I to conduct an investigation evaluating the internship experiences for unfunded interns proved futile. Only two training directors agreed to distribute questionnaires to their unfunded interns. Obviously, this lack of cooperation precludes completing the project.

Charles S. Newmark, Ph.D.  
Associate Editor



FROM THE FORENSIC EDITOR:

A short inquiry from graduate students revealed that very few university doctoral programs offer an exposure to forensic psychology. Perhaps one of the problems is in locating staff that have appropriate training and certified experience in the field. One student intern described his exposure as one by an associate professor who had an interest, did considerable reading in the field but could not speak from actual experience. The minimal amount of exposure reveals that the faculty member has no understanding of the legal complexities, and the philosophies or attitudes that come forth from the legal establishment, and the procedures.

It is the experience of this training center (Western Missouri Mental Health Center), in the applications for internship, that there is a growing interest in forensic psychology, and the fact that such experience may be gained at the center is one of the factors in selecting the site.

This Editor would like to solicit feedback from other training sites about this interest, and what the university provides or offers the student in the academics of forensic psychology. It would appear that practicing forensic psychologists might be utilized at the university level to provide practical experience to clinical and counseling psychology students, and perhaps these practicing forensic psychologists could receive some kind of faculty appointment for programs of instruction in the field. Since the field has its fascination and challenge, exposure to students would certainly help to screen out those who do not have the ability to work with criminal cases, or to relate to the legal profession and the courts. It is an unfortunate fact that many professional psychologists and psychiatrists find themselves serving the forensic client, and the courts, without the background and experience needed to deal with it. Some forensic clients, and in the assessment of the criminal mind. Let's face it. Some psychologists and psychiatrists bungle in these relationships. The news media point to this very vividly. Clinicians must realize that forensic clients do not fit the clinical mold of most outpatient or inpatient clients seen in clinics or hospitals.

Recently an APIC Directory survey revealed that of the APA approved internship facilities, 64 checked that they provide forensic clients; 71 do not. Sixteen non-APA training sites checked that forensic clients were served; 52 checked "no." One hundred forty-two training sites (APA and non-APA) left the item blank. As the Forensic Editor, I would appreciate receiving information from both the APA and non-APA sites who have indicated that forensic clients are served. Perhaps these sites will provide the nature of their exposures or programs. It would be helpful to publicize those forensic programs that have structured training in one of the APIC Newsletter issues in the future. Since the APIC Newsletter receives wide distribution, this information would certainly appear to be helpful to many.

Arthur A. Kramish, Ph.D.  
Associate Editor

FROM THE POSTDOCTORAL ISSUES EDITOR:

Psychologists having completed doctoral programs seek postdoctoral training for various reasons. Most are concerned about the level of clinical expertise they have reached and want further preparation before functioning independently. Further training, they hope, will accelerate their career development through refinement of their skills and widening or deepening of their knowledge base. Additional "credentials" may also be thought to help in the eventual realization of professional goals. While timidity or inhibition about taking one's place in the professional world may occasionally be a significant ingredient in the decision to prolong student status (and income), the decision to apply for formal, advanced training typically is made with sober recognition of the time it actually takes to achieve genuine clinical competence.

Full-time training appeals to some, part-time to others. Programs which are "generic" or at least multifaceted attract some students, more focused training draws others. Advanced training in such areas as neuropsychology, individual or group psychotherapy, gerontology, family therapy, or clinical research understandably is sought by new or even older graduates who feel a keen interest in focusing their careers in such emphasis areas. Indeed, one of the real problems facing our profession at this point in time is how much "specialization" should be done at the graduate and professional school level, including the internship, and how much at the postdoctoral level.

Another serious issue facing us is that of respecialization, career shifts from one area of psychology to another, especially when it involves one of the applied areas of clinical, counseling, school, and industrial/organizational psychology. Some states are apparently willing to allow any Ph.D. in psychology who meets certain experience and supervision requirements to sit for their exam and "become" clinical or counseling psychologists. Should postdoctoral training centers endorse and support this practice, perhaps even establishing formal respecialization programs? Or should they staunchly oppose such practices and give training only to those who hold doctoral degrees in the specific area of training sought, insisting that universities and professional schools are the only legitimate institutions for preparing professional psychologists in applied areas?

It would seem that clear agreements on such issues between the APA, state credentialing boards, doctoral programs, and postdoctoral training centers would be to everyone's advantage.

William H. Smith, Ph.D.  
Associate Editor

\* \* \* \* \*

FROM THE EDITOR FOR SETTING-RELATED ISSUES:

Dr. James Archer, Jr., Director of the Psychological and Vocational Counseling Center at the University of Florida, has been appointed Liaison Representative to APIC from the Association of University and College Counseling Center Directors (AUCCCD). Dr. Archer's function as Liaison Representative is to

From the Editor for Setting-Related Issues Continued

facilitate communication between APIC and AUCCCD and to represent the interests of counseling center training programs. The 41 predoctoral college counseling center internship sites currently listed in the APIC Directory constitute about 12% of the membership.

Any staff members at counseling center training sites who have issues they would like to raise with APIC or who have information they would like to disseminate are urged to contact Dr. Archer at 311 Little Hall, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL 32611, telephone (904) 392-1575.

An invitation has recently been extended to heads of psychology programs in medical schools across the U.S. to affiliate with the new Association of Medical School Psychology Professors which was organized at the 1982 APA meeting in Washington. It is hoped that this group will give APIC members working in medical school settings an important opportunity to have a greater impact on institutional issues affecting psychology's role in these settings. Members wishing more information about this may contact: Dr. Robert Thompson, Department of Psychiatry, Duke University Medical Center, Durham, NC 27710.

There is some indication that psychology internship programs in state hospital settings have been adversely affected, or even eliminated, as a result of recent budget-cutting steps which states have been forced to take. It will be important for information regarding this to be collected quickly so as to assess what effect national and state budgetary stringencies are having on internship training. Members who have undergone such experiences, or are aware of other similar situations, are urged to send word of this to APIC.

Robert H. Goldstein, Ph.D.  
Associate Editor

\*\*\*\*\*

FROM THE HEALTH PSYCHOLOGY EDITOR:

The Society for Behavioral Medicine recently concluded its annual convention held in Baltimore, Maryland. The meeting consisted of three days in early March focusing on institutes, workshops, papers, and poster sessions. The theme of the meeting was Behavioral Medicine in Industry. There was an especially informative poster session on behavioral medicine training programs. Well over twenty training programs were described. Programs had different emphases on research and clinical experiences. A description of the programs can be found in the program abstracts. It may be possible to contact the Society of Behavioral Medicine to obtain a copy of the abstracts. The address is: The Society of Behavioral Medicine, P.O. Box 8530, University Station, Knoxville, TN 37996.

Don't forget to update  
your Directory entry.

From the Health Psychology Editor Continued

This newsletter will attempt to describe one innovative program for training in behavioral medicine and invites APIC members to submit descriptions of their programs for inclusion in the newsletter. Vicki Beggs, Ph.D. has recently submitted a description of the clinical psychology internship in behavioral medicine at the Boston University Medical Center. The internship includes a wide variety of clinical training experiences with psychophysiological and health related disorders, as well as behavioral and psychological disorders in outpatient, inpatient, and consultation settings. The internship also includes weekly didactic and clinical conferences, consultation with health care providers from a variety of disciplines, and clinical research. Training in therapeutic interventions includes an integration of biofeedback, behavioral therapy, hypnosis, pain management, and more traditional psychotherapeutic approaches.

Assessment training is provided and assessment strategies frequently include behavioral analysis, self-monitoring, physiological profiling, as well as more traditional assessment instruments such as the MMPI and WAIS. Applications are accepted from students in graduate programs in clinical psychology, professional psychology, counseling psychology, and health psychology. It should be noted that the program is housed within a Department of Biobehavioral Sciences which is one of seven departments within the Division of Psychiatry in the Boston University School of Medicine. The department is headed by a psychologist, Lyle H. Miller, Ph.D., and a majority of the faculty members within the department are psychologists. More information about the program can be obtained from Vicki E. Beggs, Ph.D., Department of Biobehavioral Sciences, Boston University Medical Center, 85 East Newton Street, Boston, MA 02118.

Charles P. McCreary, Ph.D.  
Associate Editor