Chair’s Column

BY NADINE J. KASLOW, PH.D., ABPP

I am writing this column on a historic day in the life of APPIC, Monday, February 22, 1999, APPIC Match Day.

This day could not have been possible without the ground breaking efforts of the creators of the original APPIC computer match, Drs. Sanford Pedersen, Bernhard Blom, and Robert Klepac; the hard word work, creative problem solving, and dedication of the members of the computer match committee, Drs. Peggy Cantrell, Nancy Garfield, Jerry Leventhal, Gordon Williams, and Pat Hollander; the patience, creativity, conscientiousness, and meticulousness of Elliot Peranson and his colleagues at the National Matching Services (NMS); and the support and participation of all match participants (training directors at internship sites and graduate programs, and intern applicants). But, it goes without saying that the glue that held this process together and that made the computer match happen and work was Dr. Greg Keilin, Chair of the Computer Match Committee. Words can not begin to express my gratitude toward and respect for Greg, nor the tremendous appreciation that the entire internship training community, including internship training directors, intern applicants, and graduate school faculty feels toward Greg. Greg devoted much of his life, including many hours when the rest of us were asleep, to making this match a success. He took the time to thoughtfully address each issue that emerged, large or small, directly or indirectly related.
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Remarks from the Editor: UND PTSD

BY ROBERT W. GOLDBERG, PH.D., ABPP, FAClinP

On February 8, the second Monday in February, I found myself drifting into nostalgic reverie about Uniform Notification Day. Through a rosy haze, I seemed to recall the warm camaraderie of our doughnut-stuffed training committee confidently poised at the telephones to make offers and the grandiose feelings of competitive triumph at each applicant acceptance. But, suddenly, shocking flashbacks of cold past realities began to intrude:

— My first year as training director with only 19 applicants for my 9 slots
— The year of ‘early decisions’ when most of my applicants had accepted elsewhere 9 days before UND
— The sleepless dread of not filling slots
— The ice storm when I could not get to work before call time
— Busy signals when calling applicants
— Dead phone lines
— Making an extra offer without the money and praying for an applicant to turn us down
— Training committee arguments over which applicant should get the next offer
— Risking incontinence to stay at the phones
— Fear and loathing during hours of ‘gridlock’
— Disappointment and narcissistic hurt feelings at rejection from my favorite applicant
— Impotent rage at obvious, but undocumented, UND policy violations by rogue DOT’s
— Panic at confessing to my chief that we had to use the Clearinghouse
— Sick relief when the last slot was filled

So banish your nostalgic distortions of ‘APPIC Monday!’ Can you possibly still think that those were the ‘good old days?’

Welcome, APPIC Computer Match!
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The Association of Psychology Postdoctoral and Internship Centers (APPIC) was formed in 1968 to foster the sharing of information about mutual concerns and to provide a uniform voice with respect to pre- and postdoctoral internship training and the issues concerning the seriously mentally ill. We publish a newsletter three times per year for our members. We are recognized by APA as the primary organization to consult about internship training. Since our inception, we have maintained a formal liaison with APA’s Education Directorate.

We publish an annual Directory of Internship and Postdoctoral Programs in Professional Psychology, which is intended in part as a service to students. Approximately 1,500 copies of the Directory are now distributed each year. The Directory is updated every year in late summer, and is free to APPIC members.

We also are responsible for establishing with our members a standardized procedure and a uniform date and time span for matching internship applicants and internship programs. The procedural guidelines are published annually in both the Newsletter and the APPIC Directory.

In addition, APPIC operates a Clearinghouse to facilitate the placement of unmatched predoctoral internship applicants with unfilled positions at APPIC member programs. The Clearinghouse starts its operation after the Uniform Notification date for predoctoral matching. Please see the current APPIC Directory for detailed information on the Clearinghouse.

APPIC Membership is by institution rather than by individual. In order to be a member of APPIC, an internship program must be one year full-time or two years half time, accept only applicants enrolled in a regionally accredited doctoral degree granting program in professional psychology, be directed by a licensed professional psychologist, meet other relevant membership criteria, and provide annual updates of descriptions of its program for the APPIC Directory.

Membership dues are $400 for pre-doctoral internship programs, $600 for free-standing post-doctoral training programs, and $850 for pre-doctoral and post-doctoral programs at the same agency/institution. Application fees are $250 per application. Non-APA-accredited internship programs, and post-doctoral training programs are reviewed in order to determine whether they meet APPIC membership criteria. For further information write to APPIC, c/o Ms. Connie Hercey, MPA, 733 15th Street, NW, Suite 719, Washington, D.C., 20005, or call 202/347-0022.
We are pleased to report that a total of 2,413 applicants were successfully matched to internship positions. Nearly half (46%) of all matched applicants received their top-ranked choice of internship site, two-thirds (66%) received one of their top two choices, and nearly 4-in-5 (78%) received one of their top three choices.

A total of 510 applicants were not matched to an internship position, while 218 positions remained unfilled. In addition, 212 applicants withdrew from the Match or did not submit Ranks (we believe that some of these withdrawn applicants were rejected from all of their sites, and thus may also be considered “unplaced”). Comparing this data to previous years is difficult because of the limited prior data available. We hope that the more precise data provided by the Matching Program will contribute to the ongoing dialogue about Supply and Demand issues. APPIC will be conducting additional research on these issues, and data will be distributed in the coming weeks and months as it becomes available.

Instructions for using the APPIC Clearinghouse are available at:
http://www.appic.org/i01chouse.html
or by sending email to:
chouse-instruct@lyris.appic.org

We invite you to review the Match statistics presented below. Some items designated with a “*” require cautious interpretation, and are followed by additional clarifying information.

APPIC Board of Directors
Greg Keilin, Ph.D., Match Committee Chair

INTERNSHIP PROGRAMS

Positions Offered in the Matching Program 2,631

Match Results
Positions:
Filled in the Match 2,413 (92%)
Remaining Unfilled 218* (8%)

Programs:
Filled in the Match 812 (86%)
With Unfilled Positions 136 (14%)

*NOTE: Please use caution when comparing this number to Clearinghouse data from previous years. It is likely that, in previous years, many positions that were unfilled on Uniform Notification Day were NOT registered with the APPIC Clearinghouse. For example, some positions were registered with the ACCTA Clearinghouse, while others were likely filled via non-Clearinghouse methods.

NOTE: No ranks were submitted for 8 positions, which remained unfilled.

RANKINGS
Average number of Applicants Ranked Per Position Offered for Each Program:
Programs Filling All Positions 8.7
Programs With Unfilled Positions 3.9
All Programs 8.0

Each Registered Applicant Was Ranked by an Average of 6.0 Different Programs.

APPLICATIONS
Participation
Applicants Registered in the Matching program 3,135
Applicants Who Withdrew or Did Not Submit Ranks 212
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related to the match process. Greg communicated effectively with all of us about the details of the match process in an ongoing, informative, and comprehensible manner. He was ingenious in his efforts to solve the various and often complex dilemmas that accompanied the match process. He attended to all the small details, without ever losing the forest through the trees. And he did so by being delightful, available, and incredibly responsive to the myriad needs of the internship training community. Lest it sound like I think Greg walks on water, well I do. So, Greg, I want to publicly say THANK YOU from all of us. If you want to say thanks to Greg personally, apparently the way to his heart is via a recipe for chicken piccata. So email those to, gekelin@mail.utexas.edu

So, how did the computer match go? Was it a success? Or, as I prefer to think of it, was it “good enough”? Wimnicott reminded us often that it is not reasonable for parents to be perfect, just “good enough” (which is a lot better than average). So too, it is not realistic for the match to have been perfect and go without a hitch, just “good enough”. When one of the NMS servers went down as the match process started, we all got anxious. But, it was fixed quickly, and within 45 minutes, virtually everyone had their results. Thus, this was a minor glitch, not a real problem with the system, a good example of something that was “good enough.” And, I am confident that NMS will have a detailed explanation of this problem in the near future, as well as a solution to the problem for future years. From all informal reports, NMS did an outstanding job of sending out materials, answering questions, and accurately recording match lists, etc. But, most importantly, the match ran effectively and to date there have been very few reports from applicants or sites questioning the accuracy or validity of the match process. This suggests that it was indeed a “good enough” process.

Now was the match a success? Well, the response to this is in the eyes of the beholder and until we have your survey input, it is somewhat premature to answer the question. But, I will do my best to begin to address the question. If you were one of the 83% of applicants (n = 2,413) who matched it was a success, particularly if you were one of the 46% who received your first choice, 66% who received one of your top two choices, or 78% who will be going to one of your top three choices. Conversely, if you were one of the 510 applicants who did not get a position, you may feel like the match was a failure. Hopefully, many of you will be able to secure an internship position through the APPIC Clearinghouse, under the skillful and effective direction of Dr. Gordon Williams, or via other resources (e.g., ACCTA Clearinghouse). The 510 persons who were not matched by the computer and the subgroup (preliminary data suggests a relatively small percentage) of the 212 individuals who withdrew from the match because they knew they would not be ranked by any site are reminders of the significant supply and demand imbalance problem in psychology, rather than representatives of a problem with the computer match system per se. As a training community, we need to devote more resources to addressing the supply and demand problem as it relates to the securing of internships for all qualified applicants. In this regard, I hope that we pursue many of the recommendations from the APPIC/APA Conference on Supply and Demand: Training and Employment Issues in Professional Psychology, the proceedings of which are now available. One of the most frequently asked questions is how does the 510 number (plus some percentage of the 212 number) compare to prior years. That remains unclear, as this is the first year we have such complete data. However, in years to come, we will be able to gather data on this issue and we will conduct research to identify and follow trends regarding those who match and those who do not. This information will guide us in our problem-solving regarding the supply and demand problem as it relates to the internship experience. It should be noted that whether or not an applicant was placed, the general experience of most applicants was that compared to what their more senior peers had experienced, they were pressured less by sites to indicate their level of interest in the site and logging into the computer and seeing their match was a lot less stressful than call day had been. These are other indicators that this system was a significant improvement over the uniform notification day of past years.

Of course, we also must ask how successful the match was from the perspective of internship programs. The success rate for filling positions was quite high, 92%, as 2,413 positions were filled in the match. However, if you were one of the programs that had one of the 218 unfilled slots, you may have been unsatisfied with the match. Unless of course, you are pleased with the intern applicant you were able to match with through the Clearinghouse or other connections. Gathering statistics on how sites did with regard to the match is an extremely complex undertaking. Three of our computer geniuses, Greg, Gordon, and Elliot developed an elaborate methodology for accessing this information by using standardized rankings. According to this procedure, 38% of sites got their top ranked applicants, 63% of sites got their top 2 applicants per slot, and 79% filled with their third choice applicants or better. How does this compare to prior years? Again, we do not know. We are hoping to begin to answer this question and many more with your responses to the APPIC Match Survey recently sent your way. So, please complete these surveys as thoroughly and thoughtfully as possible and return them in a timely fashion. Data from internship training directors, graduate school directors of training, and a random sample of intern applicants will be used to evaluate the success of this year’s members as well as to inform our discussions about how to improve upon this year’s computer match. Thus, your input is invaluable to us in this process.

So, our initial impressions of the match, based on informal feedback only, are that this match went extremely well. We accomplished our goal, which was to develop and implement a computer match program that was fair, accurate, and responsive to the needs of the participants. While we certainly experienced some glitches along the way, and know that there are some things that need to be changed, by and large the process went relatively smoothly. Of course, the final assessment of the match will be determined by the survey feedback that we receive from our members, subscribers, and intern applicants, and thus we eagerly await your input. In addition, as we receive feedback from you via surveys and other research related questionnaires, we will provide you with updates on what we have learned.

Although the computer match has consumed much of APPIC’s energy and attention, there are many other activities in which APPIC is actively engaged. First and foremost, is our upcoming membership meeting in Orlando, Florida to be held March 25 through March 27. The Membership Conference Committee, under the leadership of Drs. Kathleen Boggs and Carl Zimet, have put together an outstanding and varied
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program. I look forward to seeing many of you in sunny Florida for our second membership conference. The conference will provide another forum for our members and subscribers to provide us input on future directions for APPIC. A second major focus of our efforts has been revising the APPIC Application for Psychology Internships (AAPI), a process that is spearheaded by Dr. Nancy Garfield. In addition to revising the AAPI, based on feedback that we have received and will continue to solicit from representatives of all concerned parties, we will work hard to make the AAPI even more computer user friendly this year. A third major priority area for us is the conduct of research on topics related to internship and postdoctoral training. Many of you have contacted us regarding possible avenues for research, and Dr. Emil Rodolfa and I, as co-chairs of APPIC’s newly forming research committee, look forward to collaborating with many of you in the research arena. A fourth area of attention has been on enhancing our understanding of consortia. As consortia at both the predoctoral and postdoctoral level become more popular, in large part due to market forces, we need to develop clearer guidelines for consortia. A consortium task force has been established to aid in this process. These are but a few of our major undertakings at this time. For more frequent updates about APPIC, please log into our website, and enroll on our listservs.

In closing, I want to reiterate the APPIC Board’s desire to hear from our members and subscribers and to remain in ongoing dialogue with you about salient issues related to internship and postdoctoral training. Please feel free to contact any of us to discuss these matters. I can be reached at nkaslow@emory.edu and am committed to doing my best to have APPIC be as responsive as possible to each of you.

APPIC Match Report #2:
Summary of Program Rankings

FEBRUARY 28, 1999

A number of internship sites requested additional statistics on how successful programs were, on average, in matching with applicants. There are several important issues that must be considered in attempting to analyze program success based on the rank numbers of matched applicants.

DEFINITIONAL PROBLEMS

Because each applicant submitted a single Rank Order List in order to match to a single position, it is easy to identify his or her “first choice,” “second choice,” etc. However, for an internship program, determining first or second choice applicants is a far more difficult and complex task. First, many programs attempt to fill several positions; if a program has three positions to fill, an applicant ranked third by that program can in effect be considered a “first choice” for purposes of the match. Furthermore, a significant number of sites submitted multiple Rank Order Lists for a single program, sometimes ranking the same applicant on different Lists with different rank numbers. Also, the reversion of unfilled positions between lists adds a further complication to this analysis.

We worked closely with National Matching Services in an attempt to resolve these difficulties and to develop a reasonable method of presenting this data.

STANDARDIZED RANKINGS

For the purposes of this analysis, we converted each site’s rankings to a “standardized rank.” This is best explained by example: if the number of positions to be filled from a Rank Order List was three, then the first three applicants on this List were considered to be “first choice” applicants and given a standardized rank of 1. The next three applicants on that List were defined as “second choice” applicants and given a standardized rank of 2. And so on.

Match Results by Standardized Rank on Internship Program List (percentages do not total 100 due to rounding errors):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standardized Rank</th>
<th># of Applicants Matched</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>913 (38%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>601 (25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>391 (16%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>220 (9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>136 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>57 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>36 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>24 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>9 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 or higher</td>
<td>26 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,413</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To interpret this chart: of all positions that were filled in the match, 38% were filled with “first choice” applicants (as defined above), 25% with “second choice” applicants, and so on.

Furthermore, 63% were filled with “first” or “second” choice applicants, while 79% were filled with “third choice” applicants or better.

Of course, comparing these numbers to applicants’ match statistics (distributed previously) should be done with extreme caution, given the significantly different ways in how “first choice”, “second choice”, etc. were defined in each analysis.

ASARC DEADLINE CHANGED

The deadline for complaints to the APPIC Standards and Review Committee regarding this year’s Match has been changed to: postmarked APRIL 15, 1999.
APPIC Match Report
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Applicants Participating in the Match (includes 28 individuals who participated in the Match as 14 “couples”)
2,923

MATCH RESULTS
Applicants Matched 2,413 (83%)
Participating Applicants Not Matched 510** (17%)
*NOTE: Please use caution when interpreting and reporting this number. While 510 participating applicants were not matched, remember that 218 available positions went unfilled (see above). In addition, it is likely that some of the 212 applicants who “withdrew or did not submit ranks” were rejected by all of their sites prior to the Rank Order List deadline, and thus may qualify as “unplaced”. APPIC is currently researching this latter issue.

Clearinghouse data from previous years:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Applicants registered with Clearinghouse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>(Not Available)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>489</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Previous research has suggested that some unplaced applicants did not participate in the Clearinghouse. Beginning in 1998, the Clearinghouse stopped accepting data about the number of unplaced applicants, since there were more reliable sources for that data.

Match Results by Rank Number on Applicant’s List (percentages do not total 100 due to rounding errors):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Number of Applicants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,113 (46%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>486 (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>291 (12%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>186 (7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>121 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>77 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>41 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>25 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>16 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 or higher</td>
<td>57 (2%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Nearly half (46%) of all matched applicants received their top-ranked choice, two-thirds (66%) received one of their top two choices, and nearly 4-in-5 (78%) received one of their top three choices.

RANKINGS
Average Number of Rankings Submitted Per Applicant:
Matched Applicants 8.6
Unmatched Applicants 4.6
Overall 7.9

Each Position Was Ranked by an Average of 8.8 Applicants.

New Training Directors!

Are you a New Training Director or has there been a change to the person listed as Training Director at your site? Please let us know. Any changes to person named as training Director, the mailing address, phone, or fax number, must be made in writing on your institution’s letterhead and either faxed or mailed to APPIC.

fax to: 202/347-8480
Mail to: 733 15th Street, NW, Suite 719 Washington, DC 20005-2112

At the same time, New Training Directors to the profession may request a “New Training Director’s Handbook” to be mailed.

APPIC Handout Available

“Legal Issues Related to Training” (March 1999)
by Patricia A. Hollander, Esq.
Public Member, APPIC Board


Vice Chair Nancy Garfield and Secretary Ms. Zarinah Stevens in APPIC CO
APAGS Guest Column:
Comments and Kudos: An APAGS Perspective on the Internship Selection Process

BY SHANE J. LOPEZ, PH.D., UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS

In my day there was no universal application. What do you mean there are reduced plane fares for internship applicants? When I was an intern applicant there was no computer matching. On-line clearinghouse... not a chance.

My how things have changed! Though I finished my internship in August 1998, the selection process I experienced seems like it occurred in the dark ages. What do students think about all of these changes? Here is a summary of the comments made by the most recent class to complete the selection process.

Comments on the AAPI, the Negotiated Fares, and the On-Line Clearinghouse

AAPI. Students view the universal application as an incredible time-saver. Web access allows them to download the application and complete it in a familiar word processing environment. In addition to the many positive comments made about the AAPI, two often asked students’ questions are sparked by the experience of filling out the AAPI. So, what can I count as a practicum hour? and how many do I need?

Fares. Regarding the negotiated “deals” on air travel, students were touched by the efforts of the APPIC governance. Though I have no data on the number of persons who took advantage of these price-breaks, or about the total savings, I am certain that the reduced fares eased the financial struggles of many and it clearly communicated APPIC’s understanding of the students’ struggles during the process.

Clearinghouse. The APPIC Website and on-line clearinghouse brings some order to a difficult process. Students who are unplaced on Match Day view the website as the starting point and touchstone in their search for placement.

Comments on the Computer Match Process

My APAGS colleagues Arcella Trimble and Rebecca Mandal collected email comments and summarized them for an upcoming APAGS Newsletter article entitled “Students Speak Out About Match Day.” The comments made most frequently are presented below. Though both positive and negative comments are listed, the vast majority of students who responded the email solicitation stated that they were pleased with computer matching and they viewed the process as fair.

Positive Comments About the Computer Match

- The National Matching Service (NMS) provided useful and timely information about the match process. NMS staff members were also eager to assist students.
- Many students liked receiving their match via the computer. It took the worry out of first-choice issues, accepting, rejecting, or holding offers on Match Day.
- Internship sites were more compliant with APPIC rules than in previous years.
- Sites did not know how interns ranked them. Thus, students were spared some of the pressure of talking with sites ranked lower on their list.
- The computer match saved some students the trouble of having to discuss how many offers they received.
- Couples were given special consideration and able to obtain sites in the same geographic location.
- Statistics about the Match were made available in a timely fashion and were easy to understand.

Negative Comments About the Computer Match

- The $70.00 cost to register for the match was very expensive for graduate students, especially couples.
- NMS did not inform all students that their rankings had been received.
- The time period between submission of ranks and Match Day (3 weeks) seemed too long.
- A substantial number of students wanted to receive feedback about their ranking at other sites. This feedback could have been useful for students applying for jobs and postdoctoral internships. Also, students who did not receive one of their top 3 choices or were not matched, had no way of receiving feedback about their applications or interviews from the internship sites on Match Day.
- The computer matching process was impersonal. Some students reported not even receiving phone calls from their internship sites on Match Day.
- Demographic statistics should have been collected in conjunction with the ones provided on the website.

Kudos

Kudos to the APAGS governance and membership for the efforts to improve the internship application and selection process. Specific praise goes to Nancy Garfield for her work on the AAPI, Greg Keilin for contacting the airlines and making computer matching a reality, and Gordon Williams for his work on the APPIC Website, Listserv, and the clearinghouse. Your efforts have facilitated the selection process for over 2000 internship applicants.

As stated by Trimble and Mandal, “one cannot help but wonder what other changes are in store for the predoctoral internship process.”
MORE TIPS FOR TRAINERS

BY MARTHA DENNIS CHRISTIANSEN, Ph.D.

The APPIC Board of Directors is continuing to gather information about effective ways internship training directors are doing their job. As we hear of these good ideas, we will pass them along to you, our members, in this new newsletter column and post them on the APPIC web site at www.appic.org/tipdevelopment.html. Your Tips for Trainers may be submitted to the Central Office.

Cost Effectiveness of Internship Training:

Improving Communication with Intern Applicants:
A new column has been added that should help our applicants feel more comfortable during the selection process. It is entitled, "Improving Communication with Intern Applicants:

Preferences in the APPIC Directory:
In the APPIC Directory programs have the options of designating preferences for applicants from accredited and non-accredited programs as well as type of program. Applicants would find it helpful if the program would provide more detailed information about preferences in their brochures or on their web sites. For example, the program could explain under what conditions are applicants from non-accredited programs acceptable.

INTERNSHIPS AND THE LAW: QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

BY PATRICIA A. HOLLANDER, ESQ.

Q: Were two university employees, one a Master’s degree in counseling, who were trained to assess the risk of suicide and refer students to support services, to be considered “health care providers” and thus possibly liable for negligence in the wrongful death of a student who committed suicide?
A: No. Two employees were in positions that did not require medical licensure or training in diagnosing and treating illnesses, so they were not “health care providers.” Therefore, they were immune from liability under the Wyoming Governmental Claims Act.

In this case an 18 year old freshman became intoxicated in his dormitory. The residence hall director, McHenry, knowing the student was an underage drinker and fearful he might asphyxiate in his sleep, called campus police who arrested the student and took him to the hospital.

Next morning the student was released and returned to his residence hall. Within a few hours the student superficially cut his wrists with a dull pocket knife or razor blade. The hall director, who was trained to assess the risk of suicide, determined that the student was not at risk, but requested that campus police contact the Crisis Intervention Team (CIT).

At that point Johnstone, the Assistant Director of Fraternity/Sorority Life from the Office of Student Life, responded. She was the CIT volunteer on duty at this time and interacted with the student in that capacity. Johnstone’s educational background included a Bachelor of Science degree in psychology and a Master’s degree in counseling. Her job responsibilities included supervising fraternities and sororities on campus as well as dealing with students who walked into her office with a variety of student life concerns. As a part of Johnstone’s work, she would talk with students about situational problems that could be resolved by referring them to a service, providing information, or giving support. She stated that the “counseling” she did in the Student Life Office was oriented toward developmental issues that arise when students are in the college environment, away from home and still in the maturing process. Johnstone distinguished the counseling she provided from that provided by the campus counseling center, which was often of longer duration and had different purposes. According to Johnstone, the counseling center was staffed by counseling psychologists.

Johnstone qualified for the CIT because she was a University employee with a Master’s degree in counseling. The CIT’s objectives are to assess, intervene, and refer students in emergencies to support services. CIT volunteers are to “function as situational assessors/managers, crisis counseling intervenors, and referral resources to support services.” Johnstone was trained to assess suicide risk; and, as a CIT volunteer, she received additional training in how to deal with crisis and emergency situations.

Johnstone spoke to the student for over an hour. He denied trying to commit suicide, and assured her he was not suicidal. Johnstone determined that he had neither a plan nor a means of committing suicide. She also determined that the student had a good support system of friends, and was willing to go to the campus counseling center for help. This concluded the crisis intervention. The student’s parents were not notified of this incident.

Two years later the student committed suicide and his parents sued the University, McHenry, and Johnstone for negligence.

The court pointed out that the Wyoming Governmental Claims Act provides immunity from tort liability (negligence) for governmental employees with some exceptions such as employees who are “health care providers.” The parents contended that the two employees were “health care providers.” The court found that under Wyoming law, “health care providers” are those “who cure or prevent impairments of the normal state of the body.” Therefore, the court had to decide whether these two employees were exceptions to the Claims Act and could be sued.

The court found that the positions held by these two employees required only training to assess suicide and refer students to support services, not to cure and prevent impairment of the normal state of the body by diagnosing or treating illnesses. The court held that these
two employees were not health care providers. Therefore, they were protected by the Wyoming Governmental Claims Act and immune from liability for negligence. The parents’ claims were barred by the Claims Act.


Additional Comments: Even if the two employees had not been found to have immunity from liability, other factors may have served as a defense for them. For instance, two years had passed between the attempt and the actual suicide, so proving that the conduct of the two employees was the proximate cause of the suicide probably would have been difficult.

Note: Readers are cautioned that the information contained herein is intended only to call attention to new legal developments and is not meant to be definitive in all circumstances or relied on without prior consultation with legal counsel.
FROM THE ASSOCIATE EDITORS

ADULT GENERAL PSYCHOLOGY

BY DAVID ARONSON, PH.D., FAClinP

I am writing this article after our internship program sent in its ranking of potential interns for next year’s class but before we have learned which interns selected us.

Of course, this is the first year for using the computer match process so there is quite a bit that is unknown in terms of how it will work out. I thought I would share some of our experiences with this process and perhaps it would stimulate some ideas in you. If you have thoughts or ideas you want to share, please e-mail them to me at daronson@neoucom.edu. I will share these ideas in a future article.

We have spent quite a bit of energy trying to develop standardized ways of evaluating candidates for internship positions. Our program is a consortium. This year we have four rotation sites; next year we will have six sites as two more have joined us (we also have tried to develop standardized ways of evaluating potential sites that want to join our program; however, that is a different article). Next year we will have eight internships for the six sites. To complicate things more, we have actually divided the six sites into three tracks (have I used all the numbers yet?). Now, we all know how possessive various sites can get, especially when they are footing the bill (so to speak). Each site, understandably, wants to have a good degree of control over what interns they will get the following year. This is part of the reason we developed the concept of “Tracks”. Each track represents a pairing of two sites that seem to complement each other (in terms of the training experiences each provides). We then require our intern applicants to decide which Track they want to apply to. It is almost like having three mini-programs rolled into one. Normally intern applicants would be interviewed by only those sites that form the Track the candidate applied to.

For reasons that are unknown to me, this year the applicants were less careful about specifying which Track they wanted to apply to. Most applicants either did not indicate any preference or specified two or even all three Tracks as their preferred placement. This created some technical difficulties in terms of our standardized procedures for evaluating candidates, particularly in terms of how to set up the interviews. However, that is not the aspect I wanted to discuss; I wanted to discuss how this method interacted with the overall computer match system.

Keep in mind that for the match system, the programs prioritize the candidates and the applicants prioritize the programs. Somehow the computer program at APPIC matches interns and programs so that everyone is happy. If your program has three separate Tracks (as ours does) and if applicants are supposed to specify which Track they are applying to, you have to have a method whereby the Tracks can be kept separate. The method used to do this (in the computer match program) is to treat each Track as a separate internship program. Thus, each Track gets a different ID number and you formulate a separate list of ranked candidates for each Track.

What was interesting for us was how things evolved, given the significant overlap in applicants across Tracks. As I already mentioned, many of the applicants applied to two or even three Tracks. Thus, they are ranked on each of those lists. Even though all the Tracks are in one internship consortium, they are now actually competing with each other for interns as well as competing with other Internship Programs. For example, we found that a particular intern might be ranked #2 on the Track A list and #4 on the Track B list. As mentioned, there was much more overlap across Tracks this year as contrasted to previous years. It also seemed that we had fewer total applicants this year, as contrasted to previous years. This final observation has me particularly concerned especially given all the publicity regarding the shortage of internship slots (the most recent APA Monitor, February, 1999, had yet another article about the problem of students finding internships).

Now, I have an additional worry. Perhaps our Internship Program is an outlier. Perhaps we are the only ones who saw a decrease in applicants and everyone else is getting flooded with applicants. Before my anxiety attack gets out of control, I must quickly apply some cognitive-behavioral principles. I must re-frame my self-statements so I can be calm myself. Perhaps (and I am hearing that small voice inside my head construct the next part carefully) the computerized matching system is going to work so well that students are each applying to fewer programs and all programs are getting fewer applicants. Now, wouldn’t that be a nice benefit of the computer matching system.

Do I know if this is accurate or is just my way of feeling calmer? Of course not. I will probably find out soon as the results of match day will be announced in the near future. In the meantime, I would be very interested in other Internship Programs’ experiences with the computer match system. Did it work for you? Did you get less applicants? Or, did you get more? Or, about the same? Please e-mail me with your comments and the benefits and disadvantages of this new system. If I receive enough comments, I will include them in my next article.

David Aronson, PhD, FAClinP, is the Director of Psychology at Massillon Psychiatric Center (MPC). MPC is a rotation site in the Northeast Ohio Universities College of Medicine Psychology Internship Program. He can be e-mailed at daronson@neoucom.edu.
GEROPSYCHOLOGY

by Victor Molinari, Ph.D.

This year's hectic intern selection process has triggered in me some ideas concerning how to identify a good prospect for the geropsychology inpatient rotation. I would like to share my thoughts about what criteria I utilize to rate a geropsychology intern.

Despite the ever-increasing knowledge base in developmental and clinical gerontology, it may surprise some that I do not place major weight on prior gerontological coursework or geriatric practice. This is because there are unfortunately still too many Ph.D./Psy.D. programs that do not offer such exposure, and I think that at this level it would be unfortunate to overly penalize an interested student for programmatic deficits they have little control over. Other than the routine educational requirements that all graduate students must fulfill prior to internship, coursework or externships in neuropsychology and/or family therapy may give one a slight edge. Since at least 50% of geropsychiatric inpatients and outpatients have significant cognitive decline, it behooves all geropsychologists to be knowledgeable of mental status exams and brain-behavior relationships. Given the large number of cases diagnosed with dementia, there is relatively less emphasis on individual therapy (although one can still do very good therapeutic work with cognitively intact or mildly impaired patients) and more emphasis on family work with caregivers.

What I really look for are certain in-tangible personal and professional qualities that maximize the probability of effective interpersonal encounters with older adults. One, genuine interest in being with older adults and sensitivity to their age-related sensory decrements. I have observed that gifted geropsychologists intuitively exhibit more kindness and patience with older adults, frequently related to positive experiences with grandparents. Their attitude is compassionate without condescension, respectful of older adult wisdom but mindful of their own professionalism and expertise. Such an approach allows one to forge a strong therapeutic alliance by being comfortable with sharing of common experiences from one human being to the other and thereby “bridging the generational gap”, an especially important first step in any inter-vision with older adults.

Two, a serious interest in multidisciplinary work reflecting a genuine respect for the bio-psycho-social model and the varied disciplines that contribute to the comprehensive care of older patients. Three, the intellectual openness and flexibility to allow oneself to jettison facile myths of aging (e.g. all old people are demented, depressed, or unable to profit from psychotherapy). Four, the ability to tolerate ambiguity, an important asset to prevent premature diagnostic decision-making stemming from the uncertainty inherent in some of the frequent mind/numbing assessment dilemmas we are presented with (e.g. patient who has a delirium superimposed on a dementia, with the delirium related to heavy drinking which masks a mood disorder—add some physical and social complications and you see what I mean). And five, a refusal to evade profound existential issues related to loss, disability, death, and life meaning.

I labor under the assumption that if an intern is from an APPIC-approved program, he/she has the intelligence and educational background to assimilate the didactic material that must be learned for one to be considered a well-rounded geropsychologist. But it is the above personal traits of empathy and rapport-building with underserved populations that is harder to teach at the internship level, and I expect my students to bring these to the interview for me to clearly observe.

**ISSUES CONCERNING THE SERIOUSLY MENTALLY ILL**

by Sandra E. Tars, Ph.D.

Training Resources on Consumer/Survivor Issues

In my last column, I discussed the Consumer/Psychologist Dialogue convened by the Center for Mental Health Services. For psychologist/trainers present, this dialogue raised many questions about how to ensure inclusion of the issues, concerns and insights of our CXS colleagues in our training. I’ve received a number of inquiries of how to get started in familiarizing interns with consumer/survivor concerns. This column will focus on resources which will allow you to start the process.

One excellent resource is the June 1997 volume of Professional Psychology: Research and Practice (v. 28 #3, 205-245). This contains a special section on “Servicing the Seriously Mentally Ill,” which was put together by the CAPP SMI/SED Task Force. It includes three articles which provide insight into consumer concerns: one for the family experience, and two from psychologists who are also consumer/survivors.

Free resource materials are available through the web site for the National Empowerment Center (www.concentric.net/power2u/). There you can print or download 3 excellent articles by CXS leaders: “The Ex-Patient’s Movement: Where we’re going and where we’ve been” by Judi Chamberlain; “Spirit Breaking: When the helping hurts” by Pat Deegan; and “Humanizing the recovery process” by Daniel Fisher (this last specifically addresses training issues).

At The National Technical Assistance Center (NTAC) site of the National Association of State Mental Health Program Directors (www.nasmhpd.org/ntac), you will find: “Recovery...A Guiding Vision for Mental Health Services.” This is the summary of a regional conference for Midwest mental health planning and advisory councils on April 2-4, 1998. Conference faculty included a number of experts who are on the cutting-edge of recovery activities nationwide.

The Psychiatric Rehabilitation Journal (published by the Center for Psychiatric Rehabilitation and the International...continued on page 12
ISSUES GERMANE TO UNIVERSITY POPULATIONS

by Anna Beth Payne, Ph.D.

It is not often that anyone asks for my "musings," much less the editor of the APPIC Newsletter, so perhaps my eagerness to respond is understandable. In this case, the invitation was with regard to "musings" about APPIC's venture into computer matching. Certainly it has been on my mind, and that of many colleagues.

Most of my musings have to do with control and illusions of control. For example, the primary reason I supported the match system is the increased control the match system gives couples. As far as I have been able to determine, this is the one area where NMS provides a very clear advantage over human beings. There are other advantages, but they are more on the order of making it easier for us to do our job. A bread machine makes it easier to bake bread, but it isn't necessary!

It is how training directors manage the control issue that has occupied most of my attention. At university counseling centers, training directors historically have placed a very high premium on achieving a balanced group. Perhaps it is the counseling psychologist in us, but the learning environment, including the learners, is an important variable. As such, we would like to control it.

Personally, I was always in awe of training directors who were able to achieve their goals of balancing program type, gender, ethnicity, and geographical distribution. On match day, I was never able to keep that many variables in mind. As a result, I relegated these issues to the category of "illusions of control."

Thus, making decisions about how to use the flexibility offered by multiple lists was an exercise in confronting the "control: illusion or reality" issue. This was most apparent when I contacted NMS with a question. It was fascinating to listen to the staff try to reassure me about filling my slots, when I was actually asking about constructing lists so as to consider candidates on two lists. I realized that approaching the lists from the perspective of anxiety about filling slots was different from the anxiety of creating a compatible group.

Then there was the anxiety associated with surrendering control over the details to strangers in Canada. Cross-checking my list against the names of all the candidates, worrying about getting the list delivered on time, anxiety about typographical errors... all of this was on our list-serve. The reality was that NMS was unfailingly competent and professional, eminently worthy of trust.

Trust, of course, is the other side of control anxiety. I realized the ultimate question I had to answer was whether I trusted the often-repeated claims that providing my true ranks was the best strategy. I heard a fair amount of mistrust amongst colleagues. Most of the mistrust took the form of "Sure, I can do that, but I don't believe everyone else will." I decided, finally, that I might as well behave as if I had complete trust. The anxiety certainly would be no worse than that of being "on hold," and I have survived that often enough!

The irony of these musings, I realize, is that the experience I am observing is full of anxiety. Minimizing anxiety was supposed to be one of the main advantages of engaging NMS. If diffusing anxiety over a month minimizes it, then the match is a huge success for me.

Of course, we will never know exactly how the outcomes would be different this year without the match. We are told that they should be better. Frankly, I think we will have to settle for knowing the outcomes are good enough. The real question, then, is whether the process is better for more people. All of us await the answer to that question.

For myself, I am grateful for the opportunity to observe the intricacies of control and anxiety, illusion and reality. Being a part of APPIC's first year with NMS has been historic; musing about has been soothing. So, Bob, thanks for asking!

NEUROPSYCHOLOGY

by Dean R. Skadeland, Psy.D.

There is so much change going on in neuropsychological training that it is extremely important for supervisors and students to stay as current as possible. One of the easiest ways is to check out the National Academy of Neuropsychology (NAN) website (nan.drexel.edu) on a monthly basis. Of particular relevance is the Student and Professional Development area at their website. There you will find the Houston Conference Documents and the NAN...
Student Area, which has a student chat corner and listing of pre/post doctoral training programs in neuropsychology. There is also an area for students to submit presentations/papers which, if accepted, would then be posted on the website all around the world to read.

The Houston Conference clarified and redefined the model for training in neuropsychology. However, in my interactions over the last six months with students, the majority have not even heard of it. This is especially concerning as a great number of these students were intern applicants with strong interests in neuropsychology. Apparently, professors and supervisors have been lax in getting the word out. Do what you can to familiarize your students with the Houston Conference guidelines. Refer them to the NAN website and/or consider making a hardcopy and circulate it around your office or training site.

NAN has expanded options to obtain continuing education with his Internet based distance courses. Introduced just last year, these courses are already quite popular. Currently, there are two 30-credit courses offered, one on Mild Traumatic Brain Injury and the other on Neuroanatomy. For additional information you can contact them at (610) 660-1804 or over e-mail at info@nan.drexel.edu

Past surveys have found that neuropsychologists tend in greater numbers to favor prescription privileges. It may be interesting to note that “properly trained” psychologists in the US Territory of Guam recently won the right to prescribe psychotropic medications. Apparently Alaska is being selectively targeted this year as the next battlefield for prescription privileges. Also, according to the Prescribing Psychologists Register, the Canadian Psychological Association has recently warned members to familiarize themselves with the idea of psychologists prescribing.

The fifth publication of the Division 40 training programs in clinical neuropsychology was published late last year in The Clinical Neuropsychologist, 1998. Vol. 12, 365-448. To be included on the list, directors of training at the sites, “indicated that they believe their programs are generally in compliance with the guidelines for training in clinical neuropsychology published by Division 40” (p. 365). Interested students should be strongly advised to investigate and study prospective programs to be assured that this is the case. Also the new Houston Model will likely have a major impact on many of these training programs.

Is your training site ready for the Y2K problem? A great number of neuropsychological tests are either administered or scored on the computer. As such, your testing resources may be more vulnerable to the effects of the New Millennium than say for instance that psychoanalytic Rorschach neighbor of yours. If you have not already begun to address the problems, be sure to do so NOW. The major test publishers are quite helpful when you call to inquire about their software products. You also need to check out the hardware your scoring programs are on. Any computer manufactured prior to January 1997 is suspect. There are many inexpensive software products that can quickly check and fix your hardware. Our site recently obtained the $19.95 program, “2000 Detect and Correct” (www.parsonstech.com) which, if their claims can be trusted, will now allow me a restful night’s sleep on New Year’s Eve 1999.

**SETTING RELATED ISSUES**

BY ROBERT H. GOLDSTEIN, PH.D

What’s Happened to Psychological Testing, and Why?

So, whatever happened to psychological testing? When some of us older (or, perhaps, slightly more mature) psychologists were moving into the world of real professional activity, the one thing most of us had going for ourselves was a set of special skills that were unique to psychology. We had learned about, practiced with and acquired reasonable competence in the administration and interpretation of psychological tests. With these special tools, we could make a contribution to the clinical enterprise that no other member of the mental health team could even aspire to match.

In fact, in many settings, that was really what psychologists did. Psychologists were seen as the diagnosticians par excellence. Their role in a multidisciplinary setting was sometimes limited to just that specialty. I can recall participating in clinical case conferences at which, after all the other mental health specialties gave their views of the patient under discussion, the psychologist was then asked to present the test findings and presumed diagnosis. The psychological assessment report, based on an extensive testing and evaluation work-up, was frequently afforded the same degree of heavy-weight finality as was the pathologist’s findings at a clinicopathological conference.

In these latter conferences, the medical clinicians would review a case in detail, track the patient’s course, and examine all the clinical findings and laboratory results with the aim of establishing a clinical diagnosis. At the end, the pathologist would weigh in with the final diagnostic conclusion, based on detailed pathology studies, often derived from autopsy. And no one argued with the pathologist.

That psychologists would eventually shift from this role to spending much of their time doing psychotherapy was not yet a fully acceptable idea, since their unique and special skill lay in their ability to evaluate people by using tests. Of course, some forty years later, the limited nature of that role seems fully unacceptable to broadly trained clinical psychologists.

But, oh how things have changed! The last issue of this Newsletter presented the most recent survey of the views of internship training directors. In response to the question about what areas of insufficient preparation they find in newly arrived interns, the overwhelmingly most frequent deficiency cited was inadequate preparation in conducting psychological testing!

So, what has happened to psychological testing? To begin with, it certainly hasn’t gone away. The very fact that training directors perceive interns as needing greater preparation than they’ve been getting in this area indicates that trainers still see testing as a valuable skill. Presumably, they intend to remedy that deficiency during the internship experience.

But, why are prospective interns not getting testing skills in their training programs? Do graduate programs see the assessment process as less important? Is it possible that there is some belief that these skills are less in demand? And if so, why?

There are many factors at work here. No doubt there have been shifts in the focus of psychologists’ professional interests and the roles of psychologists have expanded into many other new and exciting areas. It’s likely, however, that a primary factor in the apparent decline in testing is the way in which our healthcare system has been changing. What we’re talking about here concerns—you guessed it—those perennial favorites: the marketplace and money.

If you want to get a more detailed de-
nizations, and healthcare payors.” From there, the report goes on to document in detail the many ways in which assessment services have been discouraged, denied and inadequately paid for by the current big players in the healthcare market.

So, if the big money boys (and girls) won’t let you do it, and, if you do, they won’t pay you much for it, (presumably because they don’t believe testing contributes to their bottom line) then what’s the motivation for continuing to teach our trainees about it? Well, Part I of the report tries to answer that question by pointing out the value of psychological assessment. And that’s VALUE, both in the utility or usefulness sense as well as in the cost-benefit analysis or value-added fiscal meaning of that term.

The authors also present a set of recommendations regarding changes that they feel are needed with respect to patterns of psychological practice, training and research if we are to respond effectively to the pressures to downsize or even eliminate the role of assessment. To readers of this Newsletter, the suggestions about changes in training may seem most relevant, since these educational issues are the ones that may be of most immediate concern. The general thrust of the proposals in this area deals with upgrading and updating both the content of teaching about assessment as well as ensuring that those who do the teaching are fully qualified to do so.

So, if you want to know what’s been happening to testing, and, more importantly, to get a clear picture of who’s been doing it to us (remember, the health insurance industry refers to dollars spent on patient care as their “loss ratio”), then this set of reports is an excellent source from which to get a good overview of the situation. Both trainers and trainees would benefit from a discussion of the issues presented therein. And, the price is right—the reports are available gratis from APA’s Board of Professional Affairs.

Excerpted Minutes

APPIC Board of Directors Meeting

MARCH 26–28, 1998 KANSAS CITY, MO

The meeting was called to order at 8:30 am by APPIC Board Chair Dr. Peggy J. Cantrell. In attendance were APPIC Board members Drs. Martha Dennis Christiansen, Kathleen R. Boggs, Robert W. Goldberg, Nancy J. Garfield, Nadine J. Kaslow, Gerald S. Leventhal, and Patricia A. Hollander, Esq. The Board Member unable to attend was Past Chair, Dr. Sanford L. Pederson.

Invited guests were Drs. Phil Farber, NCSPP; Lee Anna Clark, CUDCP; Jill Reich, APA Education Directorate; Kerry Mothersill, CCPPP; Nancy Murdock, CCPTP; J. Gordon Williams, Clearinghouse Coordinator; Greg Keilin, Chair, Computer Match; Shane Lopez, APAGS; and Connie Hercey, APPIC Central Office Administrator.

Secretary’s Report

All APPIC minutes to date have been approved.

Treasurer’s Report

Martha Dennis Christiansen, Ph.D., APPIC Treasurer, reviewed the 1997 Budget with amounts actually spent. She presented the 1998 Budget which was passed in Executive Session. APPIC reserves as of 12/31/97 were $82,798.00 and $1,161 in checking.

Newsletter

Robert Goldberg, Ph.D. will investigate opportunities to cut the cost of the Newsletter. The Board decided to publish three Newsletter issues annually and the Board would revisit changing the Newsletter into a journal at a later date. A 30th Anniversary issue of the Newsletter is planned for the summer of 1998.
Board of Directors Meeting
continued from page 14

Doctoral Membership Report
APPIC Board meeting minutes and APPIC Newsletter issues will name the programs that have been submitted to the APPIC Board and recommended for approval by the Doctoral Membership Committee. APPIC Board contacts will advise the Board when the terms end for APPIC Membership Doctoral and Review Committee as well as the APPIC Postdoctoral Membership and Review Committee.

The vacancy on the committee left by Dr. Gerald Leventhal’s election to the APPIC Board of Directors was filled by Dr. Marybeth Priesmeyer, Training Director for the Missouri Health Sciences Psychology Consortium. The Doctoral Membership Committee met October 31, 1997.

The Board approved a new “fast track” procedure. The Board of Directors accepted the committee’s recommendations and voted to approve 19 new APPIC members as of Fall, 1997.

Postdoctoral Membership and Review Committee
Dr. Kathleen Boggs, the APPIC Board contact to the Postdoctoral Membership and Review Committee reported that the first meeting of the newly appointed committee met on October 18, 1997. The committee is composed of Drs. James Dobbins, George Vesprani, and Chaired by Phyllis Hutchings, Ph.D. from Nova Southeastern University.

The committee reviews new applications and is also responsible for the review of non APA accredited programs every three years. The October meeting reviewed 3 new applications for membership and one re-submission. All four programs were approved by the APPIC Board of Directors for membership and continued membership.

The Postdoctoral membership application has been revised and the committee created a Postdoctoral Criteria Clarification document. Both documents have been approved by the Board and have been used by the applicants to APPIC for the March 31, 1998 deadline. Four new postdoctoral applicants were recommended and approved by the APPIC Board Directors.

ASARC
Patricia Hollander, Esq., APPIC Board Member and Board Contact to the APPIC Standards and Review Committee (ASARC) informed the Board that to date only one formal complaint had been filed in 1998 for review by the ASARC committee. Further discussion was deferred to Executive Session.

Finance and Development Committee
Gerald Leventhal, Ph.D., chair of the Finance and Development Committee followed up on his commitment to seek advice from financial consultants. The suggestion at this time is to keep low balances in our checking account and to continue with the existing money market account.

Central Office
Connie Hercey, MPA, Central Office Administrator received confirmation from the Board that meeting at the Grand Hyatt in San Francisco for the next Board meeting met with no objections from the Board and she can continue with negotiations and planning.

Ms. Hercey expressed a strong preference for leasing vs. buying future computer equipment. The Board supported the idea of Ms. Hercey looking into a new location for Central office within a certain budgetary constraint. The Board also supported the idea of providing CO with a discretionary fund.

American Psychological Association of Graduate Students (APAGS)
Mr. Shane Lopez, APAGS representative to APPIC, expressed sincere appreciation to APPIC for allowing APAGS a column in the APPIC Newsletter. Additionally, he expressed an interest in allowing APAGS to post on the APPIC web site a way for distressed students to contact APAGS. Mr. Lopez shared the results of a survey of unplaced students done in 1997 after Uniform Application Day. The survey was sent to 439 unplaced students and a response rate of 28% was achieved. Of the 168 respondents, 13 had been unplaced the previous year. Eighty-four of the respondents (50%) had secured an internship by the time they completed the questionnaire.

APAGS participated in the APPIC/APA Supply-Demand Conference, had numerous meetings and conversations with board members of training councils, and has a planned letter writing campaign to encourage the use of the APPIC newsletter and supported the proposed APPIC matching program.

Council of Counseling Psychology Training Programs (CCPTP)
Dr. Nancy Murdock, chair of the Council of Counseling Psychology Training Programs (CCPTP), and Dr. Kathleen Boggs, APPIC Board contact highlighted the results of the CCPTP Mid-Winter Meeting held February 6-8, 1998 in Scottsdale, AZ. CCPTP will celebrate its 25th anniversary in 1999. A joint task force composed of Drs. Emil Rodolfa, Nancy Murdock, and Bob Lent, was created for “captive” internships, now called “partnered” internships to generate innovative proposals. CCPTP members generally seem to be in favor of the proposed Computer Match. There is concern that the APPIC Application for Psychology Interns (AAP) has caused more anxiety among students at all levels trying to be certain they have “enough hours” in the right categories to obtain internships, sanction programs and not students.

Council of Chairs of Training Councils (CCTC)
Council of University Directors of Clinical Psychology (CUDCP)
Lee Anna Clark, Ph.D. was acting liaison to the APPIC meeting for Dr. Bev Thorn. CCTC rejected the idea of proposing a cap on practicum hours, but adopted a generic resolution about including a variety of experiences (like program consultation) counted as practicum experience. CUDCP survey data shows that 85% of students placed on UND and another 5% placed later. Dr. Bev Thorn shared preliminary data for the Internship questionnaire from 1998 UND. Academic Training Directors (ATD) preliminary findings show: 913 students applied, 8 withdrew prior to UND, and 86% received an offer by UND. 88% received an APA paid offer and 5% received a non-paid APA placement.

Board of Educational Affairs (BEA)
BEA endorsed a motion to develop mechanisms for the systematic provision of program-specific and aggregated data to potential graduate school applicants and the public such as student-faculty ratios, internship placements, student funding, and post-graduate employment. BEA recommends that council requires that future issues of Graduate Study in Psychology includes those data as available from training programs.

Last year’s recommendation to move internship training to a postdoctoral position is on the BEA agenda as an action item.

APA Education Directorate
Jill Reich, Ph.D. expressed appreciation to APPIC for the invitation to participate in this meeting and promote further discussion on Supply-Demand
other issues. Dr. Reich asked for APPIC’s support of the Education Directorate’s request for an increase in research dollars.

NCSPP
Philip Farber, Ph.D. NCSPP representative to APPIC and Dr. Martha Dennis Christiansen, APPIC Board liaison reported unanimous support for the APPIC Computer match project. Drs. Christiansen and Greg Keilin, Computer Match Committee Chair, attended the NCSPP Executive committee and Business meetings in January, 1998. NCSPP voted to endorse the Match Proposal and to strongly encourage the APPIC members to adopt the Match proposal for implementation in February, 1999.

Council of Credentialing Organizations in Professional Psychology (CCOPP)
Credentialing Mobility as an issue was a key item for consideration by CCOPP representatives at the September, 1997 meeting in Montreal. Reciprocity issues with Canadian accreditation needs to be thought through. The new APPIC CCOPP liaison needs to be a Board member who can maintain a relationship with the organization for 4-5 years.

Inter-Organizational Council (IOC)
Dr. Kathleen Boggs reported that after 5 years, the tasks of the IOC have been completed with APA accreditation of the first postdoctoral programs. The IOC held its final meeting on September 12, 1997, and Dr. David Drum was honored for his leadership of the Council. The IOC has endorsed formation of a Council of Specialties (CoS) to deal with accreditation of postdoctoral specialty programs.

Postdoctoral Accreditation
Kathleen Boggs reported that the first postdoctoral programs have been accredited by APA.

Supply and Demand
Nadine Kaslow announced that a draft of the Supply-Demand Conference Proceedings will be out by June. A discussion of Supply/Demand issues and possible actions followed.
- The Uniform application can be changed to allow for other kinds of practicum hours. The average number of practicum hours is 1700 hours. What is the level of supervision? What are the core competencies covered?

APPIC Action steps to be considered based upon the S & D Conference include:
- Suggest that internships consider non-traditional methods of training
- How to get training and funding in these areas and positions of expanding roles.
- Workshops at the APPIC National Membership Meeting and Conference
- Change the AAPI
- Solicit a newsletter article on expanding the marketplace for internships.

How to create new internships was specifically considered, with consultation as a possible major APPIC function:
- Announce on the web site APPIC Membership Committee members are available to consult with developing programs.
- Encourage development of local/regional groups of APPIC Training Directors that can give advice and consultation to existing programs and help new programs get started.
- Ask the membership to be involved in mentoring new programs.
- Start a resource directory.
- Reform and expand existing programs
- At the next APPIC Membership Meeting and Conference have one luncheon centered around the theme of expansion and support within your region.

Under the new Model Licensure Act, the provisional license would permit the same functions as a fully licensed psychologist, but the public is not sufficiently warned that the person is not a fully licensed psychologist. The states will make the final decision.

The meeting was adjourned for Executive Session.

Canadian Council of Professional Psychology Programs (CCPPP)
Dr. Kerry Mothersill, CCPPP representative, has discussed the proposed computer match with the CCPPP Executive Committee. They are generally in favor of the Computer Match. An equal number of applicants and internship slots came to the attention of the CCPPP Clearinghouse following the UND in February, 1998. Last year there were 5 more students than internship positions. Central Office will search the database and determine how many will accept CPA only approved programs. Annual survey questions addressing numbers of applicants and acceptances to Canadian internships from APA-accredited programs and to American internships from CPA-accredited programs will be developed.

APPIC-APA Data Sharing Project
The APPIC-APA Data Sharing contract will be signed by Dr. Peggy Cantrell on behalf of APPIC and by Jessica Kohout, Ph.D. for APA. A goal has been set for the project to be self-sustaining. Data from 1997 and 1998 will be analyzed and evaluated. The data was collected by distributing to department chairs of clinical, counseling and school psychology programs and will be subsequently distributed to the appropriate directors of training.

APA Committee on Accreditation
Dr. Goldberg, APPIC board contact to the APA Committee on Accreditation reported. The question was raised about the amount of APPIC representation on the committee. CoA reps are instructed to vote their conscience rather than for their constituency.

Uniform Notification Day (UND)
Action questions:
1. What are the problems associated with the process?
2. What changes do we want to make?
3. Is the Offers and Acceptances Policy working?
4. Dr. Thorn reported the 626 internship applicants who responded to her survey reported being asked by internship sites for a ranking 836 times. This year there were only 13 inappropriate responses.
5. Include these issues on our APPIC Membership Meeting and Conference agendas and include as a topic at the APPIC annual Business Meeting and on our web site.

Practicum Hours
APPIC will not regulate a cap on the practicum hours required for internship. Academic Programs feel it would be difficult for them to enforce by themselves. The current APPIC Directory update form 1998-1999 will document the minimum number of direct and indirect hours that internship programs require of applicants.
Should Uniform Notification Day Change?
1. APPIC has a wide variety of constituencies and each has different needs around UND.
2. If Match Day is "a go" that is enough "change" for one year.
3. Moving UND later would interfere with vacation/Spring break etc.
4. Moving UND later would extend the search process and students would miss more classes.
5. Moving the Internship later in the year will cause an overlapping of Internships and Postdoc applicants. Postdoc deadlines are getting earlier and earlier.

"Best Practices" Column
A best practices column will be established in the APPIC Newsletter. Dr. Christiansen agreed to begin this column.

ASARC
1. ASARC members are available for consultation
2. Inform APPIC members and subscribers that an ASARC complaint form can be signed by an academic TD or faculty personnel.
3. Academic programs ask students if there has been retaliation against reported violators. This subject is a possible discussion topic at the APPIC Business Meeting forum or at the General Membership meeting.
4. Suggest to sites to give a 2-3 week advance notice for interviews if possible. This is an effort to be sensitive to the fact that last minute airline arrangements are more expensive.
5. Educate the community that ASARC can be contacted without filing a complaint.

Doctoral Membership Review Committee
Dr. Nancy Garfield the Board contact to the Doctoral Membership Review Committee and Mary Oehlert, Ph.D. announced that the term for this committee will end in December, 1998. The committee members and chair will need to be replaced. Dr. Mary Oehlert the current chair of the Doctoral Membership Review Committee distributed the minutes from the December, 1997 meeting. Twelve programs were reviewed at the December, 1997 meeting and have been approved for continued membership in APPIC.

Clariification of Criterion
Dr. Kaslow, with a friendly amendment by Dr. Christiansen moved for the Doctoral Membership and Review Criteria Clarification for Criterion 9 to be changed to read:
"A minimum of 2 interns with 72 hours per week total on site and a minimum of 20 hours a week per intern."
The motion was passed 7-0-0.

Consortia Task Force
The APPIC Board decided to appoint a Consortia task force. The Board will seek input from non-traditional and rural populations. APPIC consortia Programs will be asked to address issues and define themselves that would convene by e-mail. The Board will request a time certain report. A call will go out to members for volunteers to participate on the consortia issues task force.

Proposed Computer Match
Drs. Greg Keilin, Chair, Computer Match Committee, and Gordon Williams, APPIC Clearinghouse Coordinator and Webmaster were invited guests to the APPIC Board Meeting for the day. Dr. Keilin proceeded to update the Board on Computer Match progress and issues thus far. The APPIC Central office will send out another mailing of the survey to the membership which will extend the deadline for returning the surveys to April 15th. It was decided that the date for the computer match ballot could not be determined at this time by the Board until after survey results were tabulated and analyzed. Dr. Keilin mentioned limiting applications sent from graduate students is a critical issue with many internship directors. Pat Hollander informed the Board that we cannot impose a limit on applications and that members need to be educated on this issue via a white paper. At the same time the white paper can address the issue and educate members on restraint of trade. Members are not prohibited for charging for applications or for sending out applications.

Additional feedback from interested groups after viewing Dr. Greg Keilin's presentation concerned a possible trial for the match project. Members are concerned that they will be stuck with computer matching irrespective of the outcome.

APPIC proposed the following cost structure for Match participation. APPIC members will be charged $50. This fee will be presented to the membership as a special assessment. Non APPIC members will be charged $100. Students will be charged no more than $75. The fees and assessment are annual. We want the Match to fund itself.

Clearinghouse/Website
The ACCTA Clearinghouse and APPIC Clearinghouse operate separately and at the same time. Half of the open slots were filled during the first 2 weeks. ACCTA will consider dissolving their Clearinghouse since now there is an overlapping time frame.

Electronic List Serve
Dr. Gerald Leventhal discussed contacts with APA information services staff about APA-supported list service capability. It was agreed that APPIC should have three parallel "Announce Only" lists, as well as an unmoderated "all to all" list that would be open to APPIC member sites. As moved by Ms. Hollander, seconded by Dr. Boggs, and amended by Drs. Kaslow and Garfield, the three "Announce Only" lists were: (1) Member DOT's, (2) Subscribers, and (3) "Friends of APPIC." The final Motion passed 7-0-0. Dr. Leventhal will follow up on arrangements and review legal issues with Mr. Colton.

APPIC Membership Meeting and Conference - 1999
The date for the next APPIC Membership meeting and Conference is March 25-27, 1999. At the Sheraton World Resort, Orlando, FL.

APPIC 30th Anniversary Reception
APPIC will honor all past Board members and Chairs of the APPIC Board of Directors at a reception after the APPIC preconference workshops in San Francisco.

The meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,
Robert W. Goldberg, Ph.D., ABPP
Secretary
Minutes
APPIC Board of Directors Meeting

AUGUST 11–12, 1998
SAN FRANCISCO, CA

Administrative Director Connie Hercey and Chair Nadine Kaslow at APPIC’s 30th Anniversary Reception.

PRESENT: Dr. Cantrell, Chair; Drs. Boggs, Christiansen, Goldberg, Ms. Hercey (Administrative Director), Ms. Hollander, Esq. (Public Member), Drs. Kaslow, Leventhal, Pederson, and invited Board guests, Drs. Greg Kelin, Chair Computer Match Committee, Gordon Williams, administrator of the Clearinghouse and Webmaster, Emil Rodolfa, newly elected Board member effective 8/17/98, and Carl Zimet, Chair APPIC Standards and Review Committee, and Shane Lopez, APAGS representative.

APPIC Directory
The directory will be produced on a lighter weight paper this year which will reduce the overall mailing cost. The Board appointed Jeanette Hsu, Ph.D. of Palo Alto, VA Healthcare System as Director co-editor for the 1999-2000 edition. She will join Dr. Robert Hall as co-editor also at the Palo Alto VA.

APPIC Newsletter
will write about APPIC’s involvement with NAFTA in the next issue of the APPIC Newsletter.

Licensure Requirement Analysis
Dr. Cantrell and her interns have recently completed a 50-state comparison of licensure requirements. This information will now be available to our members, non-members and students on our web site pending appropriate references and documentation.

Hours in the Internships
2000 hours spent in internship training sometimes includes vacation, sick days, and holidays. Close to 30% of APPIC members have less than 2000 hours which can be a problem for licensure when transferring one state to another.

A Plan for Consultative Support to New and Developing Programs
Dr. Christiansen presented a written proposal to the Board. Everyone agreed this is a good idea but the discussion also raised a number of questions about process, procedure, and personnel. Dr. Pederson suggested these ideas should be reviewed by a task force and presented to the Board either on-line or at the next meeting.

APPIC Internship Credentials Data Bank and Other Services
The Board opposed APPIC getting into the “business” of verifying an individual’s completion at an APPIC internship site.

APAGS
Shane Lopez has completed his term as liaison with APPIC. Dr. Jessica Kohout’s office has the unplaced student survey data. APAGS has set aside money to also do an unplaced student survey. Mr. Lopez reported the APPIC-APAGS liaison remains a high priority.

APAGS shares that priority and emphasized the need for the new liaison to be able to commit to 2 years as the liaison. APAGS is split 50-50 on moving the internship to a postdoctoral position in the training sequence.

1999 Membership Meeting and Conference
Co-Chairs Boggs and Zimet will invite an APA Monitor representative to cover the Conference which will be held March 24-27 at the Sheraton World Resort in Orlando, FL. Dr. Boggs presented the provisional schedule and timeline for the Conference. The Board decided that accreditation workshops could stand alone without competition and that the committee should also take a look at the topics of diversity, legal, and global issues. The proposed registration fee will be $125 - Members, $150 - Subscribers, $200 for others. The Conference must be self-supporting. The Board is very particular about accepting funding from contributors such as book publishers and drug companies. Each offer will be judged independently.

Consortia Task Force
A call was sent out to the APPIC membership for volunteers. The first meeting is scheduled during the APA Business meeting at APA in San Francisco. Dr. Kathleen Boggs is the board representative to the task force. The board wants one member of the task force to be from the Doctoral Membership Committee and one from the Membership Review Committee.

APPIC-APA Data Sharing Agreement
APPIC and APA have signed a data sharing agreement, July 1998, and this will be announced at the APPIC Business Meeting on Friday, August 14.

Annual Survey
There were 300 questionnaires returned. The major results were as follows: (1) No change in UND was preferred. (2) Support was favored for local/regional DOT subgroups. (3) 93 respondents find applicants deficient in traditional assessment skills. (4) 74% were not effected by the ‘no first choice information’ policy. (5) 1/3-1/4 still had no e-mail or website access. (6) Internship DOT’s average 12 hours per week at that task. Full results will appear in the November Newsletter.
Doctoral Membership Committee Reports
Dr. Leventhal, board contact to the committee, reported that thus far 40 programs have been approved and that the fast track program is in effect. The existing committee will end its term and review the last batch of applications after the September 30th application deadline. The committee will then reconstitute and move to a new geographic location. A call to the membership was sent in the Summer of 1998.

Doctoral Membership Review Committee
The Committee met July 29 and will meet again on October 21, 1998. This committee will also end this year and a new committee and location will be recruited from APPIC member volunteers selected by the Board.

All committee members ending their terms will be honored at the next Membership Meeting and Conference, March 24-27, 1999 in Orlando, Florida at the Sheraton World Resort.

Postdoctoral Membership and Review Committee
This Committee not only reviews new program applications, but also reviews existing programs for renewal based upon continued compliance with APPIC Criteria. Six new programs have been approved for membership this year, and 16 have been sent review notices. The next meeting is October 21st. The Board will continue to outreach to Postdoctoral programs and will remain sensitive to how we can meet their needs.

ASARC
Dr. Carl Zimet, ASARC chair feels that APPIC’s strong action on first choice greatly reduced the number of complaints. There were only 4 formal complaints this year. The Board extended Dr. Zimet’s term as chair until the end of December, 1999.

APPIC Newsletter
The next deadline for submissions is September 30 with an expected delivery date of November. The theme for this issue will be “What APPIC has done for you”. Dr. Goldberg will continue to find ways to reduce the cost of publishing the Newsletter.

Due to the fact that there is no training journal and APPIC is being cited more and more the Board will continue to openly discuss the pros and cons of transforming The APPIC Newsletter into a training journal. This could possibly happen gradually by dedicating one of the three issues per year solely to training issues, another issue to association business, and make another issue archival.

Website
Gordon Williams, Ph.D. APPIC Webmaster, asked the Board to move the web technology from PrimeHost. The new service will cost $1850 per year more. The board agreed to this budget increase because prime Host has increased our fees on three occasions.

Match Program
There are possibly 400-500 non-APPIC internship sites. It is believed the majority are on the west coast. New programs accepted after they have paid the $100 non member fee will be rebated $50 of the special assessment when their dues are due. They will be required to send in a letter of their acceptance along with their dues payment.

Dr. Kaslow, will chair a research committee and collaborate with other research groups. APPIC will be supportive of others who come to us seeking access to these data gleaned from the results of the data collected from the computer match.

Respectfully submitted,
Robert W. Goldberg, Ph.D., ABPP
Secretary
1998 Membership Meeting continued from page 19

duced newly elected Board member Dr. Emil Rodolfi. Committee members and liaisons present were introduced by Dr. Cantrell. She announced the convening of a new Consortia Task Force which met just prior to the Business meeting in this room with Dr. Kathleen Boggs as Board representative.

Newsletter
Newsletter Editor, Dr. Robert Goldberg announced that APPIC would now publish three editions of The APPIC Newsletter this year in July, November, and March. The future focus may be toward a journal format.

Annual Survey Results
Dr. Robert Goldberg reported the findings from the 1998 APPIC Annual Survey. There were 300 questionnaires returned. The major results were as follows: (1) No change in UND was preferred. (2) Support was favored for local/regional DOT subgroups. (3) 93 respondents found applicants deficient in traditional assessment skills. (4) 74% were not affected by the ‘no first choice information’ policy. (5) 1/3-1/4 still had no e-mail or website access. (6) Internship DOT’s average 12 hours per week at that task. Full results will appear in the November Newsletter.

Treasurer’s Report
Dr. Martha Christiansen, APPIC Treasurer, reported corrections to the 1998 Budget. Total inflows are $424,125 and inflows minus outflows are $103,087. She reported we are currently on target for projections and the Board is exercising commitment for travel. The goal is to maintain 6 months expenses in reserves.

APPIC Directory Report
Dr. Peggy Cantrell compared previous year statistics and reported there are 22 more programs in 1998 with 46 more funded FT slots than the previous year. In the previous 1997 year APPIC lost 39 FT slots. There were 12 fewer unfunded slots. There are 14 new APA accredited programs in 1998 with 8 fewer unfunded APA slots. The average number of applications received per agency was 30.

Anti-trust
Is it legal for internship programs to limit the number of applicants from one school over another? Ms. Patricia Hollander, Esq. reminded members that selection practices which may be deemed to restrict entry into the profession could be interpreted to be possible violations of anti-trust law; and members should consult with their legal counsel before implementing any such questionable practices. APPIC suggests that its members assist applicants in deciding to which internships to apply by describing carefully in internship brochures the goals and training needs of their programs, and what selection criteria will be used. This should help applicants determine which programs are not a good fit for them.

ASARC
Committee Chair, Dr. Carl Zimet felt the first choice policy that APPIC made this year had a strong impact and greatly reduced the number of registered formal complaints.

Doctoral Membership Committee
Dr. Gerald Leventhal Board representative reported that 40 programs had been approved to date representing approximately 80 new slots. The current committee chaired by Dr. Mary Jenkins will convene for the last time after the September 30 application deadline. The new committee will relocate to a new region.

Doctoral Membership Review Committee
Dr. Mary Oehlert, Chair of the Doctoral Membership Review Committee began 3 years ago and the committee had reviewed 109 non-APA accredited APPIC programs for compliance. The Committee will complete their final review in October. Two problem areas for programs undergoing review were: a) training goals and statements and b) due process statements in the brochure.

Postdoctoral Membership and Review Committee
Dr. Kathleen Boggs is the Board representative to this committee which has a dual purpose. It not only reviews new postdoctoral programs and makes recommendations to the Board, but also, reviews existing postdoctoral programs for compliance with APPIC criteria. There are 78 postdoctoral members. There were 76 last year. There are 29 single programs and 49 combined doctoral and postdoctoral programs. A postdoctoral criteria clarification form was added to the postdoctoral application and is included in the APPIC Directory.

Consortia Task Force Committee
Dr. Kathleen Boggs announced the first meeting of this committee after this Business meeting. The purpose of the task force will be to help guide the Membership Committee and Review Committees in the areas of standardization, purpose, rationale, definition, minimum criteria, supervision, and any other areas of concern.

Second Annual Membership Meeting and Conference
Dr. Kathleen Boggs, Chair of the next APPIC Membership Meeting and Conference, announced it will be held on March 25-27, 1999 at the Sheraton World Resort in Orlando, Florida. Dr. Jill Reich, APA Education Directorate, will be the keynote speaker. Some proposed topics under review are: models of APA accredited programs, assessing outcomes, impaired trainees, difficult but not impaired trainees/supervisors, research, consortia, moving programs toward accreditation, legal issues, diversity, and regional and like-site settings meeting as a group.

The Website
Dr. Gordon Williams, the APPIC Webmaster, announced that the website has been in operation for 14 months. The website was designed to constantly update member concerns, The APPIC Directory, relevant legal articles, the AAPI (APPIC Application for Psychology Interns) are only a few of the more frequently visited sites on the webpage. The Board encourages the membership to visit the site frequently for updated information. The Clearinghouse was very well received this year and was accessed over 20,000 times. The APPIC web address is: www.appic.org.

APPIC List Serves
Dr. Gerald Leventhal, APPIC Board member, announced the beginning of 5 e-mail list services. Three of them are open to the public, APPIC Match News, APPIC Training Network, and the APPIC Web News. Two list serves are available only to APPIC members, the APPIC Members Network and the APPIC Members News. Use of the list serves is free and instructions for how to access each one are listed on the APPIC web page: www.appic.org.

The Matching Program
Dr. Gregory Kelin, Match Program Chair, reported that the committee has been established for one year. Committee members are Drs. Nancy
Garfield, Peggy Cantrell, Gordon Williams, and Ms. Patricia Hollander, Esq. The National Matching Service, a company in Toronto, Canada was accepted. The committee did an extensive job of educating the APPIC membership about matching with a video presentation and numerous mailings as well as being accessible by e-mail and telephone for consultation. The Match program is open to members as well as non-APPIC member programs. It is the hope that after the matching process is complete next year, we will know for the first time how many students are unplaced. The Match Program registration deadline will be December 1. The Matching Program has been a 10-year evolution with the foundation laid by Drs. Bernhard Blom, Robert Klepac, and Sanford Pederson. The membership was invited to ask questions of Match Chair, Dr. Keilin, at the conclusion of the meeting.

**Supply and Demand Conference**

Proceedings from the conference are scheduled to be available in November, 1998 to those who attended. Dr. Emil Rodolfa followed up on what was accomplished by APPIC as a result of the Supply and Demand Conference and the highlights were:

- strengthened relationship with APAGS
- changed the AAPI to include "non-direct" clinical services
- Tips for Trainers column in the *APPIC Newsletter*

- consensus that unfunded internships are acceptable but not encouraged
- a formalized process for support in developing new internships through Dr. Martha Christiansen
- established a Research Committee for Issues in Training APPIC Board members Drs. Kaslow and Rodolfa

**APA-APPIC Data Sharing Agreement**

The APA-APPIC Data Sharing Agreement has been signed and is now a legal agreement.

**Board Officers**

Dr. Cantrell and the Board expressed their sincere thanks to Dr. Martha Christiansen whose term is expiring and is no longer working at an APPIC member program. Dr. Christiansen has served APPIC well as Chair of the Membership Committee, as well as Secretary and Treasurer of APPIC. Dr. Cantrell stepped down as Chair of APPIC after her one year term of service and the Board elected Dr. Nadine Kaslow to fill that position. The Board expressed its sincere appreciation to Dr. Cantrell.

Respectfully submitted,
Robert W. Goldberg, Ph.D., ABPP
Secretary
FOR MEMBERS: APPIC members automatically receive the Directory, the Newsletter, and access to the APPIC Clearinghouse. Your program’s listing in the APPIC Directory will be updated annually. Update forms will be mailed in the Spring to all current members. To assure that your listing is current and accurate, we request that you inform APPIC by mail of any changes in the listing as soon as they occur. Please do not communicate such changes by telephone, but convey them in written form clearly identifying your program in the letter. Mail to: 733 15th Street, NW, Suite 719, Washington, D.C. 20005.

FOR NONMEMBERS: Individuals, nonmember institutions and non-subscribers can obtain the Directory at a cost of $70 per copy. Students can obtain the Directory at the reduced price of $35, provided the graduate program in which the student is enrolled is an APPIC subscriber, and they submit their Directory order on graduate program stationery countersigned by their academic advisor or clinical training director. Non-APPIC members can become subscribers. Every Subscriber program receives a copy of the APPIC Directory, the APPIC Newsletter, and access to the APPIC Clearinghouse. The cost of a subscription for a doctoral psychology program is $225 per year. Both Members and Subscribers may obtain additional copies of the APPIC Directory at a discount price of $35 per copy, $30 if 3 or more are ordered and mailed to ONE address. Additional Newsletter copies are $10 each. Orders for the Directory should state to whom, and to what address the Directory should be sent. Checks for subscriptions and for orders should be made payable to APPIC and mailed to APPIC’s Central Office: 733 15th Street, NW, Suite 719, Washington, D.C., 20005; (202) 347-0022. Prepayment is required prior to shipping.

APPIC NEWSLETTER
Robert W. Goldberg, Ph.D.
Editor
733 - 15th Street, N.W., Suite 719
Washington, DC 20005

APPIC NEWSLETTER POLICY
APPIC encourages its members to contribute to the Newsletter’s content. Contributions may take the form of essays, theoretical or data-based articles/studies, and brief reports on topics and issues directly related to internship training in psychology at the pre- and post-doctoral levels. APPIC reserves the right to accept or reject submissions for publication in the Newsletter. The opinions and statements in contributions selected for publication in the Newsletter are the responsibility of the author(s) and do not necessarily represent the endorsement, views, or policies of APPIC or the Newsletter Editor. It is suggested that the APA Publication Manual guidelines be followed for submissions. Please submit contributions (hard copy) to the APPIC Newsletter Editor at Central Office.

SUBMISSION DEADLINES: For submissions to be published in the Newsletter, manuscripts should reach the Newsletter Editor by May 15 for the July issue, by September 30 for the November issue, and by February 15 for the March issue.