

Reviewer Instructions for APCS Membership (and Renewal) Applications

Thank you very much for offering to review an application for membership in the Academy of Psychological Clinical Science. The materials from the program that you have agreed to review are posted on the APCS Membership Review web page. Locate the type of program that you are reviewing (e.g., new application from a doctoral program), and click on that heading. Then choose the name of the specific program from the list that appears. You will need the program's username and password in order to open the application materials. If you have any problems, please contact the membership chairperson by e-mail.

If you have a meaningful conflict of interest with regard to this review, please notify the membership chairperson as soon as possible. Conflicts might include, but are not limited to, the following circumstances: you received your Ph.D. from the program in question, you were a member of the program's faculty at some point in time, or your best friend is the DCT for this program.

You will be working with two other reviewers. A sample review is also posted on this site to help you plan your comments. There are 6 sections to the review. For the sake of efficiency, it might be best to divide them up rather than duplicating efforts and then having to integrate the reports. Please communicate with the other reviewers and decide which of you will write each section. In addition to writing these sections, each reviewer should make an overall recommendation regarding membership. These recommendations typically fall into one of four categories: accept, reject, grant provisional membership, or seek additional information from the program.

Before you begin to prepare your review, please read the information that is provided to programs that are applying for membership (posted as "Application Information" on this web site). That document provides background regarding the criteria that have been established for membership in the Academy and things that we ask the program to provide. Two things should be emphasized with regard to this process. First, our approach is intended to allow programs to be flexible and creative. Second, our evaluation is based more on outcomes than on process. Is the program successful in producing students who are function as clinical scientists? Although we provide the program with a list of things that will be considered when they are reviewed, our letter indicates that all items are not necessary for membership, and all programs do not have to weight these items in the same way. Clinical science programs evolve continuously. At any given point in time, they may have identified goals that are not yet realized, problems that have not been solved, and weaknesses that are in the process of being strengthened.

Here is a list of program shortcomings that might lead us to believe that an applicant organization is not well suited for APCS membership.

1. weak evidence of faculty research productivity (grants, publications).
2. weak evidence of student research productivity (pubs, presentations).
3. lack of "clinical science" in curriculum (e.g., training in ESTs, research methods)

4. major transition in program such that it is not clear what direction it is heading.
5. training philosophy that does not match well with the clinical science approach.
6. lack of resources necessary to support clinical science objectives.
7. problems with student placement (pre- or post-doc)

Please try to complete your review within 6 weeks of accepting the assignment. Don't feel obligated to put together anything lengthy; a succinct summary and recommendation, certainly no longer than the example, will more than suffice. When you have completed your sections of the review and are ready to make a recommendation, please send that information to the membership chairperson by e-mail.

Thanks again for your effort!