

Manual for Nominating Fellows of APA

Adopted by the Membership Committee on June 24, 1994

INTRODUCTION

Becoming an APA Fellow recognizes outstanding contributions to psychology and is an honor valued by many members. This manual describes the history of the term "Fellow," the nomination process, the primary basis for the nomination, the role of endorsers, and criterion considerations. The first edition of this manual was developed in response to recommendations from the Board of Directors and its Subcommittee on Fellowship Issues in December 1982, stemming from actions by the Council of Representatives in August 1982.

A second edition added a more detailed description of nomination criteria and observations regarding the nature of endorsement letters. This third edition integrates the material into a single document and provides up-to-date information on the process. Although primarily addressed to Chairs of division Fellows Committees, the information provided here should be helpful to wider audiences as well.

HISTORY

The category of Fellow did not exist in the APA until the 1946 Bylaws established a "new" APA -- the amalgamation of the American Association of Applied Psychology (AAP) and the APA. All APA Members and AAP Fellows were made Charter Fellows of the new APA. Prior to 1926, the APA had members only; the category of Associate member was established in 1926.

The 1946 Bylaws set the following requirements for Fellow status: a doctoral degree based in part upon a psychological dissertation conferred by a graduate school of recognized standing, prior membership as an Associate, and either acceptable published research of a psychological character beyond the doctoral degree or four years of acceptable professional experience subsequent to the granting of the doctoral degree.

In 1951, a Bylaws amendment established the Membership Committee (evaluation of applications had become too time-consuming a task for the Board of Directors) and increased the experience requirement for Fellow status from four to five years. Also, the Council voted "to request that the Board of Directors appoint a committee to consider the matter of more uniform and adequate

preliminary investigation of Fellowship candidates." Uniform applications and procedures were developed during 1951-52 with the cooperation of the 18 divisions then in existence. In 1952, the Council adopted the following requirements for the nomination materials to be submitted by divisions to the APA Membership Committee: (1) evidence of the possession of a doctoral degree based in part upon a psychological dissertation, with the title and a brief synopsis of the dissertation; (2) a chronological summary of all experience subsequent to the bachelor's degree; (3) a list of the applicant's publications in psychology; and (4) the names and addresses of not fewer than two sponsors or endorsers who are Fellows of the APA. Fellow status was by application, and a list of applicants was published at an appropriate time in the *American Psychologist* for information and comments.

In 1958, Bylaws amendments established three categories of membership: Associate, Member (doctoral), and Fellow. They also added the following requirements for Fellow: active engagement in the advancement of psychology in any of its aspects, and evidence of unusual and outstanding contribution or performance in the field of psychology (plus prior status as a Member for at least one year).

The principle of Fellowship by invitation instead of self-initiated application was also approved in 1958. However, it did not become mandatory until 1964 in order to give divisions time to develop their procedures. The 1959 Annual Report of the APA Membership Committee included the following recommendations, all of which were adopted by the Council as interim guidelines: (1) for the present, those divisions that wished to do so were authorized to continue with the application procedure but, in general, the divisions were strongly encouraged to initiate an invitational procedure or experiment with a combination of the two; (2) that the 1952 procedures adopted by the Council were interpreted to mean that the application need not be filed with the Central Office by the individual but may be submitted by the division concerned; (3) that in developing invitational procedures, divisions should be guided by the need for careful annual review of Members to ensure that potential Fellows are not overlooked; and (4) that appropriate division personnel should make sure that the application form is complete and that appropriate sponsors were selected.

That 1959 report also addressed the problem the Membership Committee faces in evaluating "outstanding and unusual contribution or performance." Four sources of information were listed (note the order): (1) statements of sponsors; (2) publications; (3) candidate's statements of education, positions, etc.; and (4) personal knowledge. The last source can, of course, be both favorable and unfavorable to the candidate and is too variable a factor to be given great weight. The Committee then, and today, found meaningful evaluations by sponsors or endorsers to be the most helpful type of evidence in the evaluation of applicants or nominees who are engaged in advancing psychology as a science. The adequacy of the endorsement has been of critical value in evaluating those who are advancing psychology as a profession. What was true in the 1950s is equally true at present.

A resolution introduced at the September 1979 meeting of the Council recommended a number of procedures intended to encourage Fellow nominations in a manner as free of potential bias as possible. A survey of division practices was conducted by the APA Membership Committee, leading to the adoption by the Council at its August/September 1980 meeting of the following guidelines for Divisions (on recommendation by the Committee and the Board of Directors): (1) that each division employ orderly procedures for ensuring the nomination of appropriate and deserving potential Fellows; (2) that divisions be encouraged (but not required) to ask nominees to provide a self-generated written statement setting forth their accomplishments that warrant nomination to Fellow status; (3) that evaluators at the division level submit to the Division Fellows Committee a narrative explanation of their decisions and, when the decision is supportive of the nomination, that all materials reviewed by the Division Committee be forwarded to the APA Membership Committee; and (4) that the Board of Directors continue to review the APA Membership Committee's recommendations prior to making its recommendations to the Council, as specified in the current APA Bylaws.

In 1991, a policy regarding multiple nominations (nominations of the same person by more than one division) was proposed by the Membership Committee and approved by the Board of Directors and the Council of Representatives. An amendment to Association Rule 10-8.2 was approved in August 1991 and is now included in Fellows nominations procedures that went into effect with the nominations submitted for 1993 election. Due to an increase in the number of multiple nominations for initial Fellow status in subsequent years, the need for modification and clarification of procedures had become evident to the Membership Committee and the Board of

Directors. The Committee and Board concurred that in any one year, a nominee for initial Fellow status would be best served by only one division promoting the candidate's qualifications, with allowance for endorsements and support from other appropriate divisions that deem the candidate worthy of fellowship.

The formerly used term "Old" Fellow is no longer in use. The descriptive terms to indicate type of Fellow status are 1) Initial Fellow (first time nominee) and 2) *Current* Fellow (already a Fellow of APA).

THE NOMINATION PROCESS

1. Role of Divisions

Initial Fellows

Prior to the 1951-52 actions, the division alone bore the burden of evaluating eligibility for Fellow status. The Board of Directors received a simple form, listing the name of the applicant, the year the doctoral degree was awarded, and the name of the granting institution. Fellows were "Fellows in the Division of ____." The divisions acted independently, and the Board of Directors noted and accepted the recommendations.

The divisions are the major instrument for achieving Fellow status. It is at the division level that the first judgments are made as to who is a likely candidate and the time-consuming job of collecting and organizing the necessary information is performed. It is also at the division level that the final or prefinal decisions are made about whom to nominate for consideration by the APA Membership Committee.

Each division establishes its own criteria for nomination to initial Fellow status. Sometimes these criteria are simply the same as APA's requirements for nomination; however, some divisional criteria provide greater detail and/or include additional criteria which are relevant only to a particular division.

Each division is asked to give the APA Membership Committee a list of the criteria it uses in determining a "significant contribution to psychology." Every division should clearly spell out the criteria it believes are important for its area in determining "outstanding and unusual contribution or performance." When evaluating each nominee's material, the members of the APA Membership Committee carefully consider the division's criteria -- as well as APA's criteria -- for initial Fellow status.

Nominating Procedure

For ensuring the selection of appropriate and deserving potential Fellows, the following suggestions from a 1980 report of the APA Membership Committee are pertinent: (1) a call for nominations should be issued in division newsletters indicating that nominations may be submitted by any member; (2) each year the division's Fellows Chairs should solicit the division's executive body for possible nominations; and (3) annually, every member of the division should be made aware that any nomination from any member will be considered by the division's Fellows Committee.

At the August 15, 1991 meeting of the Council of Representatives, the following change was made to the nominating procedure: If an individual is nominated by more than one division (multiple nominations), the nominee will select the division which best represents the nominee's work and contributions to psychology. The selected division will become the "Nominating Division." The nominee is asked to inform the Nominating Division of any other divisions which have expressed an interest in nominating the candidate for Fellow.

It is the responsibility of the Nominating Division to contact any additional interested divisions to request letters of support. If other Division Fellows Committees have reviewed and approved the person for nomination to Fellow status, this information should be sent to the Nominating Division as preapproval for Fellow status in that division if elected by the Board of Directors and Council of Representatives.

Aside from collecting the necessary documentary materials, the divisions must secure the required endorsing statements, following up as necessary with nonresponders and attempting to make sure that the endorsements are not perfunctory but rather meaningful and convincing. The divisions have the responsibility of explaining to those who are nominated, but whom the division decides not to recommend to the Membership Committee, why nomination is considered not appropriate (at least at that time).

The Membership Committee sends a letter to each Fellows Chair after their March meeting regarding the status of each of the division's Fellow nominees. The divisions have the responsibility of informing the nominees of the APA Membership Committee decision concerning their candidacy when the Committee's action is to defer or to not recommend (although Central Office may do so, if the division so requests, *after the Convention*).

Please note that the Committee's recommendations are subject to review by the Board of Directors, prior to nomination for election by the Council of Representatives.

In addition, the divisions are asked to provide additional information to the APA Membership Committee when they believe that a decision to not recommend or to defer warrants an appeal by the divisions. The Committee holds a special convention meeting to consider such appeals.

Divisions must ensure that the appropriate person (usually the Central Office Liaison to the Membership Committee) is fully informed about who the division officially nominates. It sometimes happens, inappropriately, that materials for Members not nominated are submitted together with those for official nominees.

Current APA Fellows

In addition to nominating Members for *initial* APA Fellow status, divisions have the right to elect to Fellow status members of their division who are already APA Fellows in other divisions. A Rule of Council specifies that the standards for such election "shall not be significantly different than those applied to a Member nominated for initial Fellow status." The divisions vary in their implementation of the Rule. Some require the person to fill out the Uniform Fellow Application and obtain endorsements; others rely on endorsements alone. This process is done internally within the division and does not need further consideration from the APA Membership Committee. However, the division must notify the APA Membership Committee Liaison when they confer Fellow recognition on a member who has already been granted such status in another division.

Several divisions honor their newly elected Fellows in special programs at the following year's convention and by special notices in newsletters.

2. Role of the APA Membership Committee

Under the Bylaws, the Committee is charged with reviewing nominations for Fellow status and making its recommendations on each case to the Board of Directors. It does this through experience and by applying criteria developed over the years through surveys of division criteria and procedures. It attempts to maintain comparable standards across divisions.

The Committee is the only standing committee limited to Fellows as members. It currently has six members who represent as broad a range of specialties as possible. It is responsible for evaluating candidates for initial APA membership as well as nominees for Fellow status. Members frequently have served as Division Fellows Chairs prior to election to the Membership Committee.

The Committee typically holds one meeting in March and a second meeting if necessary in May to consider Fellow nominations, followed by a brief convention-time meeting

to reconsider nominations not recommended or deferred at the previous meetings but for whom divisions submit additional supportive information with a request for reconsideration. The Committee has available all extant criteria developed by divisions, and there is often lengthy discussion, particularly in connection with not-recommended nominations; deferral usually involves a technical lack of information provided by the nominee, an endorser, or the division. Prior to the convention, the Committee submits its recommendations to the Board of Directors. The Membership Committee also has meetings with division representatives when problems warrant face-to-face discussions. It must be recognized that the Membership Committee *recommends* election of Fellows but it is the Council of Representatives that actually *elects* them. Generally, to avoid possible embarrassment, no public announcement of nomination status is made until after the Council of Representatives votes at the convention.

3. Role of the Board of Directors

At the convention, the Board reviews the recommendations of the Membership Committee. This meeting takes place before the Committee's annual convention meeting, and at times additional information provided by the Board has led the Committee to change its final recommendations. The Board's action typically is to pass the list of nominees on to the Council of Representatives for action.

4 Role of the Council of Representatives

The final list of Members nominated for election to initial APA Fellow status is submitted to the Council for election. Information regarding those nominees not recommended remains confidential, but the *number* of nominees not recommended is reported to Council.

5. Role of the Central Office

A member of the Central Office staff is designated by the Chief Executive Officer to serve as liaison to the APA Membership Committee. In connection with Fellowship matters, the liaison keeps the divisions informed of rules, procedures, deadlines, policy changes, and decisions of the Membership Committee, and he/she ensures that member records are appropriately updated.

Immediately following the convention, the liaison sees to it that a personal letter is sent to each new Fellow. The letter, which is signed by the APA Chief Executive Officer and the Membership Committee Chair, indicates to which division(s) the person was elected.

Upon request, the liaison also provides divisions with Uniform Fellow Application Forms, Fellow Standard Evaluation Forms, and other necessary materials. In general, requests from individual Members for the forms are referred to the relevant division because the Central Office cannot know how many copies a division might need, nor what additional information or special procedures might be involved.

The liaison sits with the Committee at its meetings and is available during the Board of Directors convention meeting to assist in the review of the nominations. The liaison also prepares the final list for submission to Council after making sure that divisions have had an opportunity to confirm their final nominations.

PRIMARY BASIS FOR THE NOMINATION

Any of the nominee's achievements may contribute to the weight of evidence in favor of the nomination. Commonly, the nominee has a particular area on which the nomination is primarily based. Most often it is research, but practice, teaching, public service, administration, or professional activity may be the primary basis. The nomination should note the primary basis in a narrative either by the nominee or by the division Fellows Chair. This narrative can save time for the Membership Committee because it directs concentration of attention.

The credentials of some nominees are sufficiently impressive so that the Committee would approve the nomination no matter which division submitted it. But nominations are likely to be more impressive if they bear a clear relationship to the submitting division. For example, the Committee considers teaching as a primary basis for the nomination if Division 2 makes the nomination. Professional political activity is more impressive if the nominee comes from Division 31. Lack of original research is not a main concern for Division 31 or Division 42 nominees. Community service is apt to be more highly regarded by the Committee in nominations from Divisions 27 and 37. In general, the Committee will tend to look for publications or relevant supporting documents that reflect the nominee's contributions to areas of interest to the particular division that submits the nomination.

1. Research as the Primary Basis

Research is the primary basis for most nominees every year, typically documented by sustained research-based publications in refereed journals. The critical issue is whether or not the nominee has one or more publications or grants that have had demonstrated impact, for instance as documented by citation indices.

The following types of contributions do not generally provide convincing evidence of the impact of a nominee's work:

1. Abstracts
2. Reports in press or in preparation
3. Book chapters in a collection that is edited or coedited by the nominee
4. Publications which, by their title, suggest that the nominee has generated a number of publications from a single collection of data
5. A long list of publications where the nominee is primary author less than 50% of the time without explanation of the nominee's role

Enclosing reprints is of limited value since the Committee may not have sufficient time to read them.

Research grant support is a legitimate credential if the granting agency is national and the amount is large. Small, intramural grants or grants for small amounts of funding are less convincing. Unfunded grant applications are not convincing as evidence of a research contribution.

2. Teaching, Administration, or Professional Service as the Primary Basis

The following attainments, even taken together, are insufficient evidence to warrant Fellow status. They represent the noteworthy psychologist, but not the outstanding one, unless it can be demonstrated that these attainments led to long-term impact in the development and progress of the science or practice of psychology at the local, state, regional, national and/or international level:

1. Department chair
2. Director of clinical training
3. President of an APA division
4. Member of an APA board or committee
5. President of a state or local psychological association
6. Recipient of an award by a local group

The following broader achievements suggest an opportunity for potential wide impact, though such impact still must be documented by appropriate statements in the nomination forms:

1. Evidence of outstanding teaching contributions such as consistently excellent student ratings; preparation of a widely used textbook; demonstrable major teaching, curriculum, or program innovations; or exceptional advising or mentoring.

2. President or dean of a college or university
3. Editor or founder of a quality journal
4. Leader of a credentialing body of psychology
5. Administrative official or influential person in a national or regional organization
6. Recipient of an award from a national or regional organization, assuming that criteria for the award are known by or made available to the Committee

3. Practice as the Primary Basis

It is more difficult to demonstrate that someone deserves the designation of Fellow with practice or clinical work as the primary basis than with other primary bases. Clinical practice is confidential; how would the world's most effective psychotherapist's credentials be presented to the Committee? Recognizing that many "practice" psychologists are also concerned with "Teaching, Administration or Professional Service," and recognizing further that by applying the sense of other criteria (such as, but not restricted to, numbers 5, 6, 7, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30 or 35 on pages 7 and 8), it becomes apparent that there are many avenues whereby "practice" can occur at an outstanding level. The practitioner candidate must present a broad history of combined practice and community service with documented impact. Again, the major consideration is the long-term impact on the science or practice of psychology at the local, state, regional, national and/or international levels.

SUPPORTING LETTERS

The Membership Committee's decision about many — perhaps most — nominations is substantially influenced by the supporting letters. The Committee considers carefully not only the text of a supporting letter but also the stature of the endorser and the endorser's status relative to the nominee. The Committee also considers the set of letters as a whole.

In documenting a nominee's contributions, the endorsers bear the major responsibility. They must first convince a division Fellows Committee that the Member is a promising candidate, and they must be willing to respond to the division's request for additional supportive material when their first statements require further specificity. Divisions vary, of course, in how well they do this job; when it is not done well, the nominee's case is weakened.

The following comments may help the endorsers draft effective supportive letters.

1. An example of an endorsement which would require additional elaboration is: "Dr. X is obviously qualified;

should have been a Fellow years ago." Such "endorsements" are sometimes signed by eminent Fellows, but they do not help the nominee or the Committee. Partly to overcome this lack, the number of endorsements required was increased in 1978 from two to at least three -- and preferably even more -- Fellows of the Association.

2. Many division Fellows Chairs are aware of the "impact" criterion, so some endorsers state that the nominee has had impact without presenting meaningful evidence for the statement. This type of assertion is essentially no more effective than the first type of statement.
3. A missing letter can be problematic. When the nominee has named an endorser who fails to respond, the question is then raised about why the letter is missing. The division Fellows Chair should address this issue when materials are submitted.
4. A set of sponsors, all of whom are from the nominee's immediate department or agency, or who are colleagues with whom the nominee has worked closely, is not convincing and suggests limited impact. Indeed, a majority of letters from persons who work closely with the nominee should be discouraged. A more diverse set of sponsors is likely to be more impressive.
5. Many convincing sponsor letters are fairly lengthy, running one to two single-spaced typewritten pages. A brief letter can be influential, but a longer letter may be necessary to testify to the sponsor's knowledge of the nominee, and to provide necessary documentation of impact. Endorsers should be strongly encouraged to type their comments. Illegible letters do not strengthen a candidate's case.
6. While longer evaluations tend to be more convincing, following is an example of a brief "good" one that supports a nomination from Division 12 (Clinical): "Dr. X has made her major contribution in the area of _____ methodology. She has pioneered in the development of computerized methodology for clinical _____ and has also been a major force in the critical examination of assessment models in _____. Her work has led many senior and junior psychologists to question the current developments in _____ from the standpoint of formal psychometric attributes. Furthermore, it has helped clinical psychologists realize that merely learning how to administer a 'valid' test does not provide them

sufficient information to draw meaningful conclusions about brain-behavior relationships at the clinical level. She has also served on several committees of import to developments in testing in _____ and on the editorial board of the leading journal in the field. Her work in _____ has been the standard for studies of _____ for many years. The endorser has known the nominee for over eight years, having read her works, having listened to her present formal lectures, and having participated with her in several symposiums at national conventions."

8. Several letters that independently address several of the same points about the nominee's impact are generally more convincing than letters which refer to different contributions.

CRITERION CONSIDERATIONS

The most difficult task facing nominees, sponsors, division Fellow Committees, and the APA Membership Committee is the documentation of "unusual and outstanding contribution or performance in the field of psychology." The following quotation from "A Communication from the APA Membership Committee" (*American Psychologist*, December 1965, pp. 1091-1092) summarizes the general problem:

"When evidence of unusual and outstanding contributions is not readily available through research activities (as revealed by publications), attainment of this criterion becomes difficult to assess. It is here that the sponsors can be of great help by carefully spelling out supporting evidence that the nominee's professional activities meet the requirement of an unusual and outstanding contribution or performance. Detailed evidence from sponsors as to the exact nature of the candidate's contributions would be of inestimable help. For example, it is usually not enough to know that the candidate was instrumental in establishing the "X" Center for Counseling and Psychotherapy in "Y" city. To assess accurately the unusual and outstanding aspects of such a contribution, one should also know how [the nominee] was instrumental and what significance the center actually holds within the field of psychology.

That a person is respected by colleagues may well be laudable, but it does not necessarily make [that person] an outstanding or unusual contributor to the field of psychology. Substantiating the claim of an unusual or outstanding contribution indeed may be difficult, but it should be less difficult for the sponsor who ostensibly is well acquainted with the candidate's achievements than for a six-member committee with no firsthand knowledge of the

[candidate or of the] candidate's professional activities. Sponsors should remember that their letters of endorsement are being written primarily for the use of an APA Membership Committee, as well as for a divisional committee whose members are specialists within a given field of interest."

The Membership Committee conducted surveys in 1968 and 1982 in response to a request from the Board of Directors Subcommittee on Fellowship Issues. There is variability among divisions, and how well the criteria are applied may vary from year to year within a given division. It is hoped that the following listing of suggestions, culled from many sources, will prove helpful to all concerned.

A. From the Standard Evaluation Form (Fellow)
used by endorsers for many years:

1. The existence of publications, if relevant, is not enough; they must report impressive work, have impact upon the work of others, and have been refereed appropriately;
2. The impact of innovations must be documented;
3. Citation of the nominee's work by others can be convincing;
4. Workshop activity is not an automatic criterion – many are entrepreneurial – but frequent participation over time can be good evidence of contribution;
5. Offices held in psychological associations, political and legislative activity, and the like are rarely enough in themselves to prove contribution. Endorsers must show the more-than-local impact;
6. Accumulation of impact and performance over time must be demonstrated;
7. Evidence of steady and continuing competence in itself is not likely to meet the criterion of "outstanding and unusual contributions"

B. From Division Surveys:

Some of these criteria are relevant only for certain divisions. However, many are relevant for all divisions. The length of this list (and it is not exhaustive) is an indication that divisions are, in their own distinctive ways, struggling to frame definitions of "unusual and outstanding contribution or performance." It should be pointed out that divisions use combinations of these criteria, as does the APA Membership Committee, when trying to assess the impact a nominee has had on the field of psychology. There can be no single criterion.

1. Sustained research contributions in well-refereed journals with favorable citation by other scientists;
2. Contributions in publications generally available to the profession or otherwise widely-communicated (such as through participation in the programs and meetings of professional groups and associations);
3. Development of influential theory or method or other scholarly pursuits;
4. Election to a board of editors or as editor or associate editor of a major journal in the field;
5. Resolution of important issues;
6. Opening up fruitful areas of investigation;
7. Generation of new knowledge/formulations/programs;
8. Outstanding teaching;
9. Innovative curriculum/courses;
10. Major role in conceiving/planning/directing a major research program;
11. Impact on local/state/national programs;
12. Demonstration of leadership and initiative in identifying problems, defining goals, formulating methods, and facilitating a productive exchange of ideas in the field;
13. Active and productive communication with those in related fields;
14. Influence on the profession outside one's setting;
15. Active participation in and leadership of relevant associations;
16. Public relations and media participation marked by energy, imagination, scholarship and persistence;
17. Creative leadership in program development in research, teaching, service, or community activities;
18. Receipt of awards for research, teaching, or service contributions;
19. Service as head or chair of a department or agency recognized as "outstanding" by peers and colleagues;
20. Invitations to address national and international conventions on a regular basis;

21. Administration of psychological programs involving considerable technical responsibility, effective supervision of professional personnel, or installation of programs in an organization;
22. Evidence of impact upon the total psychological program of major educational units and/or local, state or national programs;
23. Appointment to study sections or other national review bodies, or major participation in scholarly reviewing activities;
24. Spreading an understanding and application of new knowledge through innovations in teaching and/or practice;
25. Evidence or documentation that the person nominated has enriched or advanced the field on a scale well beyond that of being a good practitioner, teacher, or supervisor;
26. Service on divisional boards or committees, when such service can be shown to have had a positive impact on the relevant field as a profession or science;
27. Accomplishments that are visible and widely shared with colleagues;
28. For nominees in predominantly clinical practice, there is a need to specify how their therapy or practice represents an innovative application with, for example, a difficult disorder or an atypical client or patient population;
29. Contributions through consultation to courts, legislatures, and criminal justice systems;
30. Authorship or editorship of a major textbook;
31. Invitations to contribute whole chapters or major sections to textbooks;
32. Publication of a film or video series that conveys general psychological facts and principles;
33. Election to "fellow" status in related broad-based scientific or scholarly societies;
34. Evidence that the candidate has contributed to the promotion of the status of psychology on the social-political scene, especially through efforts that enhance the image of psychology.

Closing Comments to Division Fellows Chairs and Members of the Membership Committee

The responsibility of selecting appropriate individuals as Fellows of the Association is a significant one in terms of the Association's mission. The Membership Committee and staff are available to help division Fellows Chairs structure and carry out those duties efficiently, effectively, and collaboratively. This manual is one contribution to that objective, so feedback about its usefulness and about changes which should be made in it are welcome. Participating in the task and in improving how it is performed should help division Fellows Chairs, endorsers, and nominees have a positive image of the entire endeavor. Please submit comments or suggestions to the attention of the Staff Liaison to the Membership Committee, American Psychological Association, 750 First Street, NE, Washington, D.C. 20002-4242. All comments and suggestions will be greatly appreciated and will receive serious attention.