**Society for Research in Psychopathology  
 John Neale Mentorship Award**

**Guidelines and Call for Applications**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Objective** | To recognize an exceptional and sustained record of mentorship in training research scientists who go on to contribute to and advance knowledge of psychopathology or related fields of clinical science. |
| **Eligibility** | Nominees must have held faculty positions for at least 15 years (not necessarily continuously or at the same location). Nominees typically will have reached the level of full professor, although special exceptions may be considered; priority will be given to more senior people. Nominees must have had direct supervisory responsibilities for trainees and must have been a member of SRP for at least 3 years, although active membership at the time of the award is not required. In considering the accomplishments of the mentor’s trainees, primary emphasis will be given to those who were mentored at the doctoral or post-doctoral level, but evidence also may be presented regarding former undergraduate students who were significantly inspired by the mentor to pursue advanced training in psychology or a related field. In considering mentorship, mentees may be included if they worked closely with the nominee at the same institution for a period of at least 1 year, regardless of whether the nominee chaired the mentee’s dissertation. However, there must be evidence of direct supervisory responsibility beyond taking classes from the nominee or being part of the same collaborative research program. Posthumous awards will not be given. An individual may receive an SRP Mentorship Award only once. |
| **Nominations** | Nominations must be submitted by one or more former trainees, with one individual indicated as the primary nominator. Materials must be submitted electronically and include: (1) the mentor’s CV (or, if a CV is not available, a document contain information typically found in a CV); (2) at least three supporting letters from former students or trainees; (3) as complete a list as possible of students trained at the undergraduate, graduate, or post-doctoral level under the nominee’s mentorship who have gone on to research careers in psychopathology or related fields of clinical science; (4) a CV or biosketch from at least three (and preferably more) of the nominee’s former students, indicating where and when they worked with the nominee and documenting their contributions in psychopathology or related fields. Supporting letters from former trainees should describe ways in which the mentor contributed to their success beyond simply providing a spot in an excellent program, space in a lab, or financial support for their work. Self-nominations will not be considered.  Insert here information re: how applications are to be submitted (typically e-mail to Committee Chair; in the future, website may have submission capability). |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Important dates** | Application submission deadline: February 15, 20XX 🡨update each year Notification of the award winner will be made around the end of March. |
| **Selection** | A committee of at least 3 SRP members evaluates the applications. If a committee member is nominated, that committee member is replaced. |
| **Criteria** | The committee will evaluate candidates based on the research accomplishments of the students that they have mentored. Priority is given to those individuals who have trained a number of students who have gone on to make their own independent and substantial contributions to the field of psychopathology (not simply research psychology or mental health broadly defined). Emphasis is placed on the cumulative record of training extending across a period of years. There must be evidence of success beyond one or two exceptional students. It is not sufficient to show that students were productive while collaborating with the mentor or working in a related lab, but rather that the trainees went on to develop their own independent research program. Winners of this award will be people who fostered independence in the intellectual pursuits of their students and inspired the integration of methodological rigor and innovation with creative approaches to important conceptual problems in the field.  Exceptional candidates are mentors whose students subsequently train successfully their own graduate students, thus demonstrating continuity of impact across more than one generation of research scientists and extending beyond the intellectual confines of the mentor’s own specific research program (i.e., a generative academic family tree).  The award is not simply a longevity award. Professors are expected to teach, and those in strong departments eventually will be associated with some successful students. The Mentorship Award is intended to identify and recognize exceptional individuals who stand out in the context of otherwise strong training environments or who help to crystallize energy and activities within a training program made up of other talented, productive colleagues and students. The award is based on merit of the nomination and will not necessarily be awarded annually.  Nominees are evaluated largely on the basis of the contributions made by their students. It is assumed, however, that the mentor also has developed and maintained an active research program, providing a research environment that attracted talented students and that nurtured their training. Most successful nominees typically will be widely recognized and highly successful research scientists, but the overall distinction and continuity of the person’s own research accomplishments are not the primary focus of this award. A benevolent support person working in someone else’s lab or in a more generic training environment would not be eligible in spite of the important role that such faculty members play. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  |  |
| **Award** | The Awardee receives a free banquet ticket at the Annual Meeting at which the Award is presented. |
| **Announcement** | When the Awardee is informed of his/her selection, s/he is free to disclose that information if s/he desires. A public announcement of the Awardee is made at the Annual Member’s Meeting. A formal presentation of a plaque is made at the banquet of the Annual Meeting, or at the time of the paper presentation if the Awardee is unable to attend the banquet. |

**Mentorship Award Committee Chair Handbook**

**(Contains additional information beyond what’s in the Guidelines above)**

1. The committee typically consists of the Chair, the Past-Chair (for continuity), and an additional member. Typically the incoming President selects the Chair at the Annual Meeting, and it is easiest also to confirm that the Past-Chair is able and willing to continue on the committee, and to solicit the third member at the Annual Meeting. It is best to include a cross-section of interests and faculty levels on the committee. Per the bylaws, committee membership officially needs to be approved by the President.

**NOTE:** Individuals who wish to nominate their mentor for the award may not serve on the award committee in the year they do so, so you may want to inquire about this when selecting your third committee member. Members who agree to serve on the committee and subsequently decide to nominate their mentor will need to recuse themselves from the committee, necessitating finding a new committee member.

1. Typically around December 1, the secretary should send the Call for Nominations to the membership. Check in with the secretary about this in early November to determine the specific nomination deadline for the year, which is typically around mid-February. To ensure that all potential nominators have complete information, a copy of the Mentorship Award guidelines (the first two pages of this document) should be saved as a pdf file and sent with the Call for Nominations. The information can be included in the body of the e-mail and the Guidelines themselves as an attachment. Alternatively or in addition, if the current/ new website allows, the Guidelines may be posted on the website with a link in the Call for Nominations e-mail.
2. The Call should inform potential nominators how to submit a nomination (e.g., typically they’ve been e-mailed directly to the Chair, but post-website development, it may be possible for them to be uploaded to the website). When you get an nomination, check to ensure that it contains all the materials specified in the Guidelines, and inform the primary nominator if any materials are missing or confirm that the nomination is complete.
3. The nomination deadline is typically around February 15, although at your discretion you may allow a few days leeway if an incomplete nomination is submitted right at the deadline to give the primary nominator a chance to submit the missing documents if s/he can do so quickly. When all the nomination materials are in, send them along with a copy of the Mentorship Award Guidelines to the other committee members for review.

**NOTE**: Unsuccessful nominees from the previous year can roll over to the next year, so you should send the committee the previous years’ nominee materials as well. The one exception to this is if the previous year’s committee chair advises against it because, for example, the previous year’s committee did not think that the nominee met the award criteria, so if the previous year’s chair hasn’t contacted you already about this, check with him/her before sending these materials.

1. Schedule a conference meeting (e.g., via telephone, Skype, Google+, etc.) with the committee in late February or March to discuss the nominations. Alternatively, have the committee members rank order or rate the candidates and see if there is enough agreement to have the discussion via email. Come to consensus regarding the award winner or that there should be no award winner that year. Also decide whether any nominations are sufficiently meritorious that they might be rolled over to the next year.
2. When the committee has made its selection, notify the President, Secretary, Local Host, and Treasurer of whom you have chosen as the Awardee, and who is the primary nominator.
3. Around the end of March, notify the Awardee and his/her primary nominator of the committee’s selection. Tell the primary nominator that s/he is expected to give a brief presentation about the winner at the Award Ceremony or, if s/he can’t do this, that s/he should ask one of the other nominators to do this and, if none of them can, then s/he should write something for you (or the President) to say when presenting the Award.
4. Notify all the primary nominators of those who did not win that their nominee was not selected and, if the nominee is sufficiently meritorious, ask the nominators if they would like the materials to be rolled over to the next year or withdrawn so they can submit a revised nomination. If they choose to roll over the materials, file them where you can find them and send them to the next year’s Chair after s/he is selected at the next Annual Meeting.
5. The Secretary orders the plaque, but it’s a good idea to remind him/her of that at least 5 weeks before the meeting. The standard format for the plaque is:

Society for Research in Psychopathology

Mentorship Award

Winner Name

Year

1. A few weeks prior to the meeting, check in with the winner and nominators to confirm whether they will or won’t be attending the banquet and, depending on the response make any further needed arrangements (e.g., get information about the winner to present at the meeting if none of the nominators are able to do so). Also, ask the nominator (or whoever will be giving the brief presentation) what equipment, if any, s/he would like to have set up at the banquet (e.g., for a brief powerpoint presentation). **Check with the local host to make sure that whatever equipment the nominator would like to have, in fact can be made available.** If not, inform the nominator of this and make other arrangements.
2. Typically, at both the Members’ meeting and Award Ceremony, the President will introduce you as the Committee Chair and you will say a few words (if you want to do so) about the nomination process (especially, for example, if there were a number of good nominees), and then announce the winner and primary nominator. At the meeting, check with the President to make sure that this is the way s/he wants to do this and adjust accordingly.
3. Once at the meeting, check in with the local host about equipment needs at the Award Ceremony, and make sure that whoever will present the Award gets the plaque!
4. Near the end of the meeting, check with the incoming President re: who will be the Chair in the next year. Check in with that person to let him/her know about the existence of this handbook, that you will let him/her know how to access it when it’s been updated, and that you will/ won’t be providing him/her with materials from this year to roll over to the next year.
5. After the meeting, update this document (if necessary), save it to a new name by changing the date, and upload it to the SRP Handbooks webpage: <http://www.psychopathology.org/category/handbooks>  
    (userid: handbooks, pw: handbooks).   
   Let the new Chair know you’ve done this and you’re finished as Chair, congratulations!