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In the past 50 years, psychology has so heavily emphasized the full-time internship as the preeminent training model that it has often overlooked the benefits of half-time internships for educators, students, the profession, and the populations that psychologists serve. This article makes a case for the nearly forgotten half-time predoctoral internship. The history and context of the half-time internship, culminating in a recent national conference, is presented. The benefits to students, doctoral programs, and the community are described, as well as obstacles and solutions for their implementation. Implications for developing more half-time internships for psychology stakeholders are also discussed.
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In 1947, the American Psychological Association (APA) Committee on Training in Clinical Psychology articulated expectations for internship and predoctoral training in the growing field of clinical psychology (as referenced by Belar & Kaslow, 2003). Both the half-time and the full-time internship models met those original expectations. However, during the last half century, the trend of mainstream internships has been heavily weighted toward the full-time internship rather than the half-time internship. This article describes the utility of the half-time predoctoral internship. A history and context of the half-time internship, culminating in a recent national conference, is presented. Benefits of the half-time internship to students, doctoral programs, and the community are described in support of this vital model. Obstacles and solutions for its implementation are also presented. We conclude by exploring the implications for supporting and developing more half-time internships for stakeholders in professional psychology.

History and Context

The requirement of an internship in predoctoral clinical psychology training was institutionalized at the Boulder Conference in 1949 (Raimy, 1950). Both half-time and full-time internships were considered at Boulder. However, when types of full-time and half-time (or part-time) predoctoral internships were clarified in 1945 (Shakow et al., 1945), the full-time internship was deemed preferable to part-time concurrent academic and fieldwork. Part-time internships were considered less preferable because they were thought to result in “confusion and strain which come with shifting back and forth from the clinical to academic settings” (Altmaier, 2003, pp. 143–144). Full-time internships were valued for being similar to real work experiences and for the opportunity to use desirable institutions “at some distance” (Altmaier, 2003, p. 144) from the university for training opportunities, which was not considered possible with part-time internships. These early preferences predicted the trajectory of the predoctoral internship.
Today, in the United States and Canada, the traditional 1-year full-time internship is the principal model in predoctoral training. This internship is typically completed as the final stage in psychology doctoral training in larger health care settings, such as Veterans Administration hospitals, university counseling centers, and medical school hospitals, often located at a distance from the doctoral program. The 1-year full-time internship is so pervasive that in 2005, just over 1% of the combined APA-accredited and Association of Psychology Postdoctoral and Internship Centers (APPIC) internships, or a total of 36 internship slots, were half time. This is a decrease from 106 slots 10 years ago (APPIC, 1995). More dramatic is the fact that, of the 2,188 APA-accredited slots available in North America in the most recent match, only 8 were half-time positions (APPIC, 2005b).

Why did the full-time internship become the dominant model? A major factor was the bifurcation in training clinical psychologists. Early on, internship development, sequencing, components, and funding were established as the responsibility of the internship site. The academic and research preparation of doctoral students was considered the responsibility of the academic training programs. The doctoral program prepared students for the internship and then literally sent them packing to internship sites for the clinical training component of their education.

This model also required students to be more willing and to have greater flexibility to move to new locations for their internships. Because starting graduate school often required relocating, students typically had few long-standing ties to the geographical region of their academic program. Well-supported financially by the academic programs, they could devote themselves to full-time study and full-time internships. Given these factors, a concentrated 1-year full-time internship made sense. It allowed students to complete the internship experience as quickly as possible and then proceed to graduation and the next step in their professional career.

As more internships were developed and accredited, the need to establish uniform patterns of experience might have deterred the development of a variety of internship models and inadvertently stifled diversity, innovation, and better integration of academic and internship training (Weiss & Magidson, 1993). However, many conditions that led to the early adoption and current prevalence of the full-time 1-year internship have changed over the years. The need to address changes in the internship context is supported by the full-time 1-year internship have changed over the years. The conditions that led to the early adoption and current prevalence of the full-time 1-year internship have changed over the years. The need to address changes in the internship context is supported by the full-time 1-year internship have changed over the years. The conditions that led to the early adoption and current prevalence of the full-time 1-year internship have changed over the years.

Development of the Half-Time Internship

Despite the predominance of the full-time internship, the half-time internship has worked well as a training structure in some regions of the country and for specific programs as well as for client and student populations. Half-time internships take many forms. In some cases, they consist of a half-time (20–25 hr) internship throughout 2 years in the same setting. In other cases, such as Widener University’s exclusively affiliated integrated internship in Philadelphia, students participate in two half-time internships for 1 year each at two different internship sites exclusively affiliated with and coordinated by the academic program. Other half-time sites consist of a single 1-year program followed by a second 1-year program at a different site. Structurally more similar to practica than to full-time internships, half-time internships are distinct from practica in terms of organization of training, competencies expected, and responsibilities assumed by the trainee.

Local nonaccredited half-time internships flourished in California with the advent of professional psychology schools in the early 1970s (Stricker & Cummings, 1992) and in Massachusetts, where, for more than 30 years, the Massachusetts School of Professional Psychology has trained hundreds of students at half-time internship sites in the Boston medical and psychiatric-psychological community (R. Dorn, personal communication, October 26, 2005).

In these programs, the half-time internship has been integral to the aspirations of the doctor of psychology degree (D. R. Peterson, 1997) and to the pedagogical objective to carefully integrate the internship with academic work (Shakow, 1978; Weiss & Magidson, 1993).

Most half-time internships have developed through extensive cooperation between educational institutions and local field training sites. Unlike APA-accredited internships, which traditionally are located far from the student’s academic institution, the half-time program is often set within a community of students, doctoral programs, and psychological service sites. The half-time internship is now a well-established training model in California, where sites have been organized along with full-time local sites into the California Psychology Internship Council (CAPIC).

CAPIC

CAPIC is a nonprofit association of internships and doctoral programs founded in 1991, in part to provide structure and organization for member internships through collaboration, leadership, innovation, and the promotion of standards. CAPIC’s mission is “to promote excellence in professional psychology training and mental health services” (CAPIC, 2005a). CAPIC member agencies and schools have cooperatively adopted internship training standards based on national criteria that reflect the realities and needs of mental health settings in California communities. CAPIC internships become members by meeting CAPIC criteria. Throughout California, CAPIC provides uniform intern selection procedures, quality assurance, and other organizational services and benefits, much like those APPIC provides nationwide. However, CAPIC is unique in the United States as a statewide membership organization of nonaccredited internships (currently 138) and doctoral programs (currently 18) that place their students in these internships. The percentage of half-time positions within CAPIC has often approached 75%, in contrast to the number of APA-accredited and APPIC half-time positions. In 2005, 539 half-time out of 717 total positions were available on CAPIC Uniform Notification Day (CAPIC, 2005d). Although the number of half-time internships outside of CAPIC has not been quantified, the development of half-time internships in California attests to the value and importance of this model as a predoctoral training.
opportunity. However, as half-time and non-APA-accredited internships, these sites are considered to be outside the mainstream (Thorp, O’Donohue, & Gregg, 2005), which raises important questions and concerns that the field must address to effectively develop and bring wider recognition to this alternative training option.

The CAPIC Conference: The Half-Time Internship: Coming Into the Mainstream

In 2005, CAPIC convened a national conference, The Half-Time Internship: Coming Into the Mainstream, in Berkeley, California. The 96 invited participants included representatives of 23 national organizations and doctoral and internship programs who discussed the half-time internship. The APA Board of Educational Affairs provided the initial grant to support the conference; major sponsorship was provided by the National Council of Schools and Programs of Professional Psychology (NCSPP), with additional sponsorship and support from 16 psychological organizations. The conference participants neither sought consensus on recommendations nor passed resolutions. This gathering provided an opportunity to discuss the quality of psychology training in half-time internships and to develop structures, standards, and evaluation guidelines for training models. A synopsis of the conference is available from CAPIC (2005c).

Panelists and delegates brought with them what Thorp et al. (2005) described as an “openness, spirited debate, and informed action with regard to . . . issues [that] benefit students, graduate programs, faculty, consumers, and the profession of psychology as a whole” (p. 22). The overall focus of the conference was to examine how these internships could enhance attention to multicultural competence in intern training, meet the training needs of diverse students, and provide critical mental health services for underserved communities. The participants discussed fundamental questions, such as the following:

- Why do we need or want half-time internships in psychology?
- How do we regard the internships that already exist?
- How can we develop more of them?
- What form and structure should they have?
- What type of accreditation, regulation, and quality assurance evaluation guidelines should we use for these internships?
- Where do we find the resources to support and develop these internships?
- Which students should be trained in these settings?

The remainder of this article presents the conference participants’ thinking on these topics.

The Benefits of Half-Time Internships

Conference delegates identified the rationale for half-time internships and the benefits to students, doctoral programs, training sites, and the community. They concluded that half-time internships benefit each sector in a number of interrelated ways, described in the following sections.

Benefits to Students

Students have different needs and motivations for completing half-time internships. Diverse trainees call for diverse training activities, and the half-time internship may be crucial for trainees with family and work obligations (Erickson Cornish, Roehlke, & Boggs, 2000; Loomis, 2002) and the need to stay local (Boggs & Douce, 2000; Loomis, 2002). Broading training options and making half-time internships more available does not detract from existing opportunities in the full-time model; instead, additional models increase training opportunities (see Boggs & Douce, 2000, pp. 681–682, for a wide range of recommendations). Recognizing and developing additional models is especially important for those affected by the supply and demand crisis in predoctoral internship training (Boggs & Douce, 2000; Keilin, Thorn, Rodolfa, Constantine, & Kaslow, 2000; Thorp et al., 2005).

The most tangible differences between full- and half-time internships are that half-time internships allow trainees more time outside of internship demands and are more likely to be located near the student’s doctoral program (Erickson Cornish et al., 2000; CAPIC, 2005b). For those students who are slower to progress, for a variety of reasons, an extra internship year can be very helpful. Students have additional time to fulfill outside responsibilities that might be impossible to meet when combined with a 40-hr work week. For example, as more academic programs select students with postmaster’s-level experience, more internships are staffed with older students who have family responsibilities and less mobility (Boggs & Douce, 2000). In addition, as graduate education tuition increases (Murray & Williams, 1999; Pate, 2001), holding a concurrent paying job or staying local for a partner’s established career becomes critical for some students.

The half-time internship also allows students time to complete their dissertation. Simultaneous completion of a dissertation and internship has advantages for students, internships, and doctoral programs. Students are less likely to take a year off to complete the dissertation, they can stay close to their dissertation advisor, and the internship may be less obliged to provide dissertation release time, which can interfere with the progress of clinical training (CAPIC, 2005c). Doctoral programs can be reassured that their students are engaging in scholarship simultaneously with their clinical work and will graduate in a timely fashion (CAPIC, 2005c).

Training Advantages

Distributing the internship experience over 2 years also allows students and internship agencies to take advantage of a longer developmental process (Erickson Cornish et al., 2000). The intern is likely to be more skilled, more productive, and less anxious in the 2nd year, following his or her orientation and socialization in the 1st year of his or her internship. This longer time frame provides more opportunities for personal and professional growth. It also creates opportunities to receive mentorship from different supervisors and for 2nd-year interns to assume leadership roles with 1st-year interns. Furthermore, the longer time frame exposes students to new populations, service delivery models, and systems (Dowds, Peterson, & Bivace, 1986; Erickson Cornish et al., 2000). A 2-year didactic training program allows more time for the internship to introduce new content and for the intern to integrate this material (CAPIC, 2005c; see Mangione, Borden, et al., 2006, for more details on this training issue).

An added benefit of the local internship is the opportunity for students to augment their training and clinical effectiveness with
the unique knowledge, credibility, and personal investment they bring as members of the community. Half-time internships offer more time to strengthen community ties, provide continuity of service through long-term treatment, and establish themselves professionally with the populations they ultimately want to serve (CAPIC, 2005c).

**Benefits to Doctoral Programs**

In 1993, Fraser and Bent stated that a local, sequential training model allows the doctoral program to develop unique, integrated training opportunities tailored to each student’s individual needs. In addition, internship quality can be ensured when there is open communication and collaboration among academic programs; students/interns; internship staff; and external, third party organizations, such as CAPIC (Mangione, Borden, et al., 2006). Regionally focused training facilitates this collaboration. For doctoral programs based on an integrated model, maintaining the availability and integrity of these sites is imperative to meet the diverse needs of students (Weiss & Magidson, 1993).

**Benefits to Agencies and the Larger Community**

Community mental health agencies with limited resources are uniquely suited to the half-time internship model, benefiting from partnerships with local doctoral programs (CAPIC, 2005c). These community internships provide critical mental health services to underserved populations, often through agencies that cannot afford to support the requirements of a full-time internship program. Small, local agencies are also better able to meet community needs more cost-effectively. The half-time intern can provide longer continuity of care; demand less start-up and completion time; and become well oriented, equally productive, and more assimilated into staff in the longer time frame (CAPIC, 2005c; Erickson Cornish et al., 2000).

**Obstacles and Solutions**

Although half-time internships offer clear benefits to students, doctoral and internship programs, and the community, their evolution, legitimization, and consistent implementation have been met with obstacles. Similarly, although arguments supporting the need for and benefits of these sites have been published throughout the literature on internship training (Boggs & Douce, 2000; Kenkel, Swope, Brandt, & Rodolfa, 1991; Thorp et al., 2005; also see Erickson Cornish et al., 2000; Loomis, 2002; Morrison & Emmons, 2001, which all focus on this subject), they seem insignificant in light of established tradition. Various problems and issues, ranging from difficulties in procuring funding to administrative and statutory impediments, have been identified as significant obstacles to the development of half-time internships (Loomis, 2002; R. Peterson & Ober, 2006). The following overview describes key obstacles and solutions discussed at the Berkeley conference.

**Student Demand**

Currently, there is insufficient information on students’ need for half-time internships. We do not know how many students would seek half-time internships if they were available, and we do not know where half-time internships would be best supported. We do know that a main consideration is the location of the half-time internship and its amenability to students’ academic, work, and/or family obligations. In data from the 2005 APPIC survey of internship applicants, 5% reported a preference for a half-time internship (APPIC, 2005a). However, this survey might not have sampled students who were most likely to want half-time internships. APPIC and NCSPP are currently examining needs assessments on student demand and geographical concentration. These data can augment doctoral programs’ assessment of students to ensure the availability of half-time internships in local communities for students who may need or prefer them.

**Misinformation**

Misunderstanding and lack of knowledge about half-time models hinder their development and utilization. Increased knowledge and dissemination of these models to academic programs and psychologists in community agencies further their development. Berkeley conference delegates found a need to develop more widely accepted internship nomenclature and guidelines. To this end, they proposed a common terminology for describing different half-time internship models, which would enable full recognition of their scope, length, coordination, and oversight. Four half-time internships models were described: (a) 2 years of half-time training at one agency; (b) two half-time rotations, coordinated by and exclusively affiliated with one doctoral program; (c) consortium (i.e., two or more agencies offering sequenced half-time rotations over 2 years); and (d) “autonomous coordinated” agencies, each offering 1-year half-time rotations, coordinated by doctoral programs.

**Logistical Complications**

A typical half-time internship spans 2 years in the same setting. This model has been used for many years, is eligible for APA accreditation, and is often well suited for sites that also offer full-time internships. However, internship directors find it difficult to manage or do not have models demonstrating how to handle logistical problems that emerge from running two internship formats in one setting. For example, should a half-time intern be included in all the training seminars provided to full-time interns? If so, will the half-time intern be required to repeat training seminars in the following year at the same site? Also, because students continue to apply for full-time internships, internship directors do not feel compelled to design half-time internship options at their sites. Methods for handling the issues that arise when one site offers full-time and half-time internships have been described by Loomis (2002), Erickson Cornish et al. (2000), and Mangione, Borden, et al. (2006).

**Community Needs**

The half-time internship is often ideal for community-based agencies with strong service missions, usually targeted to underserved clients. Small community-based agencies are hard pressed to provide the financial and personnel resources needed for full-time internship training and supervision, stipends, and accreditation activities. These sites may also believe that the steps to
accreditation are too daunting to attempt. However, certain half-
time internships may be quite feasible for these agencies to im-
plement. For example, several agencies could form a consortium,
sharing training and evaluation activities, administrative responsi-
bilities, and costs without imposing too heavy a burden on one
agency (Boggs & Douce, 2000). Examples of these arrangements
are available from APPIC and in the literature (APPIC, 2005c;
Erikson Cornish et al., 2000; Erickson Cornish, Smith-Acuna, &
Nadkarni, 2005). Other models for reducing administrative bur-
dens on agencies are the affiliated internships described by
Abrams and Brabender (1993), the CAPIC model (CAPIC, 2005a)

Accreditation

Many current half-time internships have difficulties in meeting
some of the criteria for membership in APPIC and/or for APA
accreditation. The lack of sufficient stipends is often the major
reason for not seeking APA accreditation. Regarding APPIC mem-
bership, the half-time internship may not keep the student for 2
years but can provide only one of the yearlong rotations. (In these
cases, the doctoral program manages coordination between the 1st
and 2nd year of the internship.) On that basis, the half-time
internship would not qualify for APPIC membership. Without this
membership, such internships are not included in the APPIC
directory, and it becomes harder for students to determine where
they are available.

To expand the availability and use of half-time internships,
APPIC and APA may need to reexamine criteria to see whether
modifications can be made to develop more high-quality half-time
internships. As a recent example, following input from the half-
time internship conference participants, the APPIC board reviewed
and modified its criterion for the required number of interns at one
site. APPIC previously required two full-time or four half-time
interns at each site to ensure sufficient peer interaction among
interns. Recognizing the burden this requirement placed on half-
time internships, APPIC agreed that two half-time interns were
sufficient to elicit strong peer interaction for training and profes-
sional development (S. McCutcheon, personal communication,
August 18, 2005).

Doctoral Program Oversight

A central tenet of all internship models is that they must be
sufficiently broad and general to prepare students for initial entry
into the field (APA, 2005). In all types of internship training
(especially when the internship occurs over 2 years and possibly in
different sites), the doctoral program must oversee the progression
and sequencing of students’ training to ensure that it provides
breadth and depth of experience. Furthermore, doctoral programs
can use a multiple internship model of training to achieve broad
and general training and ensure this oversight. In these models,
such as a consortium or an internship program organized by the
graduate school, the academic program has governance responsi-
bility for coordinating internships, as described in Mangione,
VandeCreek, et al. (2006). Closer oversight brings its own set of
concerns for programs more accustomed to using the traditional
internship model. It places potentially more demands on faculty for
supervision, coordination, planning, integration, and identification

Funding and Advocacy

Concerns about unfunded training positions are often identified
as a central problem with many half-time and nonaccredited in-
ternships. Unfunded positions contribute to the perception of a
two-tier system among interns on a personal and a professional
level (Belar et al., 1989) and further stigmatize half-time interns as
second class and vulnerable to exploitation. Solutions that accept
unfunded positions are very controversial. Consideration of these
solutions raises concerns about devaluing the profession (Boggs &
Douce, 2000) and may cause fears that, by not requiring a stipend
for half-time internships, we could be representing psychology
interns as not worth the money or be taking the pressure off of
agencies to create funded positions. However, because of great
financial pressures on agencies providing half-time internships,
resources are often lacking for intern stipends.

It is important to explore whether the APA accreditation crite-
rion requiring a substantial stipend for interns could be waived or
reduced for half-time internships, although we recognize that this
is the least preferred option. Unlike those pursuing full-time po-
tions, half-time students are not required to interview nationally
for sites, to relocate, or to experience related job losses for family
members. Notwithstanding the crucial priority that training takes at
this stage, half-time interns may be otherwise employed—a solu-
tion generally unavailable to full-time interns.

New sources for intern stipends must be explored. Advocacy for
the role and value of professional psychology in these community
settings is integral to funding solutions. Agencies are willing to
search for new funding sources if they are convinced of the benefit
that internships would bring to the agency, for example, in new
fundable services. However, doctoral programs and agencies can
also learn to identify funding sources for training and service
programs as well as develop relationships with those responsible
for funding. The profession can work to clarify its professional
roles and contributions, enabling funding entities and policy mak-
ers to understand its unique role and the need for its services.
Faculty, students, and graduates should be encouraged by doctoral
programs to become involved in advocacy and public policy and to
gain membership in their local, state, and national associations.

The APA Education Directorate’s Education Leadership Con-
ference has helped expand the advocacy skills of psychologists
involved in education and training. In time, we hope the Education
Leadership Conferences will help participants to seek local fund-
ing initiatives to support half-time internships. The Graduate Psy-
chology Education Program (APA Public Policy Office, 2005a)
and the National Health Services Corps (APA Public Policy Of-
fice, 2005b) are federal programs that could be replicated at the
state level on behalf of half-time and other internships. Finally,
successfully funded internships should provide guidance to other
programs. A local training consortium such as CAPIC can serve as
a resource center for funding strategies. Funding and advocacy
committees can be developed at local, state, and federal levels.
Knowledge and information from all of these sources can be used
to build a tool kit of references and guides on how to increase internship and training funding.

Implications and Conclusion: The Future Outlook for Half-Time Internships

The ideas and recommendations from the Berkeley conference and the literature on internship training illuminate the many benefits of half-time internships for graduate psychology education. The Berkeley conference provided the first major opportunity to examine this model and yielded many solutions and next steps to further implement the underutilized half-time internship. A most important implication of this process is the need to make concrete changes to advance the field. We conclude this article with several major implications.

The Need for Diversity, Flexibility, and Innovation

Diversity in internship models and structures is necessary to be responsive to the increasingly diverse student body and the varying training objectives of doctoral programs. One size (or structure) does not fit all. Instead, flexibility in structuring full- and half-time internships meets diverse student and program needs, responds to the greater community, and provides excellent training. Innovative models of internship training should be widely disseminated to encourage the development of more internships that are responsive to different programmatic and geographical contexts and student circumstances. Much can be done on a national and regional level to encourage the creation of half-time internships and to support their organization, quality assurance, and accreditation. The APA Office of Accreditation and the Education Directorate, APPIC, CAPIC, the Association of State and Provincial Psychology Boards, and the training councils (e.g., NCSPP, the Council of University Directors of Clinical Psychology) have many resources that will facilitate the dissemination and development of alternative internship models and processes. For example, conversations are underway between APPIC and CAPIC about the possibility of coordinating standards, matching, policies, and quality assurance procedures. This sort of collaboration could lead to a more cohesive array of local and national training opportunities with consistent standards across the range of training sites. It can also provide guidelines for a stepwise progression from local internship to accreditation. Other ideas include developing and distributing a “tool box” for half-time internships and regularly informing internship sites of funding possibilities for training and service programs. Knowledge of local resources, politics, people, and culture is conducive, if not critical, to effective collaboration and development of regional and community training sites. Other regions and states can consider developing an association following the CAPIC model.

The Role of Doctoral Programs

Doctoral programs should bear some responsibility for developing a sufficient number of and different types of internships for their students. On the basis of data from the APPIC (2006) match, we currently have a bottlenecked system, with students entering doctoral programs without guarantees of quality internship training opportunities. It is clear from the APPIC data that very few half-time internships are available for students who want them. Increasing the number of half-time internships can help to fill the demand for more internship positions. For this to occur, doctoral programs with a vested interest in developing internships must initiate discussions with local agencies. Academic programs can work closely with local internships to strategize ways for agencies to meet their treatment mandates while providing high-quality training to students. Doctoral programs that assume greater responsibility for providing local internship options for their students are likely to be viewed more positively by current and prospective students. Because students have a vested interest in diverse training opportunities, we encourage the American Psychological Association of Graduate Students to become involved in promoting half-time internships.

The Relationship Between Internships and Doctoral Programs

A great value of many half-time internships is the increased collaboration between the doctoral program and the internship site (Mangione, VandeCreek et al., 2006). Intern training is enhanced by consistent input and communication between professionals at the doctoral program and the internship site (see the Council of Chairs of Training Programs, 2001, for voluntary guidelines for communication). Typically, communication and coordination between the full-time internship and the academic program is minimized to formal evaluations. In many instances of half-time internships, students spend half their time in the academic program and half in the internship. The experience adds clinical reality to coursework and provides a venue for the immediate application of classroom learning at the internship level of training. Proximity of programs increases opportunities for doctoral program involvement and communication. Closer connections between local half-time internships and academic programs can also lead to collaboration in other areas that would benefit the profession and the community (e.g., the development of innovative community-based treatment and evaluation services, research, and joint advocacy efforts for improved behavioral health funding and/or the inclusion of psychology in funding initiatives).

Scope of Practice: New Roles for Psychologists

Expanding and diversifying the locales and settings of internships is extremely beneficial to the profession and student training (see Humphreys, 2000, for a longer discussion of this issue). Most accredited internships are offered in large institutional settings, such as veterans’ hospitals, correctional facilities, or university counseling centers; they provide the intern good training and a useful understanding of that type of institution. Similarly, internships in local community-based agencies provide good training and a firm understanding of the community and its needs. If we believe our job as psychologists is to address community needs (Kenkel, DeLeon, Albino, & Porter, 2003), then such internships impart necessary and invaluable information for students’ future professional career (Humphreys, 2000; Thorp et al., 2005). Our future as a profession is certain only when the profession maintains relevance to the community. Additionally, close connection with the community reveals new ways psychology can be of service, pointing to new roles and niches for psychologists. However,
many elements of the internship training adopted in larger institutional settings are not applicable in smaller or less traditional community-based agencies. Therefore, the internship model may need to change to adapt to the realities of different training locales. The half-time model in a smaller community-based agency addresses many of the realities of internship training.

In conclusion, it is time for the half-time internship to be recognized as a credible and valuable training model. The benefits of these internships to students, doctoral programs, agencies, and the local community are significant. We encourage further development and adoption of half-time internship models.
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