

# APPLICATION STATEMENT FEEDBACK PROGRAM

**2021 EDITOR REPORT** 

This report is intended for potential ASFP editors. It summarizes the outcome of the 2021 program and gives a sense of editors' experience. For more details on what editors do, see <u>here</u>. The report for applicant feedback from 2021 is <u>here</u>.

## ASFP 2021 AT A GLANCE



\*Applicants from underrepresented minority backgrounds were prioritized, and then those who had limited access to informed mentors.

\*\* All reviews were solicited in a double-blind format, meaning that **neither editors nor applicants** had any identifying information about each other.



#### We asked editors for feedback in November 2021, a few weeks after ASFP 2021 concluded. Respondents (N=81) consisted of PhD students (58%), postdoctoral researchers (18.5%), and faculty (23.5%).

Here is what they said it was like to work with ASFP.

### EDITOR TRAINING

All editors were required to complete a 1-hour virtual editor training (1.5 hour for clinical editors) prior to the edit-a-thon.



**77.8%** of editors felt that the amount of training was just right.



**80.3%** of respondents felt that the general editor training was useful.

Most (94.5%) editors felt that the editor training provided a good balance between structure, consistency and flexibility.

We offered a 1-hour optional editing workshop with hands-on experience editing real application statements using the ASFP rubrics. 24 (29.6%) of respondents attended the workshop.



**95.8%** of respondents found the workshop helpful for understanding how to use the ASFP rubric.





**80%** of respondents felt the workshop was helpful overall.

Many editors appreciated the opportunity to walk through examples of real application statements and talk through the feedback with other editors.

#### EDITING EXPERIENCE

ASFP provides several resources for editors to use during the edit-a-thon, including the training slides and videos, rubrics, response templates, Zoom office hours, and co-working sessions.

92.6% of respondents said that ASFP rubrics were helpful for providing feedback to applicants.

**100%** of respondents reported using at least one of the editor resources.

**95.9%** of responding editors felt supported by ASFP.

We recommend that editors spend **30 minutes** per statement and provide training and resources to help editors achieve this goal.

**72.8%** of respondents felt that this was a *reasonable amount of time* for providing high-level feedback.



Editors *enjoyed* the editing experience with the average rating of 4.3 on a scale from 1 (very unpleasant) to 5 (very enjoyable).



### OVERALL EXPERIENCE

Overall, most editors felt that their *experience matched their expectations*. Many editors said that providing feedback was **easier** and **more enjoyable** than expected.

**100%** of editors felt the *goals* of ASFP were clear.



**93.8%** of respondents felt the ASFP *process* was clear.



**87.7%** of respondents found ASFP to be personally valuable.



**93.2%** of respondents had a positive experience and would volunteer again.

**97.3%** of editors would recommend editing with ASFP!



#### We also asked respondents to tell us in their own words about their experiences editing with ASFP. Here are a few of their responses:

"The ASFP Team makes it easy to edit - they train you, support you, and connect you with applicants you could never reach on your own, letting you support them and help them realize their potential. It's a win-win! The applicants do better, the editors have a great time, and it all creates a better field of psychology! I enjoyed this experience so much, and can't wait to do it again next year."

"It [ASFP] is a very valuable service to future PhD students and offers a really good opportunity to help others out with little effort. If I can improve the chances of someone getting into a PhD program by only a little percent for little effort, why wouldn't I?"

"[ASFP] is a **low commitment with a HUGE pay off** for the person receiving your feedback. It's a must do."

> Make psychology better, sign up to be an ASFP editor!