

SOCIETY FOR PERSONALITY ASSESSMENT

Spring Board of Trustees Meeting

March 25 – 26, 2020

Zoom Meeting

MINUTES

Present: John McNulty (SPA President), Joni Mihura (SPA President Elect), Robert Archer (Past President), Paul Arbisi (Treasurer), Jaime Anderson (Secretary), Nicole Cain (Representative-at-Large), Jill Clemence (Representative-at-Large), Jan Kamphuis (Representative-at-Large), Lindsay Ingram (Representative-at-Large), Sharon Nelson (SPAGS President), Monica Tune (Central Office), Martin Sellbom (JPA Editor), Chloe Bliton (SPAGS President-Elect), Bruce Smith (SPA Foundation President)

Partial Attendance: Lauren Hilger (Taylor & Francis representative)

I. Meeting Opens

John welcomed the board and reviewed the agenda for the two days of zoom meetings.

ISSUE: Review Minutes from 2019 Fall Board Meeting (*Anderson*)

MOTION: Acceptance of the Minutes from the 2019 Fall Board Meeting. Motion passed.

II. Governance

A. Executive Director (*McNulty*)

The board discussed the ED position and aspects of the ED contract. An offer has been extended to Nathan Victoria; he and John have been negotiating a contract. The executive committee has viewed the contract and given some feedback as negotiations have occurred. SPA's attorney has also been consulted and reviewed the contract twice.

ACTION: John will send the contract to the rest of the board for review.

In order to get a sense of typical hiring packages in this field, John has also consulted with one of our previous candidates for the position (who ultimately accepted another position before final interviews occurred). She stated the contract was generous, but not atypical for this type of position. Finally, John consulted salary data for organizations of our size and the salary we have offered is close to the 75% percentile.

Nathan's contract states that his position will begin May 1, though it is probable that Nathan will be available for part-time work starting April 1. He will be working to complete his dissertation in the meantime.

Nathan would like to get his contract onto a calendar year system; therefore, he will be evaluated at six months and then yearly from that time point. Evaluations will be based on performance goals set by the board, and will be conducted by the president, president-elect, and past-president of SPA.

In addition to salary, the contract also provides an allowance of \$8,000 to cover the cost of health insurance, funds for appropriate remote business expenses (e.g., laptop, internet expenses), reimbursement for his mileage in the first three months of his employment, tuition reimbursement through the end of summer 2020 (if necessary), and reimbursement for CE opportunities (up to a certain amount).

The board discussed the importance of checks and balances on the ED position. For instance, it was proposed that information is placed in a central shared location, so that the board is aware of efforts that the ED is making. Paul mentioned that all financials will be audited, but others noted the importance of transparency in all areas. One of the early goals for Nathan should be to find an appropriate way to document his work for the board. Finally, John noted that Nathan has suggestions related the functioning of the board, such as more frequent meetings and tracking progress, suggesting that an increase in accountability will likely occur in all areas.

Jill asked about the overall cost of the position (including benefits, reimbursement, etc.). Paul noted that we will want to make sure we are comfortable with the cost, particularly this year with potential expenditures related to canceling the conference.

ACTION: John will review the contract and determine the overall cost of the position.

The board discussed the goal of the ED position to eventually become budget neutral. It was suggested that we make sure that this is clear early on in Nathan's objectives. Revenue goals should be clear. Some expressed doubt that the position would increase revenue by that amount the position will cost; however, others noted that the goal should be make enough revenue and improvement to SPA to justify the position.

ACTION: John will speak to Nathan to explicitly discuss the revenue expectations of the position.

Bob expressed some concern about the length of the contract (three years). Since this is a new endeavor for SPA, it is concerning to lock us into a large financial contribution for this length of time. Therefore, performance goals will be made clear, and there will need to be movement towards reaching long-term goals at each performance review.

In addition, concerns were raised about the contract stating that Nathan can choose step down from the position with only 30-day notice. A 90-day notice was suggested instead.

ACTION: John will speak to Nathan about a 90-day rather than 30-day notice.

Bruce and Martin discussed Nathan's respective involvement with the SPA foundation and with the JPA journal. John stated that Nathan is interested in the foundation and would like to be involved in some capacity, but this role is not yet determined. We want to make sure that the society and the foundation remain separate from one another. Regarding the journal, Nathan will need to be made aware that much of the management of the journal involves Taylor and Francis; therefore, his influence may be somewhat limited.

Finally, there was a discussion about the allowance of outside consulting work, as the contract currently states that Nathan can do outside consulting. Several board members raised concerns about this interfering with the responsibilities Nathan will have to SPA. Others suggested that we should allow Nathan to be able to do consultation work on his own time if he chooses, but that it should be made clear that these additional responsibilities cannot interfere with his position.

ACTION: John will discuss issues related to outside consultation work with Nathan.

A. Treasurer Report (*Arbisi*)

Overall, we remain in relatively good financial standing with considerable assets relative to liabilities and operating expenses. We currently have approximately \$316,000 in the bank, and we have about \$100,000 in expenses coming up (payroll, refunds for registrations, etc.). We had about the same amount last year as well, but this amount does not include the cost of onboarding Nathan or potential legal fees/penalties related to the conference cancellation. Because of these, we expect increased expenses in 2020.

Our 2019 Net Income was up \$227,598, which is an increase of \$312,230 from 2018 (when we had a loss of \$84,632). Our overall revenue from 2019 was up 45.6%. Though dues decreased over \$21,000, our investment income increased, and the annual meeting revenue increased. Total expenses for the year decreased in 2019 from 2018 by \$72,192 to a total of \$538,938. This includes a decrease in employee payroll, office expenses, marketing, board meeting expenses, travel expenses, and JPA editorial expenses. Annual meeting expenses increased, though this was expected following a year in Washington D.C., where the annual meeting is always less costly.

In 2019, our total assets increased \$165,288 to a total of \$1,745,783 (including depreciation). Our Morgan Stanley account was at \$1,464,504 at the end of the year. The index fund performed well in 2019 as the market recovered from the downturn at the end of 2018. Consultation with Steve Bernstein at Morgan Stanley in January suggested that we scale down to around 50% in equities selling off growth and technology stocks. Another recent conversation with Steve on March 23 led to a redistribution of fund balances to address the downturn in the markets resulting from COVID-19. He noted that this turn in the market was unprecedented, and that no investments are completely safe, but recommended riding it out. Therefore, the overall expected impact of COVID-19 on our financial standing is unknown.

B. COVID-19 Guidelines

Joni was contacted by APA Division 12, Section IX about creating guidelines for assessment related to COVID-19. Joni previously sent a draft of the guidelines to the board for review. This process is being fast-tracked by the workgroup, but they asked if SPA was interested in endorsing the principles they developed.

MOTION: Accept the document as it is written. Motion passed.

Several groups are working on these guidelines at once; therefore, some changes may be made prior to the final publication of the guidelines.

ACTION: Joni will keep the board informed of changes made to the guidelines prior to publication by APA.

C. Annual Convention

The board discussed what to do about the award winners from this year. From a logistical perspective, it is best to defer most awards for a year so that we can recognize winners for their accomplishments. However, Martin thinks the journal awards should still be awarded since recognition of these awards at the conference is less important (award winners do not necessarily attend the conference).

Jaime suggested we also award Mary Cerney since it is also a yearly paper award and may benefit the student to have the award on their C.V. sooner. Poster awards will also be awarded since those were already submitted for review.

Therefore, the Mary Cerney, Martin Mayman, Walter Klopfer, and poster awards will be awarded. All other awards will be deferred until next year. Since these will not be recognized at the conference, we will highlight awardees on social media.

ACTION: Jill will talk to the award winners to make sure that they are willing to come to the conference next year instead.

The board also discussed Master Lecturers. We would like to re-invite our 2020 Master Lecturers to present in 2021. Since we already invited Dewey Cornell for 2021, we will have three Master Lecturers next year instead of two. Paul has already asked Jennifer Tackett to be a Master Lecturer for next year and she agreed.

ACTION: Jaime will contact Carla Sharp and invite her to attend SPA in 2021 as a Master Lecturer.

Finally, the board discussed the prospect of putting conference content online. Though there was certainly interest surrounding this idea, SPA probably does not currently have the infrastructure to accomplish this if we wanted to offer CE credits.

The 2021 Call for Papers will be done in the same way as it has been done in the past (i.e., we will solicit new submissions). Resubmissions from this year's conference can be submitted but will not be automatically accepted. Authors should note whether their submission is a re-submitted abstract from last year when submitting.

We will use 2020's conference theme for 2021.

Finally, the board discussed the Cvent software that we used for this year's registration and abstract submission. Given difficulties with the abstract software, we will not continue to use this module. We will likely revert back to our previous abstract module that we used for years prior. Monica has asked Jason to upgrade the module to make it easier to review abstracts and organize the program.

Within the next two months, we have to determine whether we would like to renew Cvent for the other software (i.e., registration and CE credits). Monica said that the software works well for this purpose and gives us the reports we need at the end of the convention.

ACTION: Monica will review the costs for renewing (including only renewing for one or two years instead of three).

No final decision was made about the software since we have another two months to decide. John suggested that we will want to evaluate this in the context of our overall technology plan.

D. Nominations Committee (*Archer*)

We have two positions (two representative at large) on the board coming forward. We had 12 nominations for these positions. The committee has chosen 4 candidates: Nicole Cain, Raja David, Leonard Simms, and Elizabeth Wheeler.

ACTION: Bob will contact the candidates to determine if they are interested in running for the Representative at large position.

F. Foundation:

The Foundation board will be meeting on Friday, at which point they will find nominees for the president and board member of the foundation. It is ideal when foundation board members have been previous members of the SPA board of trustees. The SPA board members select the board members of the foundation, and then the foundation chooses their officers.

MOTION: To nominate Jill as a member of the foundation board. Motion passed.

III. Advancing Personality Assessment

A. Publications

1. Report by JPA Editor (*Sellbom*)

Martin gave a report on the journal. We received 466 (new papers and Reject/Revise & Resubmit [RRR] revisions) submissions in 2019, which is considerably more relative to the same time period reported on in 2018 (428 total). However, we are down about 25% from what we were from last year at this time. We are early in the year, but it is possible that COVID-19 is impacting the rate of submission.

Though some submissions still remain under editorial consideration, the current acceptance rate for papers submitted in 2019 is 17% (58/340). This is substantially lower than the final rate for 2018 (29%). However, it is important to note that part of the high acceptance rate in 2018 was due to special issues. In 2019, there was only one call for special issue submissions, which involved an open call (rather than invited submissions). This has normalized the acceptance rate somewhat.

Martin continues to desk reject approximately one third (36%) of the manuscripts submitted to JPA. As was the case in the last board meeting, the most common reasons for desk rejections include: *do not fit topical scope*, *translations*, *exclusive focus on internal structure*, and *serious methodological deficits*.

The submission and acceptance rates are fairly healthy. Because Taylor and Francis extended the page budget for 2020 by 30%, we currently have a backlog of manuscripts that spans approximately 5 issues, which is a substantial improvement from 2018-2019 when the backlog was 8 issues. The new page budget will allow us to slightly increase the threshold for publication and also consider additional special issues and sections.

Associate editors continue to do a good job. Drs. Tess Neal, Corine de Ruiter, and Oliver Schultheiss have served in part-load positions, while Drs. Nicole Cain, Tayla Lee, Nathan Weed, Virgil Zeigler-Hill, and Johannes Zimmermann have served in full-load positions. Nathan Weed will be stepping down as an Associate Editor as of June 30, 2020. Martin is currently considering replacements, possibly someone with MMPI knowledge as Dr. Weed

handled many of those submissions, and/or someone with child and adolescent assessment expertise as our coverage in this regard is limited at the AE level.

The Statistical Developments and Applications section remains intact, with co-Section Editors Drs. Mike Furr, Rob Meijer, and David Streiner doing a good job. The rebranded Clinical Applications and Case Studies section has three Section Editors: Drs. Chris Hopwood, Katie Lewis, and Hadas Pade. They have all been very helpful. Martin asked Dr. Hopwood to take a leading role for this Special Section, and is now compensated for this role. In addition, the Books, Software, and Tests section is edited by Dr. Ron Ganellen.

The open science initiative was introduced in the journal almost 4 years ago. Although requests remain relatively low, Martin has continued to observe a steady increase in the number of scholars requesting open science badges for papers. He hopes to take steps to begin accepting registered reports in the near future.

Regarding the finances of the journal, the contract with Taylor and Francis provides for \$68,000 per year to support editorial stipends. In addition, this amount is increasing in 2020. The stipend for the JPA Editor is currently \$18,500/year. The full-load Associate Editors' stipends are \$5,000 per year, totaling \$32,500 (5 full-load; 3 half-load). Moreover, Chris Hopwood is paid \$1,250 per year (quarter-load equivalent) in his role as leading the Clinical Applications and Case Studies section. The University of Otago is currently charging \$18,200 NZD per year for my editorial assistant, which roughly equals \$11,750 at the current exchange rate (but this rate fluctuates). This leaves roughly \$4,000 left to spend, not including the increased 2020 stipend from Taylor and Francis.

Martin is considering several options to use the additional funds: (a) adding an additional half-load Associate Editor (\$2,500), (b) with SPA's permission, which will likely require a budget extension of *at least* \$1,000, a full-load AE (\$5,000), or (c) raise the current 6.5 full-load Associate Editor stipends. Martin believes it would be better to add an AE (full or half-time) and decrease the currently high workload of the current AEs. Nicole agreed with this sentiment.

Martin suggested that it was possible that his current budget would be able to cover the entire cost of a new full-load AE. He noted that this will depend on the NZ to US dollar exchange rate, but estimated it would not exceed \$2,000 on the high end. Paul said that it likely would not be a problem financially for SPA to help cover this if the amount is no more than a couple thousand per year.

Monica noted that up to \$7,000 can be moved from SPA to JPA if needed on any given year. This was approved by a previous board. Therefore, no motion is needed for approval.

Finally, Jan asked Martin about whether or not people seem to be knowledgeable about the fact that the clinical subsection has changed. Martin announced it and published this; however, it is important for those in Therapeutic Assessment to know that this has changed.

ACTION: Martin will revisit what is said on the website about this.

2. Publisher's Report (*Hilger*)

Lauren Hilger from Taylor & Francis came on to talk about the journal. She reviewed some of the journal statistics. The journal had 214,364 article downloads in 2019, which is 41% higher than downloads received in 2018. She reviewed which articles have the largest number of downloads, and noted that open access, naturally, makes a big difference in how many times an article has been downloaded.

The journal's 2018 impact factor is 2.839, ranking 13/63 in the Psychology, Social JCR category. This is a healthy number, and there is no real target for what the impact factor should be. Instead of focusing on the number, we should focus on the quality of the journal and making sure that the work published reflects what we want it to be. The impact factor should follow from there. Martin noted that our impact factor may decrease slightly in 2019 because a highly cited article will fall off of the impact factor this year.

There were 70 publications in 2019, 7 of which were Open Access. The average speed of article publication has also decreased, currently averaging at only 22 days from acceptance to online publication.

B. Continuing Education Committee (*Ingram*)

Five CE sponsorships were approved in 2019. Two were denied, one of which was due to a late submission. The other was denied due to content concerns. Three CE sponsorships have been approved thus far in 2020.

IV. Operations and Communications

A. Social Media Expansion (*Ingram*)

We have been working to increase our social media presence. Twitter now has 530 followers and Facebook has over 1,400. It has been more difficult to increase engagement on Instagram (which has 320 followers). Chloe, who runs the Instagram page, believes that Instagram is just a difficult platform because it is focused on posting pictures. Therefore, she recommended that we remove our Instagram page. Chloe will take over the Facebook page instead. Jenn Boland would like to step down from running the Twitter page, so we will need to find a replacement for her.

We discussed managing what students are posting on the social media pages. There was recently a posting of an article (not from JPA) that caused a lot of controversy on Twitter. It is not ideal to get negative attention, particularly when the article posted is not a JPA paper or written by SPA members. Therefore, the students need more direction on what to post.

The students noted that it has been helpful to receive emails from Lindsay about what to post, and they are going to start a dropbox so that it will be easier for them to receive updates. Martin offered to provide suggestions of articles from the journal that he thinks are important papers to highlight. Lindsay also suggested that she should be the only person communicating with the students so that the students are getting all of their instructions from one place.

Jill noted that our website does not always reflect the same content that is on our social media pages. It is important that our website remains as up to date as the social media and that information is consistent across all platforms. Our website does not get updated to an extent where it is a useful go-to for our members to keep track of things.

V. Member Engagement

A. SPAGS Committee (*Sharon Nelson/Chloe Bliton*)

SPAGS has an active social media page on Facebook. They have been highlighting one student per month on the social media pages. They have mostly been nominated by their mentors, and SPAGS is particularly interested in highlighting newer SPA members. They need more students to highlight. In addition, they used the SPAGS page to disseminate information about canceling the conference, refunds, and updating your CV to account for cancellations. They are currently doing an "Fond Memories of SPAs past" thread.

Only three posters were submitted for consideration of the diversity poster award. This award needs to be promoted better in the future.

SPAGS had two panels planned—one about conducting assessments with gender and sexual minorities, and one on transitioning from student to early career. They may retain the diversity panel (or something similar) for next year. The early career panel may be transitioned into a virtual event.

The SPAGS social was canceled with a full refund for 2020.

Finally, SPAGS wanted to formally thank the board for the funding opportunities for students this year. In addition, they have requested that the board consider additional funding for SPAGS board members to attend the conference. Most SPAGS board members have to come to the conference a day early to attend their board meeting, which creates an additional financial burden for them to do this service.

B. Membership Committee (*Anderson*)

As of March 24, 2020 we have 950 members in SPA. This includes 409 Members, 169 Life Members, 15 Associates, 54 Fellows, 104 Life Fellows, 137 Student Affiliates, and 60 Early Career members.

Our current membership is relatively consistent with March numbers over the last few years. There is always a drop in membership after February 1, due to a lack of renewals and memberships becoming inactive. Numbers increase throughout the rest of the year as members submit late renewals and new members apply to the organization. It is unclear how much COVID-19 will impact this trend for 2020.

New member approvals tend to be predominantly students. Since Jaime took over the Membership Chair position in September, there have been 53 new applications- 30 student affiliates, 9 early career members, and 14 members.

We continue to have a drop-off from student to early career. Though we currently have more early career members than last year, this is because we increased the number of years someone is early career from three to five years. However, early career transition is not unique to SPA; other organizations have similar difficulties retaining students as they become early career. SPA also has the problem of members aging out and becoming life members. This will hopefully improve with the changes to the by-laws pushing back that age.

It would be good to be able to know what percentage of students we are able to retain in SPA. Monica stated that our current database does not allow us to easily access those numbers, so this is something we should think about in our future technology plan.

C. Interest Groups (*Clemence*)

The leaders of the Education and Training group are stepping down; therefore, we need to identify new leaders for the training group. Sharon suggested that we find a student leader/student helper for interest groups to better involve students and encourage them to remain involved in SPA after graduating. Jill stated that it has been a priority to involve early career members as leaders of the groups.

Jill stated she would like to talk to Nathan about our interest groups and how to better utilize them. We have had a hard time gaining traction with interest groups, and it seemed as if he had positive ideas to make the most of these groups.

D. Fellow Committee (*Kamphuis*)

The Fellow committee had one application for fellow status. The board discussed the applicant and reviewed feedback from the Fellows committee.

MOTION: To deny fellow status and suggest that this applicant should re-apply in the future. Motion passed.

Jan introduced a broader discussion about the qualifications necessary for Fellow status. It was noted that this is SPA's highest level of endorsement, and that we should ensure that all applicants have made a substantial impact on the field of personality assessment. Due to time constraints, we decided to revisit this issue in a future meeting.

VI. New/Unfinished Business (*McNulty*)

Due to time constraints, we were unable to discuss Student Matters and the Early Career Advanced Training Program.

VII. Fall Board Meeting Date - September 11-13, 2020

There being no other business, President John McNulty adjourned the meeting and thanked the participants for their role.

Respectfully submitted,
Jaime L. Anderson, Ph.D.
Secretary



SOCIETY FOR PERSONALITY ASSESSMENT

Spring Board of Trustees Meeting June 26, 2020 Zoom Meeting

MINUTES

Present: John McNulty (SPA President), Joni Mihura (SPA President Elect), Robert Archer (Past President), Paul Arbisi (Treasurer), Jaime Anderson (Secretary), Nicole Cain (Representative-at-Large), Jill Clemence (Representative-at-Large), Jan Kamphuis (Representative-at-Large), Lindsay Ingram (Representative-at-Large), Chloe Bliton (SPAGS President), Martin Sellbom (JPA Editor), Bruce Smith (SPA Foundation President), Nathan Victoria (Executive Director)

I. Call to Order

John welcomed the board and reviewed the agenda for the meeting.

ISSUE: Review Minutes from 2019 Fall Board Meeting (*Anderson*)

MOTION: Acceptance of the Minutes from the March 2020 Board Meeting. Motion passed.

II. Evolution of Board Activity Discussion and Future Work

John discussed the issue of being a strategic vs. an operational board. Historically, the SPA board has been very operational and has handled much of the business of the organization. However, we want to move more towards strategic governance, where we focus on the overall direction of the society (mission, vision, values).

Governance includes responsibilities such as determining the overall direction, finance, management, and board effectiveness, whereas operations includes responsibilities such as implementing the direction developing a budget, and employee management.

The board also reviewed its general and fiduciary responsibilities.

One issue that has been raised is the process of onboarding new board members. SPA does not have a formal process for onboarding members, and the process seems to vary. Some have had the experience of someone walking them through the responsibilities of their position, whereas others have had limited guidance prior to joining the board.

Relatedly, board members often do not know the expectations of being on the board. For instance, all board positions include responsibilities of heading a committee of SPA (e.g., fellows committee, awards committee, etc.), though this is not publicized and many board members are unaware that this is one of their responsibilities. Prospective board members need this information in order to determine whether they have the skillset to do these duties. We need to better document this information.

John noted that not all associations elect their board in a similar fashion. Given our current bylaws, we nominate board members to serve in specific roles and then have our membership vote. However, some associations and societies identify the broad skills necessary for a functioning board. Those associations track member involvement in various volunteer activities, such as committee work, and evaluate performance. While working in those capacities, members receive training on various aspects of committee involvement and performance as well as leadership training. A Leadership Committee of the board utilizes that information as they work to identify potential board members with the skills and experience needed by the board. Once elected to the board, new members are then assigned to applicable board roles and responsibilities.

ACTION: John would like the board to review the association document about becoming a strategic board. Board members should return with potential questions and be prepared to discuss what the board is currently doing well and where the board should make improvements. Further, the board should be prepared to discuss what resources are necessary to become a better functioning board.

Finally, we discussed legal liability of the board. Individual board members can be liable for breaches in our duties. We have a duty of care, which includes participating in the board and exercising best judgment. Further, we have a duty of loyalty in maintaining SPA's interest over one's own. However, what complicates a conflict of interest is complicated. For instance, we discussed board members playing active roles in multiple associations, and the extent to which this constituted a conflict of interest on the board. Finally, there is a duty of obedience, which includes staying steadfast to the mission and purpose of the Society.

The issue of the board's insurance was discussed, specifically whether the board's insurance covers individual members. Nathan stated that he believes it covers the society, including the liability of the board. For instance, our insurance covers a member suing the board; however, it is unclear whether personal board member liability is covered (e.g., if the board takes action against a specific board member). We should examine whether our insurance covers what it needs to cover.

III. Approval of Executive Director Goals and Evaluation Process

Nathan presented on his time thus far as ED for SPA and discussed his future goals.

One of the questions Nathan has is about SPA's vision. We need to tease apart the operations of SPA from the governance and collectively decide on a vision for the Society.

Nathan spent much of his early time as ED doing a listening campaign. He has contacted 50 members and has had interviews with approximately 40 thus far. These members have included current board members, ex officio members, past presidents, graduate students, international members, and members of color. He discussed some of the themes, including:

- SPA seems stuck in a "time warp" rooted in tradition
- Clinicians and academics have different goals/interests
- SPA is lacking in diversity (in both its membership and its research content)

- The board and operations are inefficient or ineffective at times
- “Personality” is a misnomer, though there is disagreement how we rectify this

Nathan discussed the importance of addressing organizational tensions. It is important that we maintain focus on our older members, but that we also make room for newcomers and new ideas to be integrated into SPA.

Finally, Nathan discussed the five goals he would like to focus on for the remainder of the year. These include:

- 1) Analysis of incorporation statuses and bylaws revisions: As discussed in more detail below, Nathan plans to examine the benefits or consequences of moving SPA to a C3 organization rather than a C6. Further, Nathan will examine operations and determine wants in which the Society could better function.
- 2) Align operations and board infrastructure for future success: There is limited synergy between staff operations and board governance. Nathan wants to move the board towards a strategic board, while the central office focuses on operations.
- 3) Document future policies and procedures, including identifying additional ways for member engagement and better volunteer onboarding: Many activities are discussed but are not fully executed. The transition process for board members and other volunteers is not standardized. Volunteer opportunities should extend beyond a board member’s network.
- 4) Develop a membership roadmap to clarify who are, should, and can be the members of SPA. Once clarified, begin to document and create member value for those groups: We have difficulty with retention of graduate students and early career professionals is an area for growth. Further, we should support membership from a more diverse set of backgrounds (e.g., forensics, health, global members, I/O).
- 5) Execute the search for a new Database and develop a Technology Roadmap to help advance the vision and mission of SPA: Our technology is very outdated. We need to review our internal processes and develop a goal and plan related to technology.

MOTION: To accept Nathan’s five upcoming goals for the remainder of 2020. Seven board members approved. Two abstained and noted that they found the goals to be too vague to evaluate and approve. Motion passed.

IV. Finance Update and Budget Development

Paul reviewed SPA’s current financial standing. As of June 1, 2020 our total expenses have been \$143,738 (which includes approximately \$17,000 of expenses for JPA). The proposed budget for the remainder of the year is \$282,985, which includes a balance of \$18,218 for the Cvent software. Our cash balance as of June 1, 2020 was \$293,000.

MOTION: To accept to amended budget for the remainder of 2020. Motion passed.

We are anticipating no additional income this year, so the remaining 2020 will be balance with the current cash balance. The budget includes additional expenses, such as refunds from the convention (\$5,000), a technology consultant (\$30,000), and a board/ED discretionary fund with \$6,800 allocated for JPA associate editors approved last meeting.

Society expenses are down, primarily due to the cancellation of the convention (since we generally lose money each year). We have used \$3,700 of our \$35,500 travel budget, \$0 of our \$6,000 marketing budget, \$220 of our \$9,000 credit card processing fee budget, \$53,800 of our \$258,500 payroll budget (as of June), \$34,700 of the \$146,800 annual convention budget, and \$1,400 of the \$10,900 Master Lecture budget.

A total assets total to \$1,806,010 (including depreciation). We estimate that we will receive \$19,168 in 2021 dues by the end of 2020. The Morgan Stanley investment account (as of June 18, 2020) was at \$1,452,718, which is down \$500 since June 30, 2019. Fifty percent of our assets are in equities, 34.8% in fixed income and preferred, 14.8% in alternatives, and 0.4% in cash. The Beck account currently has \$32,732.

We discussed updates on the San Diego hotel cancellation. We have not heard anything back from the hotel; however, we are not expecting additional expenses related to our cancellation.

Overall, we continue to be in relatively good financial standing, with considerable assets relative to liabilities and operating expenses.

V. Technology Plan Update

Several points related to our technology plan were discussed. First, Nathan discussed the prospect of switching to a different platform from Cvent, called Event Rebels. The central office is somewhat hesitant about switching platforms, given the current comfort with the Cvent system that we have used; however, Nathan believes Event Rebels may be a good alternative program. Given problems with the Cvent abstract system for this past year, we will return to the old system for abstract submission and use either Cvent or Event Rebels for other convention organization.

Currently, our projected technology use is \$30,000 under our proposed technology budget. However, Nathan would like to use those additional funds towards hiring a consultant. He noted that SPA does many things manually that do not have to be done this way. In Phase One (projected to cost \$10,000) will focus on figuring out what requirements we have related to technology. His plan would be to create a needs assessment to present in the September board meeting. Phase Two (projected to cost \$20,000) would include trying new technology and getting a new website.

The projected timeline would be to have a sense of where we're headed by the end of the year and, at minimum, have a new database within a year. There will be additional expenses related to maintaining a new database and other various technology costs; however, it should amount to only a slight increase over the current \$30,000 budget and getting rid of Cvent should help to cover additional costs.

The board will be able to get involved and share perspectives. We need to figure out what we want and what we need. Further, there will be a core team that includes members of the board and other volunteers among our members to assist in moving the technology plan forward.

Nathan received a proposal from Ellipsis to help SPA in the area of technology. We will discuss in more detail soon.

VI. SPA and SPA Foundation Incorporation Update

Currently, SPA is a C6 organization (incorporated in New Jersey) and the SPA foundation is a C3 organization (incorporated in Virginia). Nathan has wanted to explore why we have a separate foundation from the society. It

seems as if the Foundation has been a place for members to donate and receive tax deductions, though it seems that SPA may also benefit from being a C3. These include tax exemptions, government benefits (e.g., PPE from the CARES act), and technology benefits, such as free google ads up to \$10,000 per month.

One relevant different may be the issue of lobbying. SPA wanted to engage in lobbying, but they were not sure how much SPA could lobby as a C3. There are some restrictions to lobbying as a C3; however, with a budget of \$500,000 per year. for example, SPA could spend up to 20% of the budget per year for lobbying. If we exceeded that amount, we would have to fill out extra paperwork and submit that information with our taxes; however, it is unclear if SPA would realistically ever exceed this amount. We can engage in advocacy for personality assessment regardless.

Nathan would like board approval to continue reviewing the following options:

- 1) SPA and the Foundation could remain separate entities and SPA could transfer the membership list to the C3 Foundation. The foundation could then handle all of the different components of the Society. This is non-dollar assets that would be transferred, though SPA could then also provide funds to the C3.
- 2) We could completely dissolve the C6 organization and transfer all assets to the C3 Foundation. We would need to create a whole new set of bylaws, transfer all assets, membership list, etc. to the Foundation. The voting members would need to approve this with a 2/3 majority vote. This would include the members of SPA and the board of the Foundation. They would vote on the articles of merger. It is unclear whether or not this would include dissolving both boards and holding new elections, though Nathan believes you could include a continuation of the current boards into the articles of merger.
- 3) We could try to convert SPA into a C3 and keep the Society and the Foundation separate. However, this may be a more difficult option from a legal perspective.

There are certainly financial benefits to operating SPA as a C3 organization. At this point, it does not appear that this would interfere with advocacy, though it may limit lobbying efforts if those were to increase in the future. We should discuss lobbying efforts with Radhika Krishnamurthy, as she has been leading many lobbying efforts with APA/APO.

Though there are some potential advantages, we are not yet clear on all potential consequences of this decision. Therefore, Nathan should keep looking into these options and we will continue to discuss at the next board meeting. Further, we will want to make sure to discuss this prospect with the Foundation board before making any decisions.

VII. Upcoming In-Person Meetings Update

The board previously voted to make the September board meeting a virtual meeting.

With respect to Boston, Bill Haire recommended to wait to take any action until August. Hotels are not yet discussing plans for 2021 at this point. However, there are several logistic questions that we will have for the hotel when the time comes. For instance, the hotel in Boston is already a tight space for the size of our convention. It is unclear whether the hotel will be able to fit all of us given requirements for social distancing, cleaning requirements, etc. In addition, since there may be limits on capacity (that would limit the number of attendees), we should discuss waiving food and beverage minimum requirements with the hotel.

We will continue to discuss our options in September. In addition, Nathan will create a survey for members that asks about their comfort attending in person, going virtual, whether members have travel funding, etc.

There being no other business, President John McNulty adjourned the meeting and thanked the participants for their role.

Respectfully submitted,
Jaime L. Anderson, Ph.D.
Secretary

SOCIETY FOR PERSONALITY ASSESSMENT

Fall Board of Trustees Meeting September 10-12, 2020

Zoom Meeting

MINUTES

Present: John McNulty (SPA President), Joni Mihura (SPA President Elect), Robert Archer (Past President), Paul Arbisi (Treasurer), Jaime Anderson (Secretary), Nicole Cain (Representative-at-Large), Lindsay Ingram (Representative-at-Large), Chloe Bliton (SPAGS President), Len Simms (Representative-at-Large), Nathan Victoria (Executive Director)

Partial Attendance: Jan Kamphuis (Representative-at-Large), Jill Clemence (Former Representative-at-Large; Foundation Board Member), Martin Sellbom (JPA Editor), Lauren Hilger (Taylor & Francis), Moira Edwards (Ellipsis), Radhika Krishnamurthy (Practice Guidelines Taskforce), Giselle Hass (Practice Guidelines Taskforce), Adam Natoli (Practice Guidelines Taskforce), Emily Gottfried (Practice Guidelines Taskforce), Jennifer Boland (SPAGS President Elect), Sharon Nelson (SPAGS Past President), Virginia Brabender (Leadership Council), Ron Ganellen (Leadership Council), Raja David (Leadership Council), Ryan Marek (Leadership Council), Elizabeth Wheeler (Leadership Council), Monica Tune (SPA Manager), Linda Patterson (SPA Assistant)

I. Call to Order and Quorum

John welcomed the board and reviewed the agenda for the meeting. We discussed the new process of going through a “consent agenda” where we will review and briefly discuss board reports and wait until the end for motions.

II. Consent Agenda

a. June Board Meeting Minutes

The board was asked if they had alterations to make to the June 2020 board meeting minutes. John emailed Jaime with one minor change.

ACTION: Jaime will send final version of the June 2020 minutes to the board.

b. Continuing Education Committee

Lindsay reviewed the CE report, outlining a new structure for workshops given the move to a virtual convention. This includes offering workshops throughout the year, rather than only during the week of the convention.

Joni suggested having a workshop focused on cultural competency in personality assessment. It would be good to have this focus as part of our convention. We do not normally solicit specific workshop topics, but the committee has discussed doing more of this. For instance, we asked Drs. Anestis to do a suicide risk assessment workshop last year.

The board also briefly discussed the difficulties we have with time changes for international members. We will need to offer workshops in the afternoon/evening U.S. time in order to maximize international attendance.

c. Membership Committee and Figures

Jaime reviewed membership figures, discussed the development of the membership committee, and reviewed some efforts the committee might take. See Membership Committee report.

The committee will soon start a new member contact campaign, where we reach out to new members to welcome them to SPA and gain more information about what they hope to get from their membership. The board also discussed the idea for an undergraduate mentorship program, which would include funding diverse undergraduate students and providing opportunities for learning more about careers in personality assessment. Joni suggested that we might want to see how we can connect people to others off their own campuses to get them networking with other people in personality assessment. Len suggested that we could try to work with McNair programs around the country. The Southern Regional Educational Board would be a good resource as well.

d. Awards Committee Recommendations

Jill discussed the awards committee recommendations for this year. See board report for more information. Of note, Mike Roche's (Beck Award) and Mike Bagby's (Bruno Klopfer Award) awards were deferred due to the cancelation of the 2020 convention and will be presented in 2021 instead.

The awards committee reviewed candidates for the Mary S. Cerney Award and the Distinguished Service Award. The committee voted to give the Mary S. Cerney Award to Whitney Ringwald for her paper, "Transdiagnostic predictors of interpersonal and affective variability in borderline personality pathology." They voted to give the Distinguished Service Award to Virginia Brabender.

e. Student Matters Committee Report

Nicole reviewed the Student Matters Committee report. In particular, Nicole discussed changes to the structure for travel grants since the convention will be virtual this year. The research grants will not be changed.

Nicole proposed that students should be given a waiver for the conference registration if they have an accepted paper or poster. Typically, they are given one night free in the hotel. Therefore, if the student registration

fee is similar to previous years, the loss of registration revenue would not be greater than the cost normally spent to cover hotel costs.

For the diversity, international, and early career travel grants Nicole proposed a \$500 award for a poster or paper at the convention. They would receive free registration and the balance would be an honorarium that we could suggest these recipients use for workshop attendance. This would help support and encourage these individuals to attend and submit to the convention. Paul recommended that rather than an honorarium, we provide a voucher for registration and workshop attendance up to \$500. The budget would not change; we would just be using the money differently.

f. Student Association (SPAGS) Report

Chloe reviewed the SPAGS report. She noted that they have a very ambitious board right now, which has meant good movement on a lot of initiatives, including an early career panel, diversity career panel, and an internship database. In addition, they reorganized the board committee structure and redefined board member roles (see report for details).

g. Foundation Board Report

Paul discussed the Foundation Board report. The Foundation board has a new mission statement for board review. The board met in August and spent the majority of the time discussing the implications of combining the foundation with the society. Much of the time involved educating the foundation board about what the implications would be for incorporating the two.

The Foundation Board was not very concerned about moving things from the foundation to SPA, but had questions about the process of moving SPA to the foundation (e.g., would this mean closing the SPA 501 C6 organization?). See below (SPA and SPA Foundation Incorporation) for more information on board discussion of these issues.

h. Treasurers Report

Paul reviewed the Treasurers report, with a particular focus on financial updates since the last report in June. Our expenses are looking good (including JPA expense). We are currently under our projected budgeted expenses from June through September because we did not renew all of the Cvent functions. We had budgeted \$30,000 for this, but only spent \$3,000 on the app this year. The budget should remain balanced for 2020 and it includes some additional refunds from the meeting, a discretionary fund for the board, and the technology consultation. We had new expenses for staff benefits (\$5,000), which included contributions to Linda's retirement, and health insurance for Monica and Linda. This will be easily covered. Nathan clarified that these funds were used to equal out of the benefits for all three staff members. We were not previously in compliance with how we were covering Monica and Linda's expenses, but this is solved now.

Paul discussed our current investments. We made some adjustments to the investment funds for the third time this year in order to anticipate changes in the market. Paul would like to have an advisory committee to report

back to the board regarding capping our investment account. This would be to keep track of how much gain we have, how much of that gain we want to spend, and the extent to which we are willing to tap into our principal balance to fund board initiatives over the next several years. Some organizations are comfortable with making sure their investments have enough for one year's expenses, whereas others see these funds more as an endowment. We need to establish a minimum in our asset fund and then establish our draw rate. For instance, we told Steve, our financial advisor, that we needed to get \$500 out of the Beck Fund each year, so he adjusts our investments to make sure that this happens. We should think about this for our larger investment fund.

Paul proposes that a new financial advisory committee would include the current financial committee (John, Paul, and Steve) as well as the president-elect (Joni) and one additional board member. It was suggested that rather than creating a new committee, Paul can just add additional members to the existing financial committee. The composition of this committee is not defined in the bylaws; therefore, Paul has the ability to ask additional board members to serve on this committee.

i. Executive Director Report

Nathan reviewed our expenses. In the past, we have not tracked both expenses and revenue to include things that we give away for free (e.g., free registration to workshop presenters). Therefore, Nathan would like to track our expenses, revenue, and loss of revenue more thoroughly in the future. Further, Nathan wants to move us to a point where we have a long term financial plan. He plans to present this at the December board meeting.

In addition, Nathan discussed staff needs. Given changing roles and responsibilities, Nathan has proposed a reduction in the SPA manager salary (but with an increase in benefits) and an increase in the SPA assistant salary. Notably, the roles for the assistant position will change quite a bit (i.e., we will need specific skillsets), and Nathan is working on a job description for this new position.

j. JPA Publisher's Report

Lauren Hilger from Taylor and Francis reviewed the JPA Publisher's report. She believes that JPA is doing well and is excited about some of the special issues planned with high citation potential. She also noted that these special issues have the opportunity to market JPA to individuals who may not be aware of or regularly read the journal.

k. JPA Editor Report

Martin reviewed the JPA Editor report. Submissions look good, with a submission rate for the first half of the year fairly consistent with 2019. The breakdown of where submissions come from has remained fairly consistent, though the U.S. is no longer dominating these submissions, dropping to 25% of submissions from 40%.

The rejection rate for the journal has declined slightly, though this is not entirely an accident. Martin had a large backlog of manuscripts when he became editor, so the rejection rate was quite high at first. The combination

of a high rejection rate and Taylor and Francis expanding our page limit helped to reduce the backlog of papers. We are now only 4-5 issues behind, which means the rejection rate has lowered a bit to ensure we can keep a healthy backlog.

Subsequent to the March meeting, the board agreed to cover additional funds for a new Associate Editor if JPA went over budget. Martin said he does not think this will occur in 2020, but suspects the journal will be slightly over budget in 2021.

Joni asked whether the journal and its editors had enough coverage of all areas of psychopathology, particularly psychosis. Martin noted that his editorial team has not had difficulty covering the manuscripts that are submitted and believes the expertise is broad enough to cover journal content.

MOTION: To accept the consent agenda, including the minutes with minor adjustments, the revised Foundation mission, and the revisions to the use of funds for travel grants. Motion passed.

III. Technology Analysis Phase I

Moira Edwards from Ellipsis Partners discussed SPA's Technology Analysis. One of the main priorities is to improve our member experience online; however, these experiences do not exist on their own and will require being linked to our association management system (AMS). Therefore, many of our goals will first require a new AMS. When selecting a new AMS, we should work with a vendor to ensure that the system has the capacity to meet all of our needs. For instance, we should make sure to pick an AMS that includes a registration system. We should choose an AMS this year (with candidates by the December board meeting), and implement using this AMS in 2021.

We should consider a minimal refresh to the website as soon as possible, and a more thorough revamp of the website later. A minimal refresh will cost approximately \$20,000, which would be paid to another vendor (not Ellipsis), though Ellipsis has included recommendations for potential vendors. They do not recommend creating an all new website for a few years. We need to determine new content, figure out our brand, our purpose, and our audience prior to building an all new website. A refresh would involve moving current content to a more modern website and would allow us to fix issues with the current webpage (e.g., lost content, etc.). Moira recommended that we use Wordpress for our website refresh, and suggested we continue to use Wordpress when we redo the entire website. In addition to the refresh, Moira suggested we consider adding a search tool for the website during the refresh process. She stated this would help make the site more modern and useable and it is not a particularly expensive add-on (around \$5,000).

Len asked whether the website refresh is necessary or whether we can use our current website until we are ready to redo the entire website. Nathan discussed issues with the website. It is in HTML and we have previously not been able to make updates on our own. Moving to Wordpress will mean that we have more control. It is a free platform, which will make it simpler to incorporate with a new AMS. On the other hand, if we kept the website we have, we would need to pay developers to help us move our AMS in our current system.

Ellipsis can help us find vendors for our technology needs; however, we will need to decide whether we want to hire Ellipsis to manage vendors or whether we want to manage our vendors ourselves. Nathan said he would be comfortable managing this process, but encouraged the board to consider whether this was something we wanted him to prioritize or whether this would be better outsourced.

Regarding budget projection for this year, we would expect to spend another \$40,000 in 2020. This would include some or all of the website refresh expenses and the AMS selection process. Though we did not account for

a website refresh in the 2020 budget, we have \$30,000 in the budget that we did not spend on Cvent. Therefore, we have additional funds that we could allocate to refreshing the website.

MOTION: To move forward with the process a website refresh and finding a new AMS. Motion passed.

IV. SPA Diversity and Social Justice Discussion

Nathan discussed a need to incorporate social justice more globally in SPA. Rather than piecemeal initiatives (e.g., through SPAGS, through membership, etc.), we should have an overarching strategy. In addition, Nathan noted that we waited until the board meeting to discuss these issues, but acknowledged that this meant a lack of communication to members regarding diversity efforts.

We would like to have more listening sessions so that we can gain knowledge about where SPA wants to go, and also so we can help identify people who might be good leaders for these efforts in SPA. These sessions would be targeted across four broad areas, including: redefining SPA's commitments and non-discrimination statement; intentional inclusion efforts for students and early career professionals; centering diversity, inclusion, equity, and social justice in our learning and programming; and the role of a diversity and social justice committee. The goal is for these sessions to occur through September and October. Then, we would like to have a serious proposal for an overarching diversity plan by the end of the year.

The board had a brief discussion about how this would (or would not) change SPA. We discussed the importance of focusing on inclusion. This is important for SPA's reputation and for making sure that we are a place where all people feel like their voices are heard. Therefore, we hope these efforts will make SPA a more inclusive environment for members or prospective members who come from diverse backgrounds. Importantly, these efforts should also target our international members, who sometimes feel uninvited. We need to make sure SPA is inclusive for all of our members.

Nathan has written a draft of a commitments and non-discrimination statement. However, this is just a draft and our purpose is not to approve this in the board meeting. Instead, we will use this as a starting point in discussions with our members.

ACTION: Board members should review the commitments and non-discrimination statement by Friday, September 18 and provide feedback to Nathan. He will then send the statement to members for comments.

V. Allied Societies and Advocacy

Based on previous feedback, the board would feel most comfortable approving signatures when other societies ask for endorsements on statements. However, Nathan wanted to more broadly discuss a way to determine which other areas of psychology or societies may be best suited for partnerships. Nathan would like to forge relationships with other associations, but he wants to make sure that he is reaching out to the right organizations.

The board discussed whether the purpose was to partner with other societies or offer a service (e.g., training in personality assessment). Nathan stated that both were goals; however, these issues go back to a broader discussion of our purpose at SPA. Our documents and statements say slightly different things in terms of priority. For instance, a document may say that we study personality science and its assessment, whereas another document may say that we study psychopathology and personality assessment. These are slightly different goals, so the board should decide the direction of SPA.

It may be helpful to come up with a list of societies that are good matches for our own. For instance, Section IX has substantial overlap, though societies like AP-LS may also make good partners given the number of members in forensic psychology we have at SPA. There are potential opportunities for greater partnership between societies, but it will be important for SPA to build these relationships first.

The board specifically discussed becoming an allied association for the Coalition for the Advancement and Application of Psychological Science (CAAPS). We would need to be endorsed in order to do this. However, we discussed that SPA has a reputation for being a bit behind the times, and it is not necessarily viewed as overly scientific. We know within SPA that this is not true, but perhaps signing on to something like CAAPS (or a similar organization) may help signal to the scientific community that these are goals SPA has as well.

VI. Professional Practice Guidelines for Personality Assessment

The taskforce for developing the Professional Practice Guidelines for Personality Assessment joined the board meeting. The taskforce includes: Radhika Krishnamurthy, Giselle Hass, Adam Natoli, Bruce Smith, Paul Arbisi, and Emily Gottfried. After introducing the taskforce members in attendance, Radhika discussed the progress that they have made.

This came about in January 2019. Several organizations have practice guidelines, but SPA has not produced guidelines since 2006 when we published the education and training guidelines. Given the number of SPA members who are involved in clinical practice, specific guidelines would be helpful. The board appointed Radhika to lead this effort. The original proposal for the guidelines were approved by the board in September. They have been working on the document since.

Adam discussed several ideas for dissemination, including a symposium or workshop the convention or online webinars. In addition, they discussed how to disseminate these guidelines to individuals outside of SPA. We could put together pre-packaged materials to personality assessment instructors and supervisors, which would help those individuals and also serve as good marketing for SPA. In addition, the taskforce discussed seeking open access through JPA. Further, it may be beneficial to have interest group leaders write commentary to publish along with the guidelines (e.g., how they apply in health settings, forensic settings, etc.).

Publication at JPA is up to Martin and the journal. Martin stated he is open to having these published in JPA, but said he would like for it to undergo peer review. In addition, Martin suggested it may be more helpful to ask stakeholders outside of SPA (rather than interest group leaders) to write the field specific commentary, then have the workgroup write a rejoinder putting all of the information together. Martin would negotiate with Taylor and Francis regarding open access, but suggested that if they will not support that SPA could potentially fund this. Nathan noted that SPA will also want to explore whether they will be able to retain some ownership of the guidelines if it is published at JPA.

The next step for these guidelines will be to send this document out for public comment from our members. The taskforce discussed sending the guidelines to outside stakeholders for comment prior to sending the guidelines for peer review. However, Paul recommended that we should limit the outside feedback we get prior to submission if we want outside independent commentary to accompany the publication. These are still issues to work out, but the next step the taskforce will take is to send the guidelines out the membership for input. The taskforce will move forward with this step.

Finally, John asked whether the guidelines are consistent with APA's guidelines and implementation regulations for doctoral and internship training programs. Radhika noted that the primary audience for these

guidelines is practitioners, so it may not need to be completely linked with training. Indeed, they deliberately kept the training portion of the document brief because they did not want to overlap with other efforts in SPA related to education and training. Nonetheless, it is ideal for guidelines to match up, so the taskforce will double check that there is consistency.

VII. SPA and SPA Foundation Incorporation

The board continued to discuss the benefits of moving SPA to a C3 organization. Both the SPA board and the SPA Foundation board agree that, at least conceptually, this is a positive move due to financial benefits. The things that SPA does currently do not necessitate being a C6 organization. Most academic and medical associations are C3. Therefore, we may close the C6 organization after merging with the foundation, but will we want to review that all of our operations can be done through a C3 prior to closing it completely.

SPA members will need to be notified that SPA is interested in merging with the foundation. The bylaws would have to be edited. The foundation board would need to motion and approve this (the merger and the bylaws). Then SPA (the members) needs to approve the foundation approval with a 2/3 majority approval of those who vote.

Bob noted that we previously did a lot of work to separate the foundation and SPA, including paying attorneys to help us write bylaws that separated the two. We will want to review the reasons behind doing this. Paul's recollection is that we discovered that there was a problem with the way that they were structured at the time (e.g., having the same board), but that we did not take a step back and ask if they even needed to be separate. Nonetheless, we will want to continue to review potential problems we may encounter by becoming a C3 organization.

The major differences seem to include lobbying and the type of programming offered. For instance, programming aimed at helping members build businesses may not fall under a C3 organization, because it could be viewed as being for the personal financial benefit of members rather than the benefit of society. Further, it is unclear whether training related to insurance reimbursement would be viewed as for practitioner benefit or client benefit. The majority of what we do at SPA is not focused in these areas, but members benefit from trainings with topics such as starting a private practice. Nathan will discuss this issue with our attorney.

The board discussed the costs/benefits of this move. There are monetary benefits for being a C3, such as \$10,000 a month for google ads as well as tax deductions. A C3 can apply for waivers for some taxes, which would reduce our costs for convention. We would probably quickly recoup the investment. For instance, we spent approximately \$80,000 in New Orleans, which means almost \$6,000 in taxes. We should explore what this would cost up front, but it seems likely that we would get a return on our investment within a couple years.

Another argument for making this move is simplicity. Why have two sets of bylaws, etc. if both serve the same purpose? This was not the impetus for making this move, but this would be a reality. It is currently somewhat unclear who is supposed to pay for what, do what, etc. For instance, staff spend time on the foundation, but the staff are fully paid by SPA. Historically, SPA paid for everything, even board travel for the foundation president. Attorneys suggested that SPA and SPF needed to have a clearer delineation, and we have tried to better separate these in the last few years. In addition, the board and the foundation are somewhat in the dark about what the other is doing, and that could become very complicated in the future if we continue to separate these as planned. This would be more simple if they are merged.

There is more to be discussed and worked out, but the board decided to continue to pursue merging SPA and the SPA Foundation. We should formulate a plan for making this merger, including timeline and cost. Once we have a formal plan, we can decide whether we want to actually go through the process at that time.

ACTION: Nathan will speak to the attorney about the cost, plan, and timeline.

VIII. SPA Education and Advanced Training

Advancing education and training is one of our strategic goals, but we need to decide how we want to approach this goal. What education programs do we want SPA to have?

One suggestion is to devote our efforts to the clinicians who are tasked at providing empirically supported treatment, where there is no upfront assessment incorporated into this process. If we can demonstrate that there is utility in doing personality assessment prior to treatment, then we can market ourselves quite well. Currently, we have really failed to demonstrate to the field that personality assessment is effective. Paul suggested that we partner with a therapy oriented organization to determine how we can interface better. In other words, we should ask them what they need to know from us in order to integrate transdiagnostic assessment into their practice.

It seems that we have two issues-- 1) related to training and education, and 2) related to working clinicians who we want to reach to with our work. We need to wrap our heads around the big picture and determine how we want to move forward. John suggested that we may want to set up a task force to address these issues and recommended an open call to the members. Bob also suggested incorporating the interest groups into this discussion.

ACTION: Board members should send feedback to John about our next steps in addressing our education and training goals.

IX. Evolving SPA's Governance Structure

The board reviewed the bylaws of both SPA and SPF. These bylaws were probably best practices at the time that they were made, but at that time there was no staff and things have changed in terms of our operations. Therefore, we need to review these bylaws and determine if it covers our current operations and whether these represent current best practices. Further, we should differentiate between what should be in the bylaws and what should be in a policies and procedures manual. If the board is for governance, and the staff are for operations, the bylaws need to be updated to better reflect changes that we might make in these areas. Of course, if we move to the C3 organization, the bylaws will need to be changed and approved by membership at that point.

Membership. We have four classes of members (members, associates, student affiliates, and honorary members). Any changes to the bylaws requires a membership vote, so any changes (even minor) have to go through a membership vote. So we should consider whether this is a bylaw issue. In addition, the membership categories currently have different rights and privileges, and we should determine whether we want that to continue. For instance, Nicole reminded the board that Sharon Nelson (SPAGS Past-President) brought up the issue of student voting rights last fall.

The board also discussed the possibility of a fifth category of membership for those who are not engaged in the practice of personality assessment, but may be interested or invested in the topic. It was noted that this is a broad question that would cause a bigger shift in who we serve and how we see ourselves as a society. It is unclear

what these individuals would get out of a membership to SPA currently. Though we may not be responsible for determining whether an SPA membership is worth someone's money, we should consider whether this type of member could use their membership for negative reasons (e.g., test security issues). These are conversations the board should continue to have in the future, particularly as more MA programs move to independent practice.

Board Member Selection. Many associations seem to be moving towards electing a board and then the board decides what roles each member should have. Another issue is the general nature of choosing a board. We currently have a contested election, where there are 2 or more slots open for one particular board position. Alternatively, the board could decide on potential people to put on the board based on what kinds of skills we need. The board would select people to serve and then the members approve or deny who we have selected for certain purposes. We would need to consider how we determine who is most appropriate for a board position as well as how many people we need on the board.

Committees. Once we have a committee that is long term, a previous board decided that this should go in the bylaws. However, we should consider to what extent committees are board committees and should be in the bylaws, and which ones are operational and do not necessarily need to be formalized in the bylaws.

Annual Business Meeting. The bylaws state that we should give an annual report of the business to the membership. This should be similar to a stockholders meeting where we present the business of SPA to the membership. We do not currently cover everything in the plenary session. Board members should give reports related to their particular positions (e.g., treasury report). We can fix this immediately at this year's convention.

Staff. There is no mention of staff in the bylaws at all. We need to include this and review the structure of the board with staff. This needs to be addressed sooner.

Some of the issues discussed are large questions that the board is not meant to make decisions on now; rather, we will want to consider our priorities in changing any future procedures. It seems as if the transition to being a C3 organization is a big priority, but we may want to start discussing a longer term plan for when we want to discuss and address other questions/issues.

We should create a task force to continue these discussions. Bob, Paul, John, Jaime, and Nathan will be on this committee. There should be frequent communication to make sure that this committee is being open with the current board members. We need to draft a charge for this committee.

X. SPA Leadership Council

The board met with other leaders of SPA, such as taskforce leaders, interest group leaders, and foundation board members.

a. Mission and Vision of SPA

Attendees at the meeting broke into small groups to discuss the mission and vision of SPA. Following this, the larger group discussed this topic. There was a general consensus among the group that personality assessment is a useful clinical tool to learn about our clients, convey information to the client that they can understand, and convey information to other professionals that can help them make better treatment decisions. However, the group noted that we, as a field, have failed to produce targeted research to demonstrate that this is true. SPA previously sponsored a utility of personality assessment project; this project still has funds set aside (\$25,000-30,000), so we should revisit this work.

Attendees also noted that the field of clinical psychology seems to be de-emphasizing assessment. Part of this may be due to cost effectiveness of assessment. However, training programs also de-emphasize the role of

assessment, so we need to focus on how personality assessment is being taught in clinical programs. We need to convince the field that this is still important.

Finally, the group discussed the ways in which we can solve this problem. One solution may be to partner with other organizations to provide more education about the benefits of personality assessment. In addition, we should look to international trends in training and test use. These trends outside of the U.S. may help understand where we can go from here.

b. Conflict of Interest and Code of Conduct

The group reviewed a draft of SPA's code of conduct for volunteers. Attendees noted that our committees do a lot of work, but a problem occurs in the continuation of the work when the board changes. Part of this has to do with how we onboard new board members, as we do not have a standard approach for how we transition our boards.

Virginia mentioned that she had built a transition plan for board members, but that those efforts were abandoned along the way. Ron also noted that he appointed three task forces (education, research, and practice) to assist in retaining some structure to board operations and priorities, but this has also changed over time.

We need to think about how we want to maintain efforts in SPA. In addition, we need to make sure that we are looking for additional volunteers in the SPA community. Many people want to be part of SPA leadership and assist in volunteer efforts, so we should do better to spread out the work that needs to be done among those who want to be involved.

d. 2021 Virtual SPA Convention Brainstorm and Discussion

Attendees again broke into small groups to discuss the virtual convention. Following this, the larger group discussed this topic. For instance, we discussed the purpose of the convention, and attendees mentioned several purposes, including meeting up with friends, networking, research, introducing students to others in the field, among others.

In addition, we discussed that there are opportunities with the convention being virtual, despite drawbacks. For instance, we can invite people who would not ordinarily attend SPA, we can coordinate with other organizations for joint presentations, offer more options for attendance (e.g., specific sessions). One suggestion was to offer key sessions for free access and broad advertisement, which would help introduce non-members to SPA. In connection with the discussion of working with other organizations to better market the benefits of personality assessment, it was noted that we have opportunities to invite other professionals to discuss education and training in personality assessment.

Finally, there was substantial discussion about how to best salvage the loss of social contact that comes with the virtual convention. Though the group noted that this would be impossible to replicate online, there were several ideas for engagement, including social hours, virtual games (e.g., trivia), networking events, or virtual events such as making cocktails (or mocktails), sending attendees snacks, etc. We should continue to consider how we can promote social engagement despite the virtual circumstances.

e. Evolving SPA's Interest Groups

The final topic among the leadership council was related to evolving SPA's interest groups. It was suggested that we should do a member survey to address what members want out of interest groups. For instance, there has been discussion about having more interaction outside of the convention, but it is unclear if this is something that the members really want. Regardless, we want the interest groups to be useful and worth the time investment for those who lead them.

One solution could be to provide better resources to the interest groups. They do not currently have a budget, which likely limits their effectiveness. We should discuss with group leaders what type of initiatives they would like to pursue and what resources would be necessary to make those efforts.

Related to interest groups, Virginia also noted the importance of pursuing development of local SPA chapters. Though we had made progress on this in the past, this has not been a recent priority. This could be very helpful in connecting those who are unable to attend the national convention to SPA in their local geographical areas.

Following the leadership council meeting, the board continued to discuss the interest groups. We want to have more structure to the interest groups and be able to provide more guidance for what the leaders should be doing. Jill primarily served as a liaison between the groups and the board, but we should consider what else we can be done to make the interest groups a better experience. In particular, Jill noted the importance of highlighting the leaders in some way, as they currently receive minimal credit for the work they do. It is a great idea to provide interest groups a budget each year. In addition, they need to have a place online to share information (e.g., a listserve, a place on the website).

ACTION: Jill, Len, and Nathan will have a separate meeting to discuss transitioning Jill's previous duties with the interest groups to Len.

Finally, we discussed having an early career interest group; however, Jaime noted this would be better structured similar to SPAGS (rather than one of the interest groups). We would want this to be separate from SPAGS, though Lindsay noted that maintaining some connection between the groups could be very beneficial.

XI. Evolving SPA's Governance Structure

The board discussed the effectiveness of the leadership council, as this was the first time we had this type of meeting. Members believed the small groups were a good idea, and suggested that in the future we should have each group take notes and send responses to the board. This way the board will be able to better process themes. It was also noted that it was great to see how many people are actively involved in SPA beyond the board. However, several board members noted that the larger group discussions were less effective. Though it was good that there was so much consensus among the group, there were many people saying the exact same thing.

XII. Virtual Convention

The board discussed several aspects of the upcoming virtual convention. First, the board discussed the issue of timing and the importance of maximizing attendance for international members. We determined that we should have the conference across 4 days between a 2pm-6pm EST time block for live sessions. The convention would be scheduled to run from Wednesday, March 17, thru Saturday, March 20.

We want to have a hybrid model for the convention to help meet everyone's needs. In other words, some sessions will be live and some sessions will be pre-recorded. Live sessions should cover the highest priority content (e.g., master lectures, award winners, etc.). We may have fewer concurrent sessions for the virtual format, since

some sessions will be pre-recorded. This will be helpful to decrease competition between sessions. One suggestion was to have the master lectures or plenary followed by a few scientific sessions each day. We discussed the prospect of having convention content available to attendees after the convention is over (e.g., for 30 days).

We will need to consider the logistics of making sure that individual presenters are available for live sessions. We should ask if presenters would prefer a live or pre-recorded session. Though not everyone will be given a live session, we can ensure that no one is given a live session who does not want one. We should also make sure that live presenters know that they will not have complete control over the conference schedule. We cannot account for every individual's personal schedule.

Len asked about the financial priorities for the convention (e.g., do we need to make money?). We discussed that we historically operate at a fairly substantial deficit with the convention, so we have flexibility with finances. Breaking even would be a major improvement from most years, and even losing \$10,000 would be moving in the right direction.

Nathan and Monica have started looking into various options for a virtual conference, but we do not have a cost projection yet. Nathan wanted to know about board preferences prior to creating a budget. Much of the cost will come from the production for recording sessions, and we will need to determine how much we want to do. Nathan plans to get bids in the coming month and will find an estimate for what our breaking even point would be and what our worst case cost scenario would be. However, he noted that he believes we can offer a fairly low cost convention and still have only a small loss or break even. His best rough estimate right now is \$106,000, though this is very tentative because Nathan needs to look at more specific estimates based on the plans we have made in the board meeting. For instance, concurrent sessions will be more expensive, and the more live content we have, the more expensive the convention will be.

The board discussed the cost of the convention for attendees and determined the cost should be under \$100 and closer to \$50 for someone who does not want CE credit.

XIII. Next Steps and Future Meetings

Nathan will be sending out information about the ED evaluation. The staff are evaluated by Nathan, but he will ask for feedback from the board.

Nathan will also start a doodle poll to plan the dates of the December board meeting.

There being no other business, President John McNulty adjourned the meeting and thanked the participants for their role.

Respectfully submitted,

Jaime L. Anderson, Ph.D.

Secretary



SOCIETY FOR PERSONALITY ASSESSMENT

Fall Board of Trustees Meeting December 16th and 18th, 2020

Zoom Meeting

MINUTES

Present: John McNulty (SPA President), Joni Mihura (SPA President Elect), Robert Archer (Past President), Paul Arbisi (Treasurer), Jaime Anderson (Secretary), Nicole Cain (Representative-at-Large), Lindsay Ingram (Representative-at-Large), Chloe Bliton (SPAGS President), Len Simms (Representative-at-Large), Jan Kamphuis (Representative-at-Large), Nathan Victoria (Executive Director), Martin Sellbom (JPA Editor)

Partial Attendance: Radhika Krishnamurthy (Foundation Board; Practice Guidelines Taskforce), Peter Wolk (SPA Attorney), Adam Natoli (Practice Guidelines Taskforce), Emily Gottfried (Practice Guidelines Taskforce), Giselle Hass (Practice Guidelines Taskforce)

I. Call to Order and Quorum

John welcomed the board and reviewed the agenda for the meeting.

II. Approval of September 2020 Minutes

The board was asked if they had alterations to make to the September 2020 board meeting minutes.

MOTION: To approve the September 2020 board meeting minutes. Motion approved.

III. Budget Discussion and Technology Plan Updates

a. Budget Overview

Nathan discussed the budget, including the process for budget approval. The budget will be approved each year at the December board meeting, but an update on the budget will occur in March. In keeping with our goals to move the board away from daily operations, future budget reviews will be fairly broad at board meetings, though board members will always be able to request more detailed information.

SPA's budgeting process has been fairly inconsistent, so Nathan has been working to improve the way that SPA tracks its finances. In creating the 2021 budget, he reviewed the various areas in which we expect expenses over the next year (e.g., staff, annual convention, award/scholarship/grants programs).

We are in a larger deficit this year given the numerous updates we have related to technology. Nathan attempted to budget high and keep revenue estimates at a reasonable conservative level. The current projection is that we would have a deficit of approximately \$267,000 in 2021. However, this is likely an overestimate of our deficit.

Nathan has been looking into ways to finance our projected deficit. There are two main options: 1) we could directly take money out of our reserves, or 2) we could apply for a line of credit from our reserves (similar to taking a loan from your 401k). The interest rate for our quoted line of credit would be around 3.5-4% and this option requires a financial audit. The best option will depend on the interest rate, our rate of earning (which is currently about 8% for this year), and the cost to complete an audit (approximately \$15,000). Once we have a better projection of our deficit, we would speak with the financial advisor about making the most economically sound choice. We will have a much better idea of what our deficit is by March.

MOTION: To accept the 2021 budget proposal. Motion approved.

The importance of keeping our membership informed of our financial standing was noted. Since we are looking at a potentially large deficit this year, we want to make sure that membership is aware of how funds in the society are being spent. John noted that we will be planning a business meeting at the convention each year to review finances (as well as other matters). Importantly, this deficit reflects our efforts to invest in the organization and we are in a sound financial position to do so at this time. Though the potential deficit is large, our hope is that these efforts result in positive outcomes for SPA long term.

Nathan is also planning to complete a longer range financial plan, which he hopes to show in March. We want our deficit to shrink over the coming years, and the goal is to be able to project into the future what our financial situation will look like. In addition, we would like to have a set schedule for increases in workshop/convention fees so that we can better project future revenue.

b. Technology Plan Update

i. Association Management Database Search

There were six proposals reviewed by staff and John. They reviewed four companies at varying budget levels. There were two frontrunners (Impexium and Novi). Novi is a bit more user friendly (it requires less customization). Nathan will be getting more specific estimates for both companies.

ii. Website Redesign Process

When Nathan reached out to companies to discuss updating our website, the companies discussed an issue with our branding (e.g., our branding is outdated, it is unclear who we serve, etc.). Therefore, Nathan proposes that we invest more money now and discuss our branding as we update the website, rather than updating the website without discussing our brand.

iii. Digital Brand Consultation Presentations

Nathan invited three finalists for digital brand consultation to present to the board. The three companies that presented included FusionSpan, Yoko, and Kompleks. Nathan would like to start moving this process forward in January.

The board generally preferred Kompleks, with Yoko as a second choice. However, the board would like to see additional website examples and have Nathan complete reference checks for all three companies.

ACTION: Nathan will do reference checks on all three companies.

c. SPA Reserves Fund

Paul discussed his submitted proposal for using our reserves fund each year. SPA has over \$1.6 million in reserve funds from our investments. When the finance committee met with the financial advisor, the proposal was to cap this as of 2021 and draw from our investments at a rate of 4%. We can plan to take these funds and use them in the operations budget each year without impacting our investments.

MOTION: To approve the proposal for using reserve funds. Motion approved.

IV. Evolving SPA's Governance Structure

a. Consolidation of the Foundation and SPA

The SPA attorney, Peter Wolk, joined the call to discuss the consolidation of the society and foundation boards. As part of this process, we need a new set of bylaws and articles of incorporation for this new entity. A workgroup was made (consisting of John, Bob, Paul, and Jaime) to discuss updating the bylaws. The workgroup asked Nathan to draft a new set of tentative bylaws for the consolidated boards. As part of this process, Nathan reviewed bylaws from a variety of different organizations and also reviewed best practices in bylaw creation.

One question is what we want to do with SPA after moving the assets and membership from the C6 to the C3 organization. One option would be to dissolve the C6 organization (a full merger); however, Peter recommends that we keep the C6 organization for a period of time for several reasons. First, we want to make sure that we cover any liability from SPA. This tail coverage insurance ensures that any legal action that were to come against SPA in the coming years would be covered. We also want to make sure that we are fulfilling any contracts that SPA currently has. For instance, since our Taylor and Francis contract is with SPA (the C6) and not the foundation, we will have to make sure that these contracts can also be transferred. Essentially, it is smart to keep the C6 for a period of time to make sure that everything is completely transferred. Once this process has been completed, we can review the costs and benefits to keeping the C6 organization open.

Peter also discussed board consolidation. Legally, we cannot reduce someone's board term. Therefore, we will likely have a larger board for a period of time. The tentative plan is to bring foundation board members on and keep them on until their terms end. We would then let these positions expire, as these positions are not elected by the membership and are not proposed for retention in the updated bylaws. Currently, two of the foundation board members have terms that end in a few months, and the other two go through 2022. These members can choose to be part of the transition board until the end of their term, or they can choose to resign. This applies to current SPA board members as well.

Peter encouraged us to consider any small points that need to be considered in this process. Small issues can be points at which mergers become difficult, so we want to be careful to review this process thoroughly. He also noted that it will be important to consider any points that may be problematic for our membership. If there are areas where members may have reservations, we will want to consider what changes are highest priority.

Finally, we briefly discussed the issue of what the organization will be named. We do not have to keep the SPA Foundation name. Since we are in the process of reviewing the “branding” of SPA, we will want to consider this prior to deciding on a name. Of course, we will also want to consider what the general membership would think about any potential name or branding changes.

In summary, the board agrees that we want to transfer SPA’s C6 assets into the C3 SPA Foundation organization. The name is yet to be determined. We will leave the C6 organization as a shell for the reasons Peter offered, but will eventually discuss dissolving SPA in the future. This is not an official vote, as we must notify the members of our official plan; however, the board agrees that this is the general process we want to pursue.

b. Review of the Consolidated Bylaws

The board reviewed the draft of the new bylaws. We first reviewed the name and purpose of the organization. Currently, this section of the bylaws reads as a mission statement; however, Nathan recommended that we may want to make the name and purpose more of a legal definition than a mission statement. He will continue to look into this.

Article 4 (Board of Directors) added a clause that the board can be increased or decreased by board resolution. Peter stated this is highly unusual to have in bylaws, and that this power would ordinarily be given to a membership vote. We should revisit this statement in order to maintain the power of the membership over the board.

The board discussed standing committees that should be included in the bylaws. We would require 2/3 vote from the membership to get rid of any standing committee, so we want to choose these carefully. Currently, the standing committees include the Executive, Leadership Development, Finance and Operations, and Conference committees. Martin suggested that the Publication Oversight committee should also be a standing committee given the role of the journal at SPA. This committee recommends hiring of the editor to the Board and handles journal oversight (including problems that occur with the editor). Several board members agreed and noted that this committee is already made up of the highest levels of board leadership and that a standing committee reduces any perception of bias.

Standing committees should focus on governance of SPA. Other committees that are more operational do not need to be standing committees in the bylaws. Any committee that has a governance role must have two board members, whereas operational committees do not have this requirement.

The new bylaws suggest including two additional member at large positions. This ensures that we have new at-large positions up for election each year.

Finally, the board discussed the rights of membership categories. There have been previous discussions about whether graduate students should have a right to vote at SPA. The board was in agreement that graduate students should be permitted to vote, though undergraduate students should not have this right. The board also discussed the issue of MA level practitioners and their future roles in SPA. Since APA is moving towards accreditation of terminal MA programs, and an increasing number of states are allowing for independent licensure with an MA, this

is something that SPA will need to continue to discuss. Currently, membership requires a Ph.D. in the U.S. (though there are varying standards for international members). This is not currently an issue, as we have very few associate members; however, this is something we should discuss in the future.

V. Professional Practice Guidelines for Personality Assessment

The workgroup for the professional practice guidelines joined the zoom call. October the guidelines were sent out for comment to SPA members, to APA Div. 12 Section IX members, and to the testing advisory group of the APA practice organization. The comment period was open for one month, and they received 16 comments. The committee then met several times to incorporate the comments received. There were no major changes to the document; however, some references were updated and they expanded coverage of therapeutic assessment and child/adolescent assessment.

The next step is a JPA submission. Martin said he is more than happy to consider this for publication after going through peer review. Notably, if JPA publishes this, SPA loses ownership of the document and Martin does not believe Taylor and Francis will allow for publication under other circumstances. Having open access (which would not be a large cost) would help with dissemination. In addition, we could put the document without JPA formatting on the website as long as it is acknowledged that the guidelines are also published in JPA.

Martin suggested that outside commentaries should go along with the publication. Radhika suggested it may be beneficial to have a town hall or convention discussion in the future to review these new practice guidelines.

MOTION: To approve the final practice guidelines document. The committee will send the guidelines to JPA for consideration. Motion approved.

VI. Virtual Convention and Workshops

a. Virtual Workshops

Workshop plans are completed. They will occur at various times throughout the Spring. Many of the submitted full-day workshops are being offered as two half days in order to accommodate more people.

b. Virtual Convention

Joni reviewed the convention schedule. There is a mix of live and pre-recorded sessions. Live sessions are plenary type events as well as top-rated submissions.

We will use EventRebels software for pre-recorded events. It uses Vimeo, which can track how much of a video someone has watched. The plan is that the pre-recorded sessions will be available for about a month (March 17-April 17). We have the ability to extend that as long as we would like, but we are planning for one month right now.

Some of the times have been extended (rather than 2-6 EST) in order to allow for breaks. However, we have tried to account for international members. It may be difficult for some of these times, but we will also be recording all sessions. Martin and Jan suggested some changes to make it possible for more international members to attend specific events (business meeting, award ceremony).

ACTION: Nathan will update the schedule and send a final draft.

Finally, Nathan reviewed the registration system for the convention.

X. Next Steps and Future Meetings

Nathan will send a Doodle poll to have a meeting in January. Nathan would like to start the first session involving the rebranding project. The board will also finish the executive director evaluation.

Moving forward, Nathan proposed having quarterly meetings-- March, June, September, and December. There would be a strategic timeline of standing topics for each of these meetings. Though we currently have a lot of business to cover in each board meeting, the plan is to build an infrastructure that will allow for smoother and shorter board meetings in the future.

There being no other business, President John McNulty adjourned the meeting and thanked the participants for their role.

Respectfully submitted,

Jaime L. Anderson, Ph.D.

Secretary