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**SOCIETY FOR PERSONALITY ASSESSMENT**

##### January Board of Trustees Meeting

**January 13th, 2021**

**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)

***Partial Attendance:*** Virginia Brabender (Foundation Board), Radhika Krishnamurthy (Foundation Board), Monica Tune (SPA Administrative Director), Cristina Gonzalez (SPA Membership and Marketing Manager), Sharon Nelson (SPAGS Past President)

***Absent****:* Martin Sellbom (JPA Editor)

**I. Call to Order and Quorum**

John welcomed the board and reviewed the agenda.

**II. Rebranding Discussion**

Kompleks Creative (Tobias and Chantal) joined the board meeting to discuss the rebranding process for SPA. Tobias started off by asking how we describe SPA to others. Board members described their particular perspective on who SPA is, along with reasons why SPA is not particularly well known among most psychologists.

In addition to issues with marketing, there is also confusion about the definition of personality. Based on our website, some lay people may come to personality.org and not find what they are looking for. We want the society to remain a professional society for those who have training in personality assessment; however, there could be opportunity to better inform the public on what personality assessment means. This is a marketing and educational opportunity, even if this is not the focus on SPA.

Notably, some of these issues extend far beyond SPA. Undergraduate courses in personality and clinical assessment are generally outdated or poorly designed. SPA is representative of broader issues in these fields. Relatedly, there has been a shift in how people find out about SPA. The field and academic departments have changed and lessened the focus on personality assessment, making it more difficult for students and new professionals to learn about SPA.

Tobias asked about who SPA’s audience is. Board members highlighted researchers, practitioners, academic instructors, and trainees. In addition, there may be more opportunity for education of the lay public. This may be focused primarily on those who consume our product (e.g., other associated professionals).

Our website would be improved by highlighting some of the major players in the history of personality assessment, providing resources for training, having a special section for graduate students, having a provider directory, etc. The convention is also likely to be a major part of the website. Moving forward, we have not discussed how we might change future conventions after being virtual due to COVID. One idea is to offer more training opportunities (e.g., workshops) outside of the convention schedule.

Are there other ways to increase our audience? One way may be doing better advertising when we sponsor CE offerings. We do not use this as a space to advertise currently. We may also benefit from a survey of clinicians on what types of training are missing that we can provide. It would be great if we offered some CE credits for free to members as well. could also offer free resources for instructors and students.

**III. SPA Foundation and SPA Transfer for Assets and Bylaw Review**

Nathan reviewed the current status of the transfer of assets plan. Pending board approval, our next step is to send this to the membership for a vote.

Since not all of the foundation board was present, the foundation vote will need to happen via email. If that vote is unanimously affirmative, the vote goes to the foundation “member,” which is the SPA board. The SPA board would then vote. Again assuming a unanimous affirmative vote, the vote then goes to SPA members. The members would be given 20 days to review and then 30 days to vote.

The board indicated they were comfortable with this plan.

**IV. Consent Agenda**

 **a. December Board Meeting Minutes**

The draft of the December board meeting minutes are available for review. The board suggested no additional updates to the December minutes.

 **b. AMS Database Update**

The board previous discussed two options for an AMS database. Novi seemed to be the frontrunner for several reasons (it is more user-friendly, more collaborative, has great reviews, better cost, better website capabilities). Nathan called references for Novi and it seemed as if this was the best choice. The staff would like to move forward with this company for the database.

 **c. Updated Policies and Procedures**

There are some policies that need to be updated for SPA. For instance, it is important that different policies target different audiences (e.g., the code of conduct for the convention has a different target than the code of conduct for online behavior). Nathan (in collaboration for SPA’s attorney) recommended several more specific policies that include the following:

i. Code of Ethical Conduct for Financial and Operational Standards is a policy that we would hold SPA Board and staff to.

ii. SPA Commitments and Non-Discrimination Policy was the policy the board viewed in September. It has been workshopped through SPA membership.

iii. SPA Events/Sponsored Activities Policy on Conduct, Non-Discrimination, and Harassment is the new recommended policy regarding how we conduct ourselves as leaders and our expectations at conferences and events.

iv. SPA Online Code of Conduct is an excerpt of the above policy, but would be the policy that SPA members would confirm they agree to before participating in the Virtual Convention and Workshops

v. Whistleblower Protection Policy is an abbreviated version of protections that SPA should have per association best practices.

vi. SPA Workplace Policy on Conduct, Non-Discrimination, Harassment, and Retaliation relates directly to staff. Although staff are also held accountable per c. above, our lawyer recommends that we also have a specific policy for staff per the Equal Employment Opportunity Community.

vii. SPA Volunteer Commitments has been workshopped over the past four months, and this would be the document we would ask all volunteers, including the board, hold themselves accountable to.

The board reviewed and discussed the drafted policies. One question that arose related to the consequences for breaking policies. As written, the executive director is the sole arbiter of the consequences after any complaint; however, it seems best if multiple people are involved in making these decisions. We should further discuss who should make up a disciplinary committee, how the process for appeals will work, and what potential penalties for breaking policies can be. Notably, we want to be careful not to burden one board member with these serious decisions.

The board agreed to continue to discuss the proposed process for disciplinary actions related to these policies.

 **d. Consent Agenda Motion**

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

**V. Executive Director Evaluation and 2021 Goals**

The board reviewed Nathan’s goals for 2021. Board members discussed why increased membership is not one of Nathan’s goals. Nathan stated that he purposefully did not make this a goal because we still need to have a better understanding of our mission and our audience. In other words, we should know where we want to recruit from before making this a specific goal. The board requested that Nathan discuss potential increases in membership throughout his goals.

In addition, the board asked that Nathan tie his goals more explicitly to the strategic plan. Nathan agreed to make this clearer in his stated goals.

Finally, the board asked for more specific benchmarks for meeting goals. Though some goals may be more difficult than others to create concrete benchmarks, it is important that the board have indicators that are more objective to indicate success in meeting a goal.

Nathan agreed to address these few requests. He will send an updated list of goals with more measurable outcomes and ties to the strategic plan (including impact on membership).

**X. Next Steps and Future Meetings**

Nathan will send out a doodle poll to plan for the March 2021 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**

##### March Board of Trustees Meeting

**March 24th, 2021**

**Zoom Meeting**

***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), Len Simms (Representative-at-Large), Jan Kamphuis (Representative-at-Large), Chloe Bliton (SPAGS Past President), Jennifer Boland (SPAGS President), Virginia Brabender (Foundation Board), Radhika Krishnamurthy (Foundation Board), Ron Ganellen (Foundation Board), Jill Clemence (Foundation Board), Martin Sellbom (JPA Editor), Nathan Victoria (Executive Director), Tobias Rose (Kompleks Creative)

***Partial Attendance***: Lauren Hilger (Taylor & Francis)

***Absent:*** None

**I. Call to Order and Quorum**

John welcomed the board and reviewed the agenda.

**II. Taylor and Francis Update**

Martin reviewed the journal metrics. The AEs (amounting to 7.5 full time AEs) are keeping busy and doing a good job. The journal is doing well with submissions, with a continued increasing trend over the years. Based on current submissions in 2021, the journal is set to surpass the number of submissions in 2020.

The geography of submissions has remained fairly consistent over time; however, there has been a recent increase in submissions from China and other Asian countries. This is positive, as Martin made it a goal to expand the global involvement of the journal.

Nathan inquired about rejection rates for international submissions. Martin did not have exact numbers, but estimated that the rejection rate is slightly higher for international submissions, as these are more likely to include translation studies (which are often desk rejected if they add nothing new other than translation).

Nathan also noted that it is interesting that we have such a large number of submissions from China but no Chinese members of SPA. Joni suggested that the ties between SPA and JPA could be clearer on the website, and Martin agreed he could speak with Taylor and Francis about improving the visibility of SPA through the journal. However, several board members also agreed that we do not want to bombard those who have submitted to JPA with requests to join SPA.

The acceptance rate for the journal remains healthy (around 20%). About 35-40% of the submissions are desk rejected, likely due to scope or being translation articles. Almost all decisions are made within 90 days of submission.

There has been a slight dip in the impact factor, largely due to one highly cited article falling off of the metrics. Previous years were likely inflated because of this article, and our numbers are back to where they were previously. Of course, we hope that the impact factor will increase over time.

The backlog for manuscripts has substantially improved due to Taylor and Francis’ 30% increase in the page limit. The speed of publication is also good; manuscripts are available online within a month of acceptance now.

The financial standing of the journal is unchanged from the last report. The journal is slightly over the allotted budget, but this was after gaining permission from the board to hire a new AE.

There are three special issues upcoming—personality assessment in legal contexts, assessment of personality change, and personality pathology assessment in youth.

Finally, Lauren Hilger (Taylor and Francis representative) discussed the broad standing of Taylor and Francis. She noted that 65% of traffic to Taylor and Francis comes from google/google scholar. This is good news for search engine optimization. In addition, she stated that T&F was the 494th most visited website last year, suggesting a good standing of T&F more broadly.

**II. Finance Update**

There has been no significant impact on our investments since the business meeting. Paul did not know the impact of the convention on our finances yet, so the financial standing was unchanged. We finished in the black last year due to the lack of convention and lack of expenses related to board meeting travel.

Paul noted some operational changes. We switched to QuickBooks online, which provides a more nuanced and flexible way to record our finances. We can track our finances more consistently within a given year and also over time. In addition, we are looking for a new accounting firm to better fit the size of our organization (it is possible that we are overpaying given what we need right now).

**III. Nominations and Elections Update**

Instead of being a nominations committee, this committee has evolved into a “Leadership Development Committee,” with the goal of identifying nominees for board positions as well as candidates for other leadership roles within SPA.

In addition, the committee was expanded from the traditional three-person membership (i.e., Past President, President, and President Elect). They wanted to include a variety of backgrounds and viewpoints on the committee. In the future, this committee will also include the chair of the Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Committee (though the chair has not yet been identified). In addition to these standard members, several other SPA members joined this committee, including Chloe Bliton, Abbey Mulay, Matthew Yalch, and Julie Craddock O’Leary.

This committee will generate a list of names for presidential candidates (the only open position this year). There will be an open nomination process in April/May, followed by interviews with the President/Past President/President Elect to choose a final slate of candidates. A vote from the membership will likely occur in early July.

**IV. Board Development Proposal**

John discussed a board development proposal with three broad components.

1. We should evaluate how we have done as a board. We will develop a questionnaire covering various aspects of board membership (to be developed) to complete a self-review of our board performance.
2. We should identify areas in which we could use additional board training. What areas can be improved as a board—and what type of training would help us get there? In particular, we may want to seek training on how to become more of a strategic board for setting goals and making plans.
3. Our strategic plan is reaching the end of its initial time frame (2021), so we should revisit this plan and come up with new goals.

Nathan has been working with someone named Cynthia Mills, an expert in association management. She may help us identify training needs and set future plans.

Finally, John asked us to consider questions about our current pace. It has been a busy year for many reasons, and some have questioned whether we are doing too much and making changes too fast. We should consider this moving forward in how we want our pace to be.

**V. Kompleks Creative Exercises**

Tobias Rose from Kompleks Creative joined the meeting to discuss several aspects related to our branding, such as identifying our mission, vision, values, and core audience.

Based on feedback from SPA members, Tobias stated that there seemed to be a misalignment of what SPA should do, who it is for, and how it should operate. In addition, he noted that many discussed issues with diversity and inclusion (though many also acknowledged current efforts to improve in this area). Finally, he noted that our website does little to represent SPA’s vision.

Tobias discussed numerous opportunities he believes SPA has. For instance, most people identified the journal and the conference to be the value of an SPA membership. This provides a lot of area for growth, such as improving social content related to SPA (e.g., through the website or other media outlets). We have the opportunity to lead conversations related to personality assessment, but we are not visible. Similarly, he showed us our Wikipedia page, and noted that it is very sparse, particularly considering the age of SPA. Finally, he recommended changes to the website—he noted that it was set up for current members almost as a bulletin board and did little to show prospective members what an SPA membership could do for them.

The board also participated in a vision exercise to discuss the overall purpose of SPA. Various board members discussed what they believe the vision of SPA is/should be. However, Tobias identified that we were often discussing values rather than vision. SPA is good at identifying values (e.g., production of science, education in personality assessment, providing optimal clinical care, etc.); however, the vision takes this one step further and establishes why these things are important. Ultimately, our vision is likely about improving the lives of clients and perhaps making some more systemic change (e.g., in clinical practice).

We also discussed who the audience of SPA is. Our current audience seems to focus on researchers, clinicians, and graduate students. It is possible that we should consider other possible audiences (e.g., clients, those from affiliated fields, psychologists in other fields, test publishers), but it is probably best to focus first on our target audience.

Finally, Tobias noted that, based on feedback he received, our current name is a good representation of who we are. He does not recommend that we change our name.

**VI. Adjournment**

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**

##### October Board of Trustees Meeting

**October 9-12, 2021**

**Zoom Meeting**

***Present:*** Joni Mihura (President), John McNulty (Past President), Anita Boss (President-Elect), Jaime Anderson (Secretary), Lindsay Ingram (Representative-at-Large), Jan Kamphuis (Representative-at-Large), Jennifer Boland (SPAGS President), Jill Clemence (Foundation Board), Nathan Victoria (Executive Director), Ksera Dyette (Diversity and Social Justice Committee Chair)

***Partial Attendance***: Cynthia Mills (Consultant), Paul Arbisi (Treasurer & Foundation Board President), Nicole Cain (Representative-at-Large), Ron Ganellen (Foundation Board), Martin Sellbom (JPA Editor)

***Absent:*** Len Simms (Representative-at-Large)

**I. Call to Order and Quorum**

Joni welcomed the board and re-introduce Cynthia Mills. She reviewed our board culture commitments. The board then engaged in an icebreaker activity related to the Strengths Quest test.

**II. Strategic Framework**

*Saturday, October 9th*

Cynthia Mills began by discussing our plan for creating a strategic plan. Cynthia referred to the first day as a “messy design day” in which we generate many ideas. The board took a survey prior to the meeting, and we started by discussing the survey insights.

The board then discussed our previous vision and mission drafts. Many board members felt the vision did not apply to SPA. The board worked to create a more representative vision statement.

Notably, the board discussed whether SPA is a global or an international society. After much discussion, the board determined that “global” would be a much greater shift, and we are far from being a global society. Therefore, “international” is a better term to describe SPA.

Following this discussion, the board began breakout work to discuss potential strategic outcomes (e.g., lead the field, guide the procession, grow the society) and how we can accomplish these outcomes. Each group discussed various efforts that SPA could engage in to meet our goals.

*Sunday, October 10*

Cynthia began by discussing a more organized and condensed version of our ideas for outcome strategies. While day one was about generating ideas, Cynthia noted that the second day would be more about making decisions.

We began by clarifying some definitions in our work as a society (e.g., field vs. profession, personality assessment vs. psychological assessment). We then returned to our mission and vision statements and Cynthia presented the drafts we had developed.

*Vision*: SPA is the indispensable resource and advocate for personality assessment internationally.

*Mission*: To advance the science, practice, and impact of personality assessment through research, education, training, and advocacy.

The board agreed that these seemed to better represent SPA. We will finalize these at a later date.

The board then broke back into groups to discuss outcome strategies. Each group identified their top three strategies, and we discussed as a board. Ultimately, we identified our top strategies as: defining the value of personality assessment, developing a membership recruitment/retention plan, and continuing to improve the digitization of the society. As part of implementing these strategies, we should develop both short-term (e.g., in the next year) as well as long term goals.

Cynthia indicated she would provide a more thorough report of our strategic planning meetings to Nathan.

1. **Consent Agenda**

Board members had the opportunity to discuss various reports submitted to the board.

1. June Board Meeting Minutes

A couple of typos were noted. All board members should email/message Jaime with edits.

1. President’s Report

Joni discussed some presidential initiatives she would like to focus on. Board members had no major questions or comments.

1. Continuing Education Committee

Board members had no questions or comments.

1. Membership Committee and Figures

There were no questions or comments related to the membership report. However, Jaime also noted the issue of MA level practitioners in the U.S. and where they will fit into our membership structure. They likely best fit in the Associate category; however, this may change as more MA level practitioners are able to practice independently. In addition, it was noted that Associate level members have no voting rights. A task force was recommended to discuss these issues, and members of the board suggested making this a topic of discussion at the December board meeting.

1. Awards Committee Recommendations

The Awards Committee met to discuss the awards and various issues associated with them. Committee will be meeting to finalize what to do with these awards (e.g., new awards, better criteria for each of the awards, etc.). This committee also reviewed the awards (and the award winners) for the 2022 year. They made recommendations for three of the awards already (see report).

As a nominee, Jaime left for discussion of the Beck award. The board nominated Jaime Anderson for Beck award. The board discussed the Klopfer award. Joni left the discussion due to conflict of interest with a nominee. The board voted to give the Klopfer award to Aaron Pincus.

Finally, the board discussed the Hertz Memorial Award. We will be recognizing those who have passed away this year (it is what we did last year). However, there is a question about whether we want to have a winner this year. It was suggested to do open call to the membership for potential memorial winners.

1. Student Matters Committee

Board members had no questions or comments.

1. Student Association (SPAGS)

Board members had no questions or comments.

1. Diversity and Social Justice Committee

Ksera discussed a previous DSJ Committee conversation regarding the SPA Exchange. The committee discussed the Exchange as a possible outlet for publishing DISJ topics. There was some concern about whether the Exchange would be the official publication of the DISJ committee, and that is not what the committee intended. The board likes the idea of having a permanent place DISJ discussion in the Exchange.

A taskforce for the Exchange should be created. This should represent the various areas that have an interest in this. Nathan will work to do this.

1. Nominations and Elections Committee

We discussed the issue of our member-at-large positions. We are supposed to have 6 MAL positions, and we scheduled them to be rotating off every 3 years. An election should have occurred this year to fill these spots, but we did not do that. We currently have an additional two MAL positions after merging with the foundation board (who serve for one more year).

The board discussed options moving forward, including holding an election for 2 2-year term positions this year, or asking Jill and Ron to continue their service until those positions would be up for re-election.

The board also discussed when board terms should begin. Our new bylaws state that the timing is by resolution of the board. The bylaws taskforce suggested April 1; however, there was discomfort with this. Nathan suggested January 1 as the start date, which would also help with budgeting. The board was generally supportive of this idea.

1. Interest Groups

Len has been trying to have quarterly meetings with the interest groups. The IGs have been appreciative of the yearly stipend provided. The board discussed evaluating IG leaders to better ensure that all leaders are pulling equal weight. Board members noted that it seems as if early career leaders may be more invested in some cases.

1. Foundation Board

The Foundation board voted in principle to accept the transfer of resources into the foundation. They agreed to support the new bylaws. As of next week, the foundation and SPA boards will be merged. The vote has not closed, but approval seems very likely. At that point, Peter Wolk will send Paul information related to incorporation in Virginia. Nathan is working with the accountant and lawyer to discuss when the do the physical transfer of assets.

There is a technicality about Paul’s position on the foundation board (since he is SPA treasurer and Foundation president). However, in the newly merged board, Joni will be president, John past-president, Anita president-elect, and Paul will retain his position as treasurer on the SPA board. He will no longer be president of the foundation.

1. Treasurers Report

Nathan has been working with a new accountant to reconcile the books better.

Nathan discussed membership and convention rates and how ours are lower than many societies. Nathan recommended a slight increase in convention rates. We subsidize the convention (and have always been ok with this), but we are nowhere near breaking even on the convention. We should also consider dues + convention costs when we are making comparisons.

We currently have approximately $1.8 million in our investments. We are buffered against market shifts pretty well. The Beck fund is also at $40k as of July 1.

APLS has agreed to coordinate/partner with us. They will be marketing some of the benefit of SPA. We should make sure to highlight specific speakers/events that may be particularly good to show why some of these individuals may want to be part of SPA.

The board raised no concern with Nathan’s proposed budget. However, we will confirm the budget in December.

1. Executive Director Report

Board members had no questions or comments. Nathan is continuing sourcing for convention locations.

1. JPA Editor Report

Board members had no questions or comments.

**MOTION: To approve the consent agenda.**

8 Yes. 0 No. 1 Abstention. Motion passed.

1. **Strategies for Implementation**

As a final task, the board continued the discussion about strategies for implementing our strategic plan. Ultimately, our three broad outcomes are: leading the field, growing the society, and guiding the profession.

Nathan presented a summary of the strategic plan that we created in the previous two days. This will last 5 years; however, it is a living document and can be adjusted over time.

The board should spend the next couple of months thinking of additional tactics to implement our plan. In the December meeting, we should approval a tactical plan for 2022.

**VIII. Adjournment**

In December, we will discuss goals for 2022. We will also discuss an evaluation for Nathan.

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

Respectfully submitted,

Jaime L. Anderson, Ph.D.

Secretary

**SOCIETY FOR PERSONALITY ASSESSMENT**

**December Board of Trustees Meeting**

**December 7th and 14th, 2021**

**Zoom Meeting**

**Tuesday, December 7 (4:30pm-6:00pm, ET)**

***Present:*** Joni Mihura (President), John McNulty (Past President), Anita Boss (President-Elect), Jaime Anderson (Secretary), Lindsay Ingram (Representative-at-Large), Len Simms (Representative-at-Large), Jennifer Boland (SPAGS President), Jill Clemence (Representative-at-Large), Nathan Victoria (Executive Director), Ksera Dyette (Diversity and Social Justice Committee Chair), Paul Arbisi (Treasurer), Nicole Cain (Representative-at-Large), Ron Ganellen (Representative-at-Large), Martin Sellbom (JPA Editor)

***Absent:*** Jan Kamphuis (Representative-at-Large)

**I. Call to Order and Quorum**

Joni called the meeting to order.

**II. Strategic Framework Part 1**

Nathan reviewed the finalized strategic framework we developed with Cynthia Mills last board meeting. The outcomes and strategies were reviewed, and no major changes were made. However, the strategy to “improve reimbursement for the profession” was changed to “promote equitable compensation for expertise in personality assessment,” as this is less U.S.-centric language.

Nathan reviewed our top three strategies for 2022:

1. Define the utility and impact of personality assessment and communicate its value
2. Continue and improve the digitalization of the society
3. Develop a membership recruitment and retention plan

SPA staff recently had a staff retreat. As part of this retreat, staff members began to map out a plan for implementing various tactics associated with our prioritized strategies for the year. Nathan reviewed the tactics and an estimated month of completion. Nathan discussed the various tactics and invited questions and comments from the board. Notably, these focused only on digitalization and membership, as staff felt they needed more guidance from the board to implement the first strategy.

The board discussed the strategy to “define the utility and impact of personality assessment and communicate its value.” Though we have discussed ideas in past meetings, we need to solidify a plan.

One specific area we could focus on is advocacy. We should have continuous representation with APA and improve advocacy for the field of personality assessment. This should be done at a broad level, as insurance reimbursement may prevent many people from incorporating personality assessment.

A working group was suggested to determine what type of work would be best suited for meeting this goal. Specifically, a workgroup could determine research priorities for funding from SPA. However, others noted that we do not really have the necessary funds to support longitudinal personality assessment outcome research. Though we have approximately $20,000 still from a previous “utility of personality assessment” project, this is a relatively minimal amount if we want to demonstrate to insurance providers or other stakeholders that personality assessment is cost-saving and useful on a broader level. Members may be hesitant to put more money towards this effort if we cannot demonstrate how this money is used.

Another strategy mentioned was to network/partner more intentionally with individuals who are active in assessment communities. For instance, the *Testing Psychologist* was mentioned as a potential outlet to better promote SPA and personality assessment more generally. We discussed asking members to be more purposeful in advocating for personality assessment in their areas (whether it be on a listserve/group like the *Testing Psychologist* or at an institutional level such as at the VA).

One area of weakness in the field is graduate training in personality assessment. Many areas of psychology have essentially stopped doing assessment, particularly in general clinical settings. This starts at the graduate training level (including MA level training). We should put efforts into enhancing graduate training in personality assessment. In addition, we could provide better mentorship to graduate students or early career professionals who have not had as much training in personality assessment.

Finally, Martin suggested a special issue in JPA on the utility of personality assessment.

**III. SPA Policies and Procedures Revision Taskforce**

Nathan and Joni reviewed our policies and procedures manual, and it is fairly outdated. Nathan has been working to revamp the manual, but we need a group of board members to review our current policies and procedures as well as sample policies and procedures from other organizations. We updated our bylaws, and that is our overarching document, but the policies and procedures lays out how we operate day-to-day, and this should be written in one place.

This taskforce should be formed now, will update the board in June on the progress, and will aim to finalize the policies and procedures by the September board retreat.

Board members should contact Nathan and Joni if they would like to participate.

**III. Executive Director Evaluation Part I**

The board began a discussion of Nathan’s evaluation, and the process for reviewing his goals from 2021. Board members were asked to thoroughly review the feedback we received regarding Nathan’s performance, Nathan’s own performance review, and his goals from 2021 in order to finalize the evaluation in the next week’s meeting.

**Tuesday, December 14 (3:00pm-7:00pm, ET)**

***Present:*** Joni Mihura (President), John McNulty (Past President), Anita Boss (President-Elect), Jaime Anderson (Secretary), Jill Clemence (Representative-at-Large), Nathan Victoria (Executive Director), Paul Arbisi (Treasurer), Nicole Cain (Representative-at-Large), Martin Sellbom (JPA Editor), Lindsay Ingram (Representative-at-Large)

***Partial Attendance:***Jan Kamphuis (Representative-at-Large), Jennifer Boland (SPAGS President), Ksera Dyette (Diversity and Social Justice Committee Chair), Len Simms (Representative -at-Large)

***Absent:*** Ron Ganellen (Representative-at-Large)

**I. Call to Order and Quorum**

Joni called the meeting to order and reviewed the meeting agenda.

**II. Approval of October Board Meeting Minutes**

 **MOTION**: To approve October board meeting minutes. Unanimously approved.

**III. Awards Taskforce Update**

Len reviewed the work that the awards taskforce has done.

Some of SPA’s award appear overlapping. For instance, we have two early career awards (Exner and Beck) and two later-career awards (Klopfer and the Distinguished Service award).

The Distinguished Service award currently mentions scholarship in addition to general service to the field. The committee proposed to separate this from Klopfer by removing reference to scholarship from the service award. The board was supportive of this. The board also discussed the prospect of making this a named award. The board briefly discussed Bruce Smith as a namesake for the award; however, the board will discuss this at a later date.

Differentiation of the early career awards seemed more difficult based on their descriptions. Board members noted that the Exner award has historically functioned more like a grant to support research, whereas the Beck award has been focused on early career achievement. However, the descriptions are fairly overlapping.

The committee discussed the establishment of a mid-career award, potentially making either the Beck or Exner award focused on mid-career achievement. However, this could be difficult due to the endowment of funds for the awards and the established reputation of the awards among members. The board discussed making the Exner award a research grant, keeping the Beck award for early career achievement, and creating a new award for mid-career achievement.

In addition, there was discussion about naming all research grants under Exner, but we would have to discuss the way that these awards are financed and if it is possible to combine them in this way.

The committee recommended no changes to the Mary Cerney award, but stated we should clarify what a “student paper” is.

Finally, they discussed the prospect of creating a diversity award—and whether this should be an award for achievement in this area or whether this should be a grant to fund diversity-focused research. The board generally supported the idea of a research grant to generate science over awarding work that has already been done.

**IV. 2022 SPA Budget Approval and Long-Range Financial Plan Discussion**

Nathan reviewed our current financial standing.

One major change for 2022 is CE sponsorship—where we will charge a flat fee for administrative tasks. This will start Feb 1, which is when the new CE calendar begins. Additionally, there are organizations that SPA staff are trying to do part time administrative support to help with CEs (e.g., with the TA group). This can be a potential increase in revenue and also opportunity to build partnerships.

Nathan discussed the costs associated with a hybrid in-person and virtual conference. The board was supportive of a virtual option for the convention. We do not want to alienate membership by not having a virtual option.

The board discussed the projected deficit. What are we getting from losing this much money? How does this benefit the membership? There are certain circumstances where we want to go in the red (like the convention), and we have always been ok with this. However, the personnel costs have increased over the last two years. Nathan noted that these salaries are based on industry standards. As the board, we should provide guidance to the executive director on where to cut costs. Eventually, we will not be able to cover these costs and our deficit will grow.

Nathan also noted that if salaries were to be cut long-term, we should start with his position. He noted that he is putting systems in place for SPA to run more efficiently. If we are unable to grow to a more neutral financial position, these general systems can potentially be maintained by other staff. Nathan’s contract ends in December 2022. Nathan wants to continue to discuss renewing his contract throughout 2022 to better prepare for where we are going. Notably, the board needs a CEO transition policy. We need a process for this. These conversations are important for us to have. Our primary purpose of the board is to make sure that we are protecting the financial standing of the society.

Staff are making a lot of progress right now, but it is also important to consider longevity. We are making an investment in the future of SPA, and we are spending a lot of money. We will need to consider at what point we change our strategy—when do we hope to be budget neutral? The board discussed a general deadline of 2022 for seeing major financial improvement; however, other board members thought this was too soon of a timeline, particularly given COVID and the uncertainty of convention attendance. Nathan suggested a timeline of 2024/2025 was more reasonable. It is unclear when we will have a reasonable expectation for “normal,” however, we will evaluate at the end of 2022 whether things are trending upwards or downwards.

Nathan returned to the long range financial plan. Because we have made money in the past, we have let some expenses get out of hand. For instance, we spent $90 per person on coffee in 2019.

We are projected to get our membership growth numbers. The budget should stay neutral even if numbers drop, and membership numbers might drop because we remove life members.

The board discussed our standing on losing money on the convention and whether this should be our general rule. The board has periodically discussed this, and historically we have not really laid out the specific costs (e.g., on coffee). In the past when we have had these conversations, we had plenty of money and we were ok with losing funds for the convention. However, if there are now long-term implications, then we need to do something about it.

One of the things we like about SPA is that the registration has always been relatively low compared to other organizations. We could increase fees. We are on the low end, and this may need to go up faster than what people may be comfortable with. We are so far behind because of hesitancy about this in the past. We should analyze the “market” for registration costs. Notably, if we doubled the cost and had 500 people, that is $50k. Some board members expressed that this is a loss well-spent—that we could be a little tighter in our budget, but that convention costs should be the last thing we look to cut.

The board will continue to discuss the budget in March. We should continue to consider where we can make cuts and give Nathan direction on how to do this.

**MOTION:** To accept the deficit budget for year 2022 only. Unanimously approved.

**V. Strategic Framework Part 2**

Nathan re-viewed the strategic plan as we have previously laid it out.

 **MOTION:** To accept the strategic framework. Unanimously approved.

In what ways do we want to communicate this plan and roll this out to the membership? After discussing various options, the board decided we should try to have a the strategic plan up on the website by mid-January, but then do an official announcement in March knowing that we will have achieved one of the tactics. We can have the big launch at the convention.

In regards to board terms, the board decided we should move to a January 1 term date. If the board approves this, we will have 1-1 conversations about when it makes sense to roll in new people. We can discuss implementation after approving the new term date.

 **MOTION:** To change the term date to beginning January 1st. Unanimously approved.

Nathan discussed his 2022 goals. Nathan discussed this tracking tool and reviewed some of his upcoming goals.

**VI. Executive Director Evaluation Part 2**

Nathan discussed 2021 goals and highlighted accomplishments prior to leaving the meeting.

We should have a committee to help make these decisions. We should also make the survey evaluation more tied to the decisions we are making for the bonus in the future.

Given that we do not have these standards in place, a threshold model seems most appropriate. The board generally agreed Nathan has met each of his goals.

As a final note, board members were reminded that they should book their flights and complete doodle polls for future meetings.

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

Respectfully submitted,

Jaime L. Anderson, Ph.D.

Secretary