



March 2024 Board of Trustees Meeting
San Diego, California
March 13th and 14th, 2024

Present: Jan Kamphuis (President), Jill Clemence (Past-President), Jaime Anderson (Secretary), Tayla Lee (Treasurer), Nicole Cain (President-Elect), Abby Mulay (Representative-at-large), Kate Thomas (Representative-at-large), Matt Yalch (Representative-at-large), Len Simms (Representative-at-large), Katie Lewis (Representative-at-large), Sarah Gottlieb (SPAGS President), Ksera Dyette (DISJ Committee Chair), Jordan Wright (APA Liaison), Martin Sellbom (JPA Editor), Nathan Victoria (Executive Director)

Partial Attendance: Stephen Finn (Representative-at-large)

Absent: None

1. Call to Order and Quorum

Jan called the meeting to order. He thanked Jill for her service in the role of president and discussed his view of the role of president and his goals for his time in the role. This includes contributing to the utility of assessment and growing membership.

The board reviewed the agenda and the strategic culture commitments.

2. 2024 Strategic Framework and Key Performance Indicators

Nathan reviewed progress on various strategies we are pursuing. Board members reviewed the document, and some suggested that we also note when we expect for a goal to be completed and how we will know a goal has been met.

Partnerships

Nathan will be attending APLS next week and will be particularly focusing on advertising the MMPI symposium. He will be pursuing additional partnerships throughout the year.

Revenue for HiTOP is currently a little lower than budgeted but cost is lower than anticipated too. Tayla has asked Nathan to track some of our indirect costs too—so Nathan has started to do that (in the document). It looks like we will land around \$5k in profit, though this is a rough estimate.

Utility of Personality Assessment

SPA is pursuing the “Voices” proposal. We will have four videos at the presidential address that will discuss firsthand stories of the impact of personality assessment. This will help provide the personal side of personality assessment. We will also be talking with members throughout the convention—things like what got you into PA, what do you get out of SPA, etc.

There are two special issues in JPA being pursued—one on the utility of personality assessment and one on the assessment of trauma.

Mentorship

Mentorship program is launching at convention. We have 30 pairs of mentor/mentees. The board discussed the benefits and drawbacks of letting students choose pairings. In the future we may want to create a manual for mentors based on student mentee feedback.

Member Retention

We only retain about 68% of members year to year.

We have started examining data about student to early career transition. Around 1/3 of first-time attendees from last year (around 50 of 150 this year) and the year before (around 30 of 90) attended the convention the following year. We may also want to look at multi-year cycles—e.g., how many come back within 3 years. Nathan will have more information in June.

Workshops

Workshop revenue is down quite a bit (and has been since COVID). Nathan will be talking to the committee to decide the future—what will make people come in person to the workshop? Do we want to move to a different model? We have always been accepting of most and cancel a few, but we canceled six this year. The board discussed examining trends of topics that get cut and who attends. The board also discussed better curating the topics and creating a system of recognition for workshop completion (e.g., APA has badges).

Expert insights will happen again in November. The CE Committee is working to curate the topics. The board discussed the need to have measurable outcomes so that we can evaluate how we want to move forward with the event.

Convention

We have filled 91% of our room block (only 75% is necessary for the contract). This year, we have the attendee lounge, headshots, and a music presentation. Over half of the attendees at the zoo event purchased a ticket (as opposed to getting free admission as a leader). We did not break even (and we cannot fundraise at the zoo). The board discussed optimal venues for future events as well as how to turn the event into a fundraising opportunity.

Nathan discussed various potential cost saving strategies for future conventions. He explored tier 2 cities for convention and the board meeting. It was not much of a cost savings for us when you added in flights for the board, but we will survey membership about this. In addition, Nathan proposed that the board consider changing the conference timing during the week (e.g., a

Sunday-Tuesday), which would be substantially cheaper. There were mixed views on this as a board, but Nathan was asked to survey membership and look into how much money this would save. Finally, the board discussed venues other than hotels for convention or partnering with a university; however, this would be unlikely to result in much savings.

Nathan is also looking into alternative apps for the convention.

Definition of Personality Assessment

The board discussed the definition of personality assessment. The aim of this discussion is to define our organization, with implications on our mission, what we do as a society, and who our membership is. The board set a goal to have a working definition to put out to the members at the October board meeting. We will survey members and also seek feedback from individuals who are involved in assessment but not personality assessment.

3. Finance Materials

Tayla discussed the current status of the Finance Committee. The committee will need a new member to replace John McNulty.

The committee met a few weeks ago to review finance data. They have been working out roles—e.g., what is Tayla's responsibility vs. Nathan's responsibility. In addition, they have been working on developing long range financial goals and indicators.

The board will review and discuss goals for 2025 in October. The board should consider what financial information we need to know in order to make decisions.

Nathan reviewed current finances. We projected a loss of around 300k in 2023. We ended with a deficit of 237K. We have never been consistent with where we track money (e.g., membership income). We are being more consistent with this now—money meant for 2024 will be tracked in 2024. We currently have \$1.6 million in investments (with a 11.89% return last year and 6.38% over the last 5 years). We project our plans at 3%. We have the buffer we need to get through 2027, with some extra wiggle room (without going below the \$1 million minimum line we set). We have been taking small draws over time rather than taking one big lump sum—so that the money can continue to grow and we only take out what we actually need over time. There are no transaction costs to do that. Nathan and the finance committee will be redoing the long-term projection for the board in the near future.

The condo remains up for sale and we have a new realtor who has sold in our complex.

Nathan briefly reviewed the budget to actual overview for the current year. The board does not review this in detail, the finance committee sees greater detail.

Staffing the Society

The board discussed various staffing options for SPA.

Nathan has discussed with Jan the following options, and the SPA Board will take the next few months to determine what makes most sense fiduciarily, for the Society:

- Executive Director (only FTE) who outsources work to consultants, Nathan leaves.
- Executive Director (only FTE) who outsources work to consultants, Nathan stays.
- Association Management Company, all new staff.
- Association Management Company, Nathan is retained.
- Association Management Company, Nathan and Staff go to new AMC (NextGen AMC).
- Current staffing model but with different staff with different salaries.

Nathan's contract is up in June 2025. We pay approximately \$375k in staffing costs right now (including lawyer fees, advisor, etc.). We need to do due diligence to make sure we are evaluating all options available.

The board discussed the needs of the organization in comparison to cost. The bid from NetGen would be around \$300k. So it would save money. Other bids might be around \$400-425k. Nathan noted that an AMC model could be beneficial because you have access to people with varying areas of expertise (rather than an ED who cannot be an expert in all areas). However, the board also discussed the loss of a personal touch.

Regarding current partnerships, MMPI would stay with us because that is a contracted SPA relationship. However, other partnerships (or potential partnerships) such as HiTOP or APLS would remain separate.

The board discussed the prospect of a psychologist ED. We have fixed much of the business side of SPA (e.g., accounting, website, membership database, etc.), so it may be a good time to have a leader with more content expertise to help grow SPA.

Another way to consider this problem is rather than thinking about what SPA wants/needs, what can SPA afford? We would dip into our reserves with each option above. We can pull from our reserves and its not a problem for a nonprofit to do so, but we should keep that in mind as we are considering options.

A taskforce was discussed to continue reviewing staffing options (the executive committee, plus three board members—Jordan, Len, and Kate).

4. Environmental Scan, Foresight, and Drivers of Change

The board broke into groups to discuss this year's ASAE (American Society of Association Executives) drivers of change for organizations that were deemed most relevant to SPA. These included healthcare disruption, supporting mental health, and next generation professionals.

Following the small group discussions, the board shared summaries of these discussions as a large groups.

Healthcare Disruption

We are not meeting the needs of society for assessment. We should think of a strategic initiative for educational content to train up the MA level workforce and the next generation of assessors. It would be a big upfront cost on our part and a big risk, but could also be a great payout.

Sticking to our very thorough comprehensive approach to assessment may not be useful—we should consider how we can contribute to shorter/screening assessment. From a population health perspective, we could screen and see whether the person needs higher care/greater assessment.

Supporting Mental Health

Personality assessment is more than diagnostic. Society is moving in the direction that mental health is not just well or unwell and we are actually ahead of the curve here. However, we do little advocacy as an organization and our audience is currently exclusively psychologists.

There is less emphasis on personality assessment in many realms. SPA's focus has maybe narrowed too much to only clinical and we have lost other disciplines (e.g., I/O, sport psychology, health). What would we need to do to bring them back?

The Next-Gen Professionals

There is a decline in assessment training. SPA could work on a packaged training for students—e.g., videos of Therapeutic Assessment allow students to see what assessment can really look like.

Gen Z refuse to see incremental change, which we should consider when attempting to retain junior members or when we are responding to problems (e.g., DEISJ negativity at SPA).

5. Board Orientation

The board reviewed the board role continuum. We used to be very operational, but we have moved in the direction of strategy (though we are not quite there yet). Nathan introduced a new board section on the website where documents will be housed.

The board discussed the process for declaring and reviewing conflicts of interest. We will declare potential conflicts in February and the EC will review them. The EC is determining a process for how to work through these conflicts, though the board should be open about conflicts as they arise.

Nathan reviewed the board orientation book.

The board discussed culture-- the board is collective and we have to trust each other. The board discussed the benefits and costs of having “one voice” and discussed how we are responsible to SPA the organization—not necessarily the members of the organization.

6. SPA Strategic Discussions

Convention Update

Nathan reviewed convention numbers. Partnering with other organizations seems to be successful for us (based on TAI and HiTOP). As of the meeting, we were at 408 total SPA registrations (down from 459 last year). We are down virtual and workshop only, which accounts for this difference—the in-person registration is roughly the same (+2 this year). Trends are similar in terms of professional breakdown (professional/early career/student). We are down first-time attendees, but up for returning first timers from last year. The board reviewed demographics of attendees; notably 33% identified as non-white this year. The board discussed other areas we should track (e.g., primary profession, awardee return, how many stay in the hotel, student university, how many join SPAGS).

The board discussed increasing student programming, as we need students for the future of the organization. We currently have 188 graduate student members. It was also noted that we should ensure this programming actually retains students.

Finally, the board discussed the proposal for a convention chair process. In the future, we will have two chairs (each serving for two years), with a past chair and an incoming chair. Adam Natoli and Jennifer Laney would like to continue for next year (with Jennifer being past chair and Adam being incoming chair). Adam will serve again as past chair the following year. Nathan recommended Joye Anestis as a good choice for the next incoming chair (she has been on the conference planning committee for 3 years and is AE at JPA).

Leadership Development Committee Update

A call was put out for people to join the committee. There are two elections for this year (rep at large). If someone is on the committee they cannot run, so we have to be thoughtful about how we recruit for this committee. APA creates a matrix of what they want, and then tries to fill a committee from there. This could help to be clear on what needs we are filling (e.g., professional status, professional area, etc.) to make sure you have diverse experiences and input.

The board discussed the idea of an uncontested slate. The association industry seems to be moving towards an uncontested process. We currently do an open call for nominations. Interested individuals submit materials and are interviewed (previously by the presidential trio, but potentially the whole committee in the future). Then a slate is drawn up, with 2-3 people per position and the membership votes. Secretary was uncontested a couple years ago and we did not hear negative feedback from that. We get around 20-25% of the membership voting.

The board discussed benefits of an uncontested slate. We currently have what amounts to a popularity contest, where the individual with the best credentials may not win against a better known candidate. In addition, an uncontested slate provides more ability to build a board with the right balance of skillset. Finally, this process would provide better opportunity for candidates from diverse backgrounds.

However, concerns were also raised. Even with good intentions, this could be viewed as building a board that we want, granting the board and leadership development committee a large amount

of power (though membership would have the power to vote down the slate). In addition, this assumes we have a deep bench of leaders we can build an optimal board from. Finally, there was concern that a faction of SPA could take over the board, even if our current intentions are good.

The board was not ready to move towards this model, but discussed areas of concern in our process and improvements we should consider. For instance, the board discussed ways to improve visibility for those who want to be leaders. We discussed rank-choice voting and a hybrid slate of contested and uncontested candidates (e.g., contested officers but at large positions uncontested). Finally, the board discussed the process for this year, discussing an improved process for getting to know our candidates better (e.g., videos, campaigning, etc.).

Finally, the board discussed an alternate presidential track that would last four years instead of six. Someone would be president elect for one year, president for two years, and past president for one year—ensuring that each year there are two people in presidential positions (with a past president in the first year of presidency and a president elect in the second). The board was generally supportive.

DEISJ Committee

The board discussed the results of the DEISJ grant process and potential conflict of interest in ratings. The most highly rated grant was someone on the committee, but the ratings are higher if you take out those with a potential conflict. The committee opted to fund two grants fully, one partially, and one will not be funded.

The board discussed the issue of statements on current events. For instance, there had been some discussion about a statement on the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. However, these statements take away from other work on the committee and it is currently unclear when a statement from SPA should be written. The board had reservations about whether it was our role to make comment about issues like this and some felt it best to focus efforts on societal issues that had more direct impact on personality assessment. Public statements should likely be reserved for issues where SPA's stance is going to be impactful, whereas other issues can be addressed in other ways (e.g., a tea time, etc.).

SPAGS Update

SPAGS has made it a goal to increase student representation in leadership, which has improved quite a lot over time. Getting students involved in leadership will hopefully help with retention. In addition, it was noted that there could be better communication between committees and the SPAGS board (e.g., a past president was unresponsive on the LDC, but the SPAGS board was not notified and could not fill the void).

We have specifically referenced student members in calls for committees, though some committees do not have a student. The board discussed whether this was an issue of the board being interested in having students, a lack of student interest, or a problem in the line of communication. Sarah recommended that we reach out to SPAGS when we have had limited interest from students in committees.

Scholarships were discussed. The SPAGS board would like more information on how scholarships are chosen so that this can be communicated to student members. There was also interest in data on whether everyone who received a scholarship attended the conference and whether scholarships lead to improved retention.

Student events were discussed—we should be intentional about networking with student members and consider having SPAGS events that are not concurrent to better encourage participation.

Finally, there are travel issues related to visas and the fees for visas for international students. SPAGS will be putting forth a proposal for funding related to visas.

APRN Proposal

The board reviewed the updated APRN proposal. The proposal now focuses on establishing APRN, rather than funding research, and now has specific deliverables. Staff will be supporting Adam Natoli in creating this. The budget has graduate student funding included as well, but we will not fund that without further conversation and approval from the executive committee. Without a graduate student the budget implication is \$1500 currently.

It is now only Adam on the proposal and not others who were on the original research grant proposal. Adam agreed to make the network open, and other names were removed from the previous grant to ensure that it would be an open call.

Master's Level Taskforce

The taskforce for developing a plan to include MA level practitioners has largely ended. The membership vote is ongoing. Sarah noted she would send an email out to SPAGS providing context for this proposed change.

APA Liaison Report

Masters level competencies (and doctoral level) are going out for public comment in a couple weeks. It would be great to have SPA comment on both of those documents. Assessment is featured prominently. A relevant interest group normally drafts the comment and then it goes from there. The EC could start this process. We will let the membership know about the call for public comment, but we will keep our official comment coming from the board.

APA is trying to get in front of students entering college. We could think about a pipeline for undergraduate students to spark interest in assessment earlier, perhaps age down some of our marketing efforts. Perhaps some of the video initiative could be repurposed for teachers in secondary schools or for organizations focused on helping students build their careers. The goal would be to provide a better view of the options for career paths in psychology.

The market is going to explode as more MA level practitioners can practice independently. We need to demonstrate that there is value to being a member of SPA and determine if/how we want to recruit these members.

The board discussed creating an online assessment program to train a new workforce of assessment professionals. This would be a big risk financially, but it is very mission consistent. This could be sold for use in courses or at an individual level. The board was enthusiastic about this idea and discussed next steps: we will make this a focus of strategic discussion in June. We could approve a budget that includes this initiative in December and announce to the membership in March. We may need to provide a stipend for a couple people to lead this for it to go well, which should be part of the proposed budget.

Journal Update

Martin discussed JPA. Submissions are doing well—we are up to older levels of submissions and receive submissions from all over the world. Martin aimed to globalize the journal and has been successful in this. The impact factor is currently 3.4, slightly lower than recent years, but higher than previous years. Martin noted a previous error in the report (saying there was a 7% acceptance rate—it is actually 18%). Regarding staff, Martin noted that there is no longer a Rorschach specific expert on the journal. However, he recruited a more broadly dynamic person who could handle these papers who is not a Rorschach expert specifically (limiting conflict of interest). Notably, we have a lot of reviewers on the board who can handle these papers from a reviewer perspective.

Budget

The board briefly reviewed the budget.

Motion: To accept the revised budget for 2024. Vote: 11-0-0.

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

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



June 2024 Board of Directors Meeting

June 17 - 18, Zoom

Present: Jan Kamphuis (President), Nicole Cain (President Elect), Tayla Lee (Treasurer), Jaime Anderson (Secretary), Len Simms (Member-at-Large), Stephen Finn (Member-at-Large), Kate Thomas (Member-at-Large), Katie Lewis (Member-at-Large), Matt Yalch (Member-at-Large), Abby Mulay (Member-at-Large), Ksera Dyette (DEISJ Chair), Jordan Wright (APA Liaison), Nathan Victoria (Executive Director)

Partial Attendance: Jill Clemence (Past President), Sarah Gottlieb (SPAGS President), Martin Sellbom (JPA Editor)

Absent: None

I. Call to Order and Quorum

Jan called the meeting to order and reviewed the agenda.

II. SPA Financial Conversation

The Finance committee has been working on updating policies and procedures, which is part of the consent agenda.

Condo Sale Update

Nathan reviewed the recent offer on the condo, which is a proposed seller-financed transaction. This type of loan is not so uncommon in real estate. Nathan and Tayla have been discussing the process with a real estate attorney and others with expertise in commercial real estate to better understand potential exposure for SPA.

The exposure to SPA is if the buyer goes into default, because we would have to go through foreclosure on the property. However, if they complete the entire loan transaction, we would earn around \$23,000 in interest from the 2-year loan. We would negotiate the contract to include protections for SPA, such what occurs if they default on the loan or fail to obtain additional financing in the 2-year term. In addition, we would request a comprehensive financial picture of the buyer.

Motion: To approve the sale of the condo at \$225,000 with a loan at 7% and a 25% down payment over a 2 year period. Motion passed 11-0-0.

Motion: To allow Jan and Tayla to move forward with condo sale negotiations. Motion passed 11-0-0.

Financial KPIs

2024 Convention

Nathan reviewed proposed vs. actual revenue for the convention. We were under our projection for registration. We had fewer longer-standing members in attendance and it is unclear if this is a trend. Nathan will work with Katie to survey senior members. In addition, virtual attendance was down and the board should consider the benefits vs. costs of offering a virtual option.

We set fairly aggressive goals and engaged in a lot more marketing efforts this year, though we ultimately had a similar number of registrants to previous years. It is unclear why this was the case and whether the convention is a place for potential future growth. We should consider the role of location, asking members why they did not come to San Diego, and consider better targeting marketing for our content.

The zoo event was well-attended but ended up over budget (by approximately \$1,800).

Membership

Membership numbers are down (by 19), but the trend has been fairly flat over the last few years. We are no longer experiencing a membership decrease. The board discussed retention of students from SPAGS, the drop in early career, and retention of students who go into full-time practice. The board also discussed the role of factors outside of our control, such as an overall decrease in

conference attendance and society membership post-COVID. However, we should continue to try to better understand membership trends so we can best target where funds should go.

Expert Insights

Katie and Steve discussed the ongoing planning for the Expert Insights virtual conference in fall. This year will determine the future of the event. The CE committee did a membership survey and plans to make the content more clinically relevant. The pricing structure has also changed, including an increase in registration and inclusion of an a la carte option for registration (rather than daily). They have filled most of the spots for speakers, but are still looking for speakers for topics related to forensic psychology and ethics.

MMPI Symposium

The symposium had a projected loss of around 8k. We anticipated growth because there has not been an introductory workshop offered in person since the pandemic. However, we did not have the expected number of registrants. There was some feedback that location and timing (i.e., Father's Day weekend) may have played a role.

Over half of the attendees were non-members of SPA and we received 15 new members from the event. Attendees were also a more diverse pool than our traditional membership at SPA.

Staff is asking that we consider one additional year. Staff would work with the CE and finance committee to approach this differently next year and see if we can make money. For instance, we would need to be much more conservative in our hotel contract. The board discussed the risk of loss and whether the Minnesota Press should cover some of that risk. The contract with them stated that they would pay for workshop presenter travel, and SPA took on all risk but was also going to receive all profit. Nathan will speak with Katie Nickerson about re-negotiating next year to share the loss risk.

Nathan will move forward with planning but will not sign another contract to continue the event without additional board discussion.

III. Taskforce/Committee Updates

2025 Annual Convention

Adam and Jennie will continue to chair this year and are still trying to finalize a chair elect. Katie will be serving as the CE representative on the committee.

The call for program will open in a couple of weeks. They are moving up the deadline but have also proposed to make the poster deadline a month later than paper/symposia/round table proposals. Registration will not increase.

Awards

The board discussed recognition of awards. We should better ensure award winners stay on track with time and consider other ways to shorten the awards ceremony. The board also discussed the Hertz Memorial Lecture. We have not done this every year recently, but we need to consider how we will handle losses moving forward—we do not want to leave people out, but we also may not have time in our schedule to give each loss a non-competing hour in the convention schedule. The board discussed options (e.g., having a montage in the awards ceremony and memorial panels, memorial lectures during regular convention slots, etc.). The awards committee and full board should continue to discuss the optimal way to acknowledge and honor individuals we have lost.

Off-Site Event

Staff and the convention committee are considering options for the off-site event that would be more budget neutral. This will be a cocktail hour rather than a full dinner. We should attempt to choose a venue that is appealing (since the zoo itself was a major hook). In addition, the board discussed having the option for members to pay for students and surveying attendees about how the event impacted their experience at SPA.

HiTOP Partnership

We met the financial benchmarks that we had proposed last year (with approximately \$3,000 in profit). There was some feedback that integration of the two events could be improved, which would be considered this year. Staff propose another year of the partnership.

Motion: To approve another year of partnership with HiTOP, with details to be worked out. Motion passed 10-0-0 (1 recusal).

Featured Speakers

The board discussed featured speakers for 2025. Although overall reviews were positive, there was some feedback that last year's speakers were not research-oriented enough or not overtly relevant to personality assessment. The board discussed being more purposeful in having one lecture be more clinically oriented and one more research oriented.

Scholarship Criteria Discussion

Matt reviewed the process for making funding decisions. Applications for scholarships have steadily grown over the years, meaning fewer people get funding.

The Student Matters Committee discussed several issues, such as the definition for early career, the goal of scholarships, and the definition of diversity. They proposed early career should be defined as 5 years, consistent with the membership category. They proposed the goal of

scholarships to be retention, engagement, and recruitment (in that order in terms of priority). Finally, they proposed considering various factors in the diversity scholarship, including minority status (e.g., race, ethnicity, gender identity, sexual orientation), disadvantage (e.g., first generation students), and underrepresentation (e.g., international).

ABAP Acquisition

There is an opportunity for SPA to take over running the American Board of Assessment Psychology (ABAP). The owner is not asking for any money for it. He wants to hand it over. It could be a money maker for SPA. ABAP would need to be acquired as a C6 under our C3 organization, with SPA maintaining authority. Nathan is looking for approval to continue these discussions with the owner, since this will require staff time and lawyer fees.

ABAP is currently for-profit. Notably, it includes credentialing beyond personality assessment. There was some board discussion about ensuring some authority for the ABAP board in their decision making despite SPA having authority over the business end.

The board discussed the mission centrality of this opportunity. Even if the net was neutral, it may still be worthwhile to pursue given that this promotes good practice in assessment. There is limited cost associated with the acquisition (increased insurance, staff time, lawyer fees), but Nathan estimates we would break even by year two. Some board members expressed hesitation that the projections in the proposal might be a bit lofty. However, there is limited financial risk to exploring or even ultimately taking this on.

We would have to make decisions later about what this meant for MA level practitioners, or whether we would automatically grandfather in everyone who current hold ABAP status.

Motion: To create a taskforce to examine moving forward with the ABAP acquisition process. Motion passed 11-0-0.

Diversity and Social Justice Update

Tea Time was launched, with additional content upcoming. The committee submitted a proposal for the special issue to JPA.

Ksera discussed a proposal to assist in funding a podcast by Linda McGhee. She is asking for financial support (\$5,500) from SPA to cover various expenses. The board discussed various questions, such as CE credit, potential revenue generation, and other outside support she has secured (e.g., from Pearson). Some of the funding could be reallocation from the DEISJ budget, but this would not cover the full proposal. The board would like to see a full proposal with details about the relationship with SPA, potential revenue generation, the breakdown of cost and support, and how much additional financial support has already been secured (and from where).

Similar to APRN, the proposal will go to the EC for initial review, followed by the full board for final approval.

Creating a Learning Taxonomy for Training

Nathan suggested we use the APA training guidelines in assessment as a guide for how to structure our training. The board will discuss more details in the October board meeting.

IV. Staffing the Society

Nathan Victoria recused himself from this portion of the meeting.

The board discussed various models moving forward to staff SPA. Jan and Nicole reviewed the progress that has been made on the taskforce. The taskforce consists of the EC, Len, Jordan, and Kate. They met three times and discussed three orienting questions:

- 1) Do we want to have an executive director?
- 2) Do we want to have Nathan in this role?
- 3) What should the rest of the staffing structure look like for SPA?

The taskforce has been largely in favor of maintaining a staffing model that includes an ED. The board discussed retention of Nathan and potential next steps of the process. The ED would handle negotiations, which would include more specific stipulations related to KPIs, reducing overall staffing cost, deciding contract timeline, and ironing out policies and procedures. A final contract (should it be successfully negotiated) would go to the full board for approval.

Motion: To offer a new contract to Nathan, with specifics to be worked out by the executive committee and others on the board who have raised specific concerns. Contract will be returned to full board for approval. Motion passed 9-2-0.

V. Consent Agenda

The board briefly reviewed and discussed the consent agenda.

Motion: To award Len Simms fellow status. Motion passed 10-0-0.

Motion: To approve the consent agenda. Motion passed 11-0-0.

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

Respectfully submitted,

Jaime L. Anderson, Ph.D.

Secretary



October 2024 Board of Trustees Meeting

Sheraton Centre Toronto Hotel | Toronto, ON

October 3-5, 2024

Present: Jan Kamphuis (President), Jill Clemence (Past President), Nicole Cain (President Elect), Tayla Lee (Treasurer), Jaime Anderson (Secretary), Abby Mulay (Member-at-Large), Matt Yalch (Member-at-Large), Katie Lewis (Member-at-Large), Len Simms (Member-at-Large), Steve Finn (Member-at-Large), Sarah Gottlieb (SPAGS President), Martin Sellbom (JPA Editor), Jordan Wright (APA Liaison)

Partial Zoom Attendance: Kate Thomas (Member-at-Large), Ksera Dyette (DEISJ Committee Chair)

Absent: None

1. Call to Order and Quorum, Agenda Review, & Board Cultural Commitments

Jan called the meeting to order. Jan reviewed the agenda and the culture commitments.

2. Creating a Learning Taxonomy for Training (Master's Discussion)

Jordan led a discussion related to Master's level training.

Master's Scope of Practice

SPA did not submit a comment on the Association of State and Provincial Psychology Board (ASPPB) Master's scope of practice document and several board members expressed disappointment about this. ASPPB's final document will likely determine licensure laws across various states.

The taskforce suggested the following for MA scope of practice:

- Anything educational (e.g., testing in schools)
- Anything vocational (e.g., career planning, aptitude)

- Anything related to treatment recommendations

APA has recommended that this licensure be named Licensed Practitioner of Psychology (LPoP) and has suggested training on tracks (assessment vs. treatment).

The board discussed various implications and Jordan presented some alternative perspectives. There was particular concern related to the area of “treatment recommendations” since this is quite broad. Identification was presented as an alternative—where doctoral level psychologists do a deep dive and MA level psychologists can identify problem areas. Although some argued this may discourage consideration of differentials, others argued this provides a path for individuals to obtain services. The issue of enforcement was also discussed—how are these differentiations in practice actually enforced? Other issues included access to medication (which would require formal diagnosis) and an increased emphasis on diagnosis. There is a balancing act between thorough evaluation and access.

The international perspective was also discussed. A master’s degree is the highest degree for practice in many places. There are individual differences within degrees as well, and research is clear that MA practitioners are just as good at therapy as doctoral level clinicians. We should be careful not to assume hierarchy in ability based on degree.

Jordan will be meeting with the taskforce and will provide feedback to them.

Master’s and Doctoral Level Competencies

APA has drafted a new competencies document that differentiates areas/levels of competency for master’s and doctoral level graduates.

There were separate taskforces created for master’s and doctoral level competencies, but the doctoral level taskforce was ultimately disbanded. Their draft was approved by the Board of Educational Affairs but rejected by the Board of Professional Affairs. The document for review is different and coming primarily from BPA.

The board discussed this document and highlighted areas of concern. This included some of the distinctions made between master’s and doctoral education (e.g., doctoral practice is rooted in culture, master’s practice does not state this), the vagueness of many competencies, and operationalization of some areas of training.

Matt is chairing our taskforce to provide feedback. The taskforce will draft a response.

Master's Level Training

The board broke into small groups to discuss a system for master's assessment training. The board broke into five groups focused on various areas of assessment training:

- Foundational knowledge
- Relationships and communication of results
- Interviewing techniques
- Selecting, administering, and interpreting tests
- Data integration, conceptualization, etc.

Following small group discussion, the board met as a group to discuss ideas for training.

3. Taskforce/Committee Updates

ABAP Transition Taskforce

Nathan reviewed the process for obtaining ABAP thus far. It would be marketed and operated independently as ABAP (e.g., with a separate board). The board would include current ABAP diplomates across assessment fields (e.g., school, neuropsych). We would be buying it for \$25 and would run it as a non-profit.

The board discussed the transfer process and potential ownership. Because it is a certificate program, ABAP would have to be transferred to our C6 organization and would be controlled and owned by our C3. There is an option to operate ABAP but not formally own it by allowing ABAP to function as an independent C6 with an affiliation agreement. This could assist with outside perception that SPA took over the entire operation. However, there are risks if we do not own it. We will use SPA resources to manage ABAP and do not want to risk not having control. If they chose to, ABAP could violate the contract and we would have little recourse but to pursue legal action or to cut our losses. Our lawyer believes it is in our best interest to own ABAP. That being said, there would be an MOU providing ABAP an out in the future if they wanted it. The board decided they would like SPA to have formal ownership.

Motion: That SPA approves the purchase of ABAP assets. Motion passed 12-0-0.

Motion: To authorize Jan and Tayla to work with Nathan to work out the details of the MOU to present in December for board vote. Motion passed 12-0-0.

Motion: To empower Jordan as chair of the taskforce to explore and come back to the board with a slate of ABAP board members in December. Motion passed 12-0-0.

2024 SPA Awards Discussion

Len discussed the proposed policies and procedures for the awards committee. It describes the awards and the process for nomination and committee selection. The board then votes and accepts or rejects the recommendations. The board cannot decide on a different winner—they can just reject the slate and send it back. Award nominees cannot be deceased at the time of nomination.

The board discussed whether in person acceptance of the award was required and decided we would want to state that acceptance of the Klopfer Award included a lecture (in-person ideally, but with option to do a recorded or zoom lecture). The board also discussed whether Klopfer could be won by a board member. Since we have now empowered an external group to make these decisions, there is not rule prohibiting current board members from winning.

The board discussed the awards ceremony, which has now grown quite lengthy. The board decided we should remove the acceptance speeches to shorten the ceremony. With the Klopfer award address, the ceremony should be limited to 1.5 hours in total.

As nominees for awards, Matt and Jordan were asked to leave the room while the board discussed most award rankings.

Motion: To approve the recommendations with the exception of the mid-career award. Motion passed 11-0-0.

Len then left for the mid-career award discussion, as he was nominated for this award.

Motion: To award the mid-career award to Len Simms. Motion passed 11-0-0.

Diversity/Social Justice Committee Update

Ksera provided updates on the DEISJ committee. A special issue proposal for JPA is being finalized. Ksera completed two Tea Time videos that she will be sending to Nathan soon.

The board discussed the proposal to assist in funding the Multicultural Psychologist podcast. The board requested additional information and Ksera worked with Linda McGhee to create a proposal for the partnership, which the board reviewed. The board discussed interest in supporting this proposal as well as financial implications.

The proposal is for seed money (\$5,500). Linda has already found a production company and has some other sources of funding. Most of the funding requested would be a reallocation of funds we had set aside for other projects (e.g., the MAC foundation). The current draft contract states that SPA would own the podcast, but Linda would have indefinite licensing rights to the content. The board discussed whether we could specify that a certain percentage of the content should be assessment-oriented and discussed having some control of the type of advertisements allowed.

Motion: To formalize a partnership between SPA and SPA member Linda McGhee as the Multicultural psychologist. Motion passed 12-0-0

Motion: Transfer of funds as noted in the proposal, pending negotiation between Linda McGhee, Jan, Nathan, and Tayla. Motion passed 12-0-0

Journal of Personality Assessment Report

Martin reviewed the JPA report. The journal is doing ok with submissions and we have had continued success in globalizing submissions. The impact factor is down, but this is related to the spike from online articles that has now leveled out. JPA is either similar or better on other metrics of journal success. The journal has been stable in turns of personnel.

The journal backlog is currently less than two issues. Special issues can be helpful with this. We have one ongoing (assessment of trauma) and another in the works (diversity). Martin brought an issue to the board for their consideration. He has historically not submitted papers to JPA to reduce perception of conflict of interest. However, this is conservative in comparison to most journal editors. Martin asked the board about their thoughts regarding him submitting papers to JPA and noted that he would appoint special editors to handle his papers (rather than current AEs). The board supported Martin doing this.

Sarah suggested we could consider creating pathways for students to learn more about reviewing papers. SPAGS will work with Martin directly.

Defining Personality Assessment Taskforce

Jill reviewed the taskforce charge. There were some points of contention, including how to define personality. The taskforce took a fairly broad approach to this and attempted to include both research and clinical practice in the definition.

The board discussed the proposed definition and made additional suggestions. Jill will make changes to the definition, followed by committee review, and eventually member comment.

Scholarship Discussions

Sarah discussed concern with scholarships covering the convention hotel room without flexible application of the funding. Currently, the scholarships cover a night in the hotel to further negotiate costs down for convention (as this contributes to our room block). We will look into what flexible funding would ultimately cost.

Flexibility is not likely an option for Toronto because of our current contracts. It is more feasible in Denver, but the call for scholarships is already open. The board discussed having an option for students to ask for alternate funding. Nathan and Matt will work out how to communicate this.

Matt discussed a more formalized scholarship review process.

4. SPA Financial Conversation

Revisit 2024 Goals

SPA set a goal to consider our financial goals every year. Our current financial model is not sustainable past 2028. At the end of 2023, we decided to do more strategic/long-term financial planning. We have a goal to sustain our operations without using our reserves, while maintaining a staffing model that allows us to continue meeting strategic goals. We would like to have a balanced budget by 2028 (working towards a net neutral convention). Increasing conference/membership rates or cutting costs will not get us where we need to be—revenue generation is necessary to meet our financial goals.

Membership

Nathan and Kate have had strategic conversations about membership and the committee. We have started asking whether people would recommend SPA on our website. Of the 232 individuals that have answered, 66% (152) individuals are promoters (an answer of 9/10), 23% (54) are passives (an answer of 7/8), and 11% (26) are detractors (6 or below).

We will have more membership benefits this year (e.g., grand rounds, online learning platforms, etc.).

We have a scheduled increase in membership cost this year. The board will always have final say via budget approval in these cost increases, but staff will default to increasing membership or convention every other year. Staff have received no comments about increasing fees and there has been no difference so far in membership renewal. Staff are working to get better retention data on the student to early career pipeline. Some of our drop in membership is due to our life

members. There was also a suggestion to give members an option for a multi-year membership at a discount or to have an auto-review option for membership.

The board reviewed membership engagement data. Younger members are more engaged. With our new system, we will be able to better track member engagement. It would be helpful to know how we compare to other similar sized societies. Jordan volunteered to try to obtain information about Div. 12.

Expert Insights

We are currently estimated to make around \$7,100 for Expert Insights, but Nathan is hoping we will reach up to \$25,000. We should advertise expert insights at the convention if this year is successful and we opt to continue the event. It will also be important to track how popular these webinars are on the learning platform. Finally, there was a suggestion to send out physical flyers in the mail to advertise the event.

Convention

The goal for convention is not currently to break even, but we want to remain under a loss of \$30,000. Nathan is exploring Tier 2 cities for the convention, as well as holding the convention on a college campus. In making these decisions, we will need to consider financial benefit vs. membership engagement.

SPA needs to obtain outside data for workshop presentations. Although Nathan believed we were on the high end for workshop payment, some board members disagreed.

Nathan discussed the cost of Wifi. It is close to \$19,000 (~ \$42 per attendee) to cover Wifi during the convention. Many board members felt we do not need this.

We will continue a HiTOP partnership for 2025, but there is unlikely to be a partnership for 2026. All of the revenue will go to SPA again this year. However, there was a request from HiTOP to look at non-member registration and they have requested some portion of that revenue differential (i.e., people who are non-SPA members and are only registering for HiTOP). Nathan and Tayla will work with the finance committee to make a decision and work it out with HiTOP.

Condo

SPA is receiving revenue from sale of the condo now.

MMPI Symposium

Nathan discussed financial KPIs for the symposium. The ultimate net was \$-8,295. We are working on a plan for next year with better financial protections.

5. Staffing Models

The board continued conversations related to potential staffing models. Jan discussed staffing model options and the history of this decision process. In June we opted to offer a contract renewal to Nathan.

Jan presented several options:

- Full Staffing - All staff with no changes. Only contractual raises included. This is the baseline budget that the Finance Committee has provided feedback to Nathan.
- Contractors - Completely remove Operations Director line, fulfill minimal roles with external support for HR and accounting.
- Entry-Level Role - Completely remove Operations Director line, replace with entry-level staff/interns. The budget would be \$42,500 plus benefits.
- Part-Time Role - Shift Operations Director line to a 10 hour a week part-time, administrative support role at \$25/hour. There is a separate line item to have this individual contract at the Convention.
- AMC - Explore working with NextGen Association Management, bringing over two staff and contracting with Monica for the convention.

This is the net (revenue-expenses) breakdown for each option:

- Full Staffing: (\$-216,452.64)
- Contractors: (\$-151,256.08)
- Entry-Level Role: (\$-189,130.33)
- Part-Time Role: (\$-141,692.33)
- AMC: (\$-112,367.15)

Nathan answered questions from the board about what these would look like. He was then excused from the meeting for the remainder of the discussion.

The board determined we would like to prioritize continuity, meaning consideration of models that include Nathan. We will want to consider our long-term goals for growth. We had goals when we hired an ED—to modernize the society, streamline operations, add new member benefits, and increase membership. We have not seen an increase in membership. This decision is about considering the risks and benefits to the society (in addition to financial implications).

The board discussed Monica's position. Nathan should not absorb Monica's duties because this is not a good use of executive time. Some of her responsibilities would be outsourced (through an AMC if we went that route, or other contractors).

The board discussed the need to protect ourselves by having better policies and procedures in place for Nathan's role. Regardless of the model we choose, we should ask Nathan to document his role to reduce our future risk if he leaves or we move to a staffing model eventually that does not include him.

The AMC option was discussed. An AMC model would allow us to capitalize on areas where Nathan may not be as strong. Concerns were raised about whether we would be able to maintain our current systems if we moved to an AMC or whether we would be required to move over to their preferred systems (e.g., membership software, website, etc.). We want to have this information before moving to an AMC model.

Tayla and Nicole met with T.J. from NextGen Association Management. They are a smaller and new company, which could be nice for SPA. We may get closer attention and there are areas of growth we may be better able to tap into with an AMC. However, the board also discussed what we potentially lose by moving to this model—despite financial gain. Members have sometimes responded negatively to feeling the society is becoming more “business like.”

The board discussed the prospect of considering other AMCs, but this may not allow for continuity since we do not know whether other AMCs would hire our ED. Some expressed concern about this being potentially the only AMC option.

The board also discussed the need to consider what happens if Nathan does not stay on, because that outcome is uncertain. We decided to prioritize keeping him, but we do not know whether he will ultimately sign a new contract, so we need to choose a model that is going to be best for SPA and consider where we want to be as a society long term.

The finance committee recommended the contractor model or AMC model. The contractor model is what was intended by the board when they decided to hire an ED. The AMC model allows us access to resources to continue growing, but there are potential risks there as well. The board also discussed the part-time model, which would mean having someone to handle daily operations. The board again discussed the need for policies and procedures for our internal operations to reduce risks of lost knowledge moving forward.

A model is needed to budget for 2025 (our current model or one of these options). The contractor model was discussed as the next transition, with the option to continue examining an AMC model for the future. There are unanswered questions and risks associated with moving to an AMC that we will want to consider further before officially moving to that model. However, a contractor model allows us to move in a better financial direction (with the option to adjust the budget accordingly should we opt for an AMC later since the AMC cost is lower).

Motion: to ask the executive committee and executive director to make the changes to implement the contractor model for 2025. Motion passed 10-1-0.

Motion: to empower the executive committee to continue to gather data and information to inform a potential AMC model in the future. Motion passed 10-1-0

The EC was already empowered in a previous meeting to work out a contract with Nathan. The board discussed needing basic procedures written down by the end of his current contract term (June 2025).

The board discussed the vote process, and some noted it felt rushed or as if there was a lack of clarity in the direction we ultimately wanted to go. Many support an AMC model, but did not feel ready to confirm that for the 2025 budget. We can still move in this direction and will continue collecting information needed to make a decision (e.g., whether we need new systems, how many FTEs we would be contracting, whether NextGen is the only realistic option, etc.).

6. Board Self-Evaluation Discussion

Jan reviewed a potential new process for board self-evaluation. Jan would like to focus mostly on culture and strategy. The board supported this process and decided on a frequency (yearly) and rating scale (6-point scale). Some supported an anonymous response option, whereas others felt we should have to include our names. This process would be ideally discussed in person, but we will do this online in December for a trial run. The feedback survey will be sent out in November.

7. 2024 Strategic Framework Report/2025 Strategy Discussion

Overview of Tactics from 2024

Nathan reviewed tactics for 2024 and how progress has been going. Some members who are not on the EC noted that they feel out of touch at times. We could make EC meeting minutes available to the full board through the leadership folder. In addition, the board discussed the importance of connecting our strategies to our financial goals.

Imagining a 2025 Framework

The board reviewed 2024 strategies and decided to focus on the following strategies for 2025:

- Develop a membership recruitment/retention plan.
- Build a diverse profession by increasing students & professionals interested in personality assessment.

- Define the utility & impact of personality assessment and communicate its value.
- Become a comprehensive resource for personality assessment.

The board will have about a month to come up with tactics to address these strategies. SPAGS would like to take tactics that involve students to the SPAGS board for their reaction.

CE Conversation

The board discussed whether convention content should automatically be added to the online learning community. The board discussed issues related to financial incentives to let SPA use your content, issues of intellectual property, as well as test-security, sensitive client information, etc. Ultimately, the board decided we should ask members to opt-in to adding their recorded presentation online. We could discuss an incentive model in the future.

Annual Convention

The 2025 Wednesday event will be at the Meow-Wolf museum in Denver.

Visa proposal from SPAGS: some students, particularly those from Muslim countries, will have extra costs to attend the convention in Toronto. The cost will vary from country to country—some need a visa (\$100) and biometric data (\$85). SPAGS submitted a proposal to give up to \$250 to 8 students (for a total proposal of \$2000). The board was supportive. Since this would be worked into the 2025 budget, no current vote is needed.

8. Consent Agenda

- a. June Board Meeting Minutes Approval
- b. Continuing Education Committee

The committee recently launched the grand rounds program, which has been successful with good feedback thus far.

- c. Interest Groups Report
- d. Leadership Development Committee

Jill announced the winners of the election— Matt Yalch and Jordan Wright will begin new terms for January 2025. Jill reviewed the elections process and the campaign policy draft. In addition, the board discussed the involved process of running for a board position (e.g., statements,

interviews, etc.). Jill will take board feedback and return with an updated draft for the December board meeting.

e. Finance Committee Report

f. APRN Update

g. SPAGS Update

SPAGS is starting to follow the same strategic board process. There was acknowledgment of SPAGS becoming a bigger time commitment and concern about getting continued student involvement.

h. Other Updates

Len provided the board with the final awards policy document. The board decided the definition should continue to be reviewed, and the board briefly discussed the prospect of a leadership academy for SPA.

Motion: To accept the consent agenda. Motion passed 11-0-0.

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

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



December 2024 Board of Trustees Meeting

Monday, December 16, 1pm-3pm (eastern), Tuesday, December 17, 1pm-3pm (eastern)

Present: Nicole Cain (President-Elect), Jill Clemence (Past President), Tayla Lee (Treasurer), Jaime Anderson (Secretary), Abby Mulay (Representative at Large), Kate Thomas (Representative at Large), Steve Finn (Representative at Large), Matt Yalch (Representative at Large), Len Simms (Representative at Large), Sarah Gottlieb (SPAGS President), Ksera Dyette (DEISJ Committee Chair), Jordan Wright (APA Liaison), Martin Sellbom (JPA Editor)

Absent:

Partial Attendance: Jan Kamphuis (President), Katie Lewis (Representative at Large), Jack Burke (SPAGS President-Elect)

1. Call to Order and Quorum

The meeting was called to order and board members introduced themselves to the incoming SPAGS president. Nicole reviewed the board culture commitments.

2. Taskforce/Committee Updates

Defining Personality Assessment Taskforce Update

Jill reviewed the work on defining personality assessment. We did an open call to members for feedback on our definition of personality assessment. There were many member comments. Minimal changes were made to the definition.

We will respond to the membership. Many of the comments were too specific to incorporate into the definition, and some members stated that the definition was too broad. This definition is very broad on purpose, but this may make the definition lack utility (particularly with consumers). The taskforce sees this as a starting point for a broad definition that particular sub-fields can take and make specific for their purposes.

APA provides publishes feedback in a transparent manner, along with what was addressed or not addressed with each comment (and why).

The board discussed additional feedback and potential changes to the definition. The board discussed having a virtual townhall or panel at the conference. We could provide time for an open discussion among members.

In terms of next steps, the taskforce will work on responding to feedback. Then we will discuss ways that this could be used, including whether we need subcommittees to write definitions for specific areas.

ABAP Transition Conversation

We have signed contracts and now own ABAP as of January 1. Jordan is helping the old ABAP finish out their applications.

Jordan has worked on coming up with a founding board for ABAP. It is a small group that represents different areas of assessment. They will use the first half of this year to develop bylaws. We will need to vote to create their board, but this will be the last vote we have over ABAP functioning. We will need to appoint a liaison for communication between the boards as well.

Motion: To accept the slate of founding board members for ABAP. Motion passed 11-0-0.

3. 2025 Strategic Framework Discussion and Approval

Nathan introduced a new software (Asana) for tracking our initiatives and tactics. He also discussed progress on various areas as well as goals for 2025 in terms of upcoming tactics.

Defining the Utility and Impact of Personality Assessment

The board reviewed an update for the Assessment Practice Research Network (APRN). Adam Natoli is in the final stage of the IRB for the inaugural study. He expects he will have approval by the end of January. SPA budget includes marketing support and administrative tasks. They will do an open call for joining APRN in Feb-April.

The board also discussed additional ideas for tactics, which includes collecting testimonials from members. Having a journalist complete a therapeutic assessment and writing about it was also discussed, but board members noted the need to be careful about ethical implications with this.

The board discussed hiring a graduate student to help with a utility of assessment website. They would help gather research and information and would report to the president. Nathan will work with Jan to define the scope of this role and determine if he still wants to pursue this.

Finally, the board discussed support for members to speak at other conferences. We have sponsored travel for people to present at NAN the last two years. The return on investment is difficult to quantify in terms of exposure or building connections. We could potentially set up an application process for sponsored travel in exchange to putting a plug about SPA into a presentation (potentially with a standardized slide provided by SPA).

Build a diverse profession by increasing students & professionals interested in personality assessment

Staff felt the tactics for this goal were overlapping with the membership recruitment and retention plan, so these tactics were moved to that goal.

Become a comprehensive resource for personality assessment

SPA will be starting an Essentials of Culture webinar series in partnership with Division 12. We are piloting a reduced registration for those who may not have the means to pay full price.

We are in final contract stages for the Multicultural Psychology podcast. There will likely be around 15 podcasts in 2025. There is no budget implication for this because none of the funding is from this fiscal year (and will likely make more money than it costs). We may also have a panel at the convention introducing this.

The board discussed a master's level training program. The CE committee felt this training program was a bit outside of the scope of the current committee. Nathan reviewed a compensation model for it, but encouraged the board to consider other compensation models. Our goal will be to determine what kind of training program we want to create and update the budget in March 2025. We will then identify the right people/groups to lead this initiative. This is not at a point where staff can schedule and manage the tactic—we need volunteers to determine the concept/content.

Finally, the board discussed resource sharing as a membership benefit (e.g., teaching materials repository, discussion forum). Students have been asking for this kind of resource as well.

Develop a membership recruitment/retention plan

The board asked staff to do more recruitment and retention work. Staff explored a text messaging marketing program. They are going to start with students, early career, and young professionals.

The board discussed membership concerns. We received a concern from a member recently and it might be good for us to have a place where people submit concerns. Jan has been working on a response to that specific member. There is a larger conversation needed about the role SPA wants to play in some of these issues (e.g., political issues, insurance, etc.). APA is doing some of this work, and they have more power, but we could try to work with them.

The convention will have two mentorship events—a sip and share where seasoned SPA members spend time with more junior members and the mentorship lunch.

The board also discussed several areas where we could grow membership or improve the membership experience including focus groups for early career/international members, targeted marketing to JPA authors, a newsletter in JPA with the SPA annual report, marketing to internship directors/personality assessment instructors, and holding the convention outside of the United States.

Finally, Nathan noted we would have a master calendar to follow tactics.

4. SPA Financial Conversation

Tayla oriented the board to the financial conversation. Nathan then reported on key performance indicators.

Expert Insights

Fifty-two people registered for the full experience. Nathan reviewed the numbers for all of the various registrants/attendees. We net \$10,516, which is close to the budgeted net of \$11k. This does not include the selling of the content afterwards. Another Expert Insights conference for next year is included in the budget for 2025.

2024 Budget to Actual

We budgeted for a loss of 236k, and our projected loss is 70k. We were under budget for our revenue, but we set aggressive goals (824 vs. 778). Our expenses were also under budget though (1.060M vs. 977k).

The budget reviewed at this point included projections; we will have an actual budget report out at the March convention. But one area to point out is that we are over for staffing. We were

supposed to reduce Monica's salary and did not. There was some confusion related to how the role would be reduced and/or eliminated.

There are some big discrepancies that have to do with where we have budgeted and where things are filed in Quickbooks. Totals are accurate, but this is a translation issue and some of the subcategories are just messy. This will get cleaned up next year through Quickbooks. Nathan was previously doing this by hand. The finance committee has been working to make the information easier to digest and make the reports more useful for us.

The finance committee discussed needing a projected to actual each time the committee meets—this is probably why they missed the discrepancy with Monica's salary too.

2025 Budget Discussion and Approval

The board reviewed the proposed 2025 budget.

The reviewed budget assumes Monica's role through May 31st. This will get us through the convention before moving to a new staffing model.

The 2025 budget proposal is a deficit budget of \$198,501.

The budget items for editorial fees may be incorrect. Nathan is working with Taylor & Francis to confirm the correct amount. Some other numbers may change a bit as we move towards a new staffing model as well, but we will have more information in March.

Motion: To approve the proposed 2025 budget with the contractor only model. Motion passed 11-0-0.

Staffing the Society

Board members met with T.J. from NextGen Association Management last week and had a debrief. It seems most were open and in favor of working with NextGen. It comes down to nuts and bolts in terms of finance, long-term thinking, etc.

There are a couple of scenarios looking at the transition year. We have also been looking into later years to consider long-term implications. We have to consider the finance as well as intangible outcomes (e.g., level of service, good of the society, etc.).

Tayla reviewed budget differences between a contractor only (CO) and AMC model. The projected difference for the AMC is around \$23k (if we were doing either one for the *whole* year in 2025). The finance committee felt as if this was a fairly small amount of money when you

consider the size of the budget. In other words, the amount is small enough that we should not choose solely based on cost savings (and should consider intangibles).

Board members commented that we have been really working to cut costs. So, this amount of savings is not much in terms of budget, but it is also something. We have been working to decrease our deficit and we have been successful in this. However, under either model, we still have to increase revenue 20-25% over the years.

SPA has continuity if we change staff by using this AMC, which is beneficial. It delays things when we have to bring on new staff.

Tayla discussed some projections with the different models. No matter what option we choose, we will go into the negative eventually with our current revenue/expenditure patterns. Once we determine our staffing model, we will revise key performance indicators, etc.

We had a bid from Bill Haire for his company to handle some things for us—which would still require us to have a cheaper ED and his company would handle the operations piece. It would be a different kind of alternative to the contractor model. We have already voted to move in a different direction, but this could be a future option.

It was noted that if we were able to get the hotel rebates from the conference hotel, we would have about \$15k extra per year. We would likely see these benefits with an AMC.

The board then moved on to a bigger discussion about more intangible considerations (beyond financials). Some members suggested we needed a change in structure from both financial and strategic standpoints to prevent being stagnant.

T.J. may have some expertise in things we are struggling with. However, we should not assume that moving to an AMC will revolutionize the society. Management isn't a driving factor of bold moves in the field—if we want to make moves, we will have to make those moves as a strategy board.

Finally, the board discussed an “off ramp” for either option. If we are unsuccessful in increasing revenue, which is the easiest model to scale down? An AMC model may allow to have all the pieces we need to operate, just on a smaller scale if the society needs that in the future.

The board discussed moving forward with contract negotiations with NextGen.

Motion: Nicole, Tayla, and Jan move forward with contract negotiations with the NextGen AMC. Motion passed 11-0-0.

The board will be able to review the contract later and will need a different vote. This vote is just about moving forward with contracting. The budget projection under this model will also need to be updated for March.

5. Board of Directors Evaluation

Jan briefly reviewed the self-evaluation. There are some issues in the ratings and areas we might do better. It has been a useful exercise but needs more preparation than the board had in this meeting. The EC will talk this through in January and we will discuss it more fully with the full board in March.

6. Executive Director Evaluation

Nathan and the incoming board members for 2025 were excused from this portion of the meeting. The board discussed Nathan's evaluation and a potential performance bonus. The evaluations submitted had quite a bit of spread. However, by central tendencies, people were generally positive about Nathan.

The board discussed the threshold for a bonus. Most ratings were in the "meets expectations" range, though some were higher. Therefore, a bonus would need to be modest.

There are not clear guidelines on how to define "outstanding performance" (as stated in the contract) or how to determine a bonus amount. However, several members suggested they were comfortable with a bonus of \$3,000 this year.

Motion: To grant Nathan an annual bonus of \$3000 for 2024. Motion passed 11-0-0.

7. Consent Agenda

- a. Annual Convention Update
- b. October 2024 Minutes Approval
- c. Continuing Education Committee
- d. Interest Groups Report
- e. Leadership Development Committee
- f. Finance Committee Report
 - a. SPA's Current Financial Status (2024 Year Budget to Actual, Report on Investments, Profit and Loss [Totals & Detail, Years Comparison], Statement of Financial Position [Current Year, Across Years]).
- g. APRN Update
- h. SPAGS Update

Motion: To approve the consent agenda as outlined in the board book, with the exception of the giving Tuesday report out, which was not reviewed. Motion passed 11-0-0.

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

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