



December 2025 Board of Trustees Meeting

Present: Jan Kamphuis (President), Jill Clemence (Past President), Nicole Cain (President Elect), Tayla Lee (Treasurer), Jaime Anderson (Secretary), Len Simms (Member-at-Large), Steve Finn (Member-at-Large), Matt Yalch (Member-at-Large), Abby Mulay (Member-at-Large), Jordan Wright (Member-at-Large), Katie Lewis (Member-at-Large), Jack Burke (SPAGS President), Julie Millie (SPAGS President Elect), Jennifer Laney (DEISJ Chair-Elect), Nathan Victoria (Executive Director), T.J. Cote' (CEO, NextGen Management Association)

Partial Attendance: Ksera Dyette (DEISJ Chair), Martin Sellbom (JPA Editor)

Absent: None

1. Call to Order and Quorum

President, Jan Kamphuis, called the meeting to order, reminded the board of our culture commitments, and reviewed the agenda.

1. SPA Financial Conversation

Key Performance Indicators: Expert Insights

Expert Insights had its 3rd year. Numbers were down and we did not make budget. The board discussed some reasons why this may have been the case (e.g., timing, market is saturated). That being said, the experience was very high quality—content flowed, surveys were very positive. The net profit was around \$2500. The CE committee discussed cutting the event for 2026.

Katie and Steve discussed thoughts. The experience was so positive, which makes the committee want to continue working with this, but we may need to be more creative about marketing the event. Katie and Steve discussed a “watch party” option (local host sites where individuals could connect). This would improve engagement and make the event more unique, but it would likely require some funding from SPA for food, etc.

The board discussed whether we are meeting a market need. It is a lot of work for limited profit. The board discussed multiple options for improvement—making the content more thematic, considering better timing, watch parties, etc. The board was interested in another experiment year but should continue to consider whether this event is meeting our goals (reaching members, expanding SPA's reach, etc.). It may be beneficial to gain better insight into why members do not attend.

2026 Budget Discussion and Approval

Tayla presented an overview of the budget. Tayla, Ntahan, and TJ met and found the budget was far easier to cut than expected and there is no need to go through the budget to make additional cuts at this time. It will be substantially more difficult for next year.

Currently, many committees are allotted a certain amount of funding per year. Finance committee has recommended that outside of awards, student affairs, and CE there will not be line items for committees and interest groups. Instead, there will be a committee funding application. Board will review requests and revise budget based on these proposals. The finance committee is prepared in January to revisit the policy in terms of budgeting. It will make very clear where we are spending money strategically.

Nathan reviewed updates to the budget. Food and beverage will look a bit different at the convention (e.g., different coffee service, drink tickets instead of open bar). We are also moving forward with having one poster session instead of two. The board discussed these budget changes in terms of long range planning.

Motion: To approve the 2026 budget as presented. Motion passed 11-0-0.

2. Taskforce/Committee Updates

SPAGS Conference Track Discussion

Jack discussed the proposal for a conference track. Board members provided some feedback (e.g., about the requirements, the learning objectives, etc.). Jack will refine and return with more detail.

Leadership Development Committee

Jill reviewed the board vacancy with Len moving into president. We had a three-way tie for the next person for a member at large position. The board took a straw poll on who we will ask to finish Len's remaining 1-year term.

The board discussed the findings from our poll and discussed candidates.

Motion: To approve Joye Anestis to fill the vacant board position starting in January. Motion passed 11-0-0.

Motion: If Joye Anestis declines, the board will offer the position to Connor Adams. Motion passed 11-0-0.

Motion: If the two other candidates decline, we will offer to Jared Ruchensky. Motion passed 11-0-0.

Jan will contact Joye.

APA Liaison Update

APA is having board meetings next week. The one big thing that is going on is that APA was notified last week that they are being investigated by congress for antisemitism. We should be aware of this. We are not a big target, but because we have invested in DEI, we should be aware of this, particularly when making public statements.

1. 2026 KPIs and Strategic Framework Discussion

Overview of Strategies for 2026 and Corresponding Tactics

Nathan reviewed progress regarding our identified KPIs. The board and staff continue to work on this and the board will vote to approve in March.

Board members provided feedback. Board members provided feedback that they wanted to see KPIs presented differently. We want them to consider effectiveness, operational health of the organization, outcomes. We should also consider what data we need to evaluate how we are doing and strengthen measurement and evaluation in these KPIs. Nathan and TJ will come up with some examples to make sure we can get on the same page.

Nathan is working to implement Asana, our new software. He provided a brief overview of what the system looks like.

Presidential Transition

Jan provided an overview of his time as president.

1. Consent Agenda

- a. Annual Convention Update
- b. September 2025 Minutes Approval
- c. Continuing Education Committee
- d. Leadership Development Committee
- e. Finance Committee Report
- f. SPAGS Update

Motion: To approve the consent agenda as outlined in the boardbook. 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

DRAFT



March 2025 Board of Trustees Meeting
Sheraton Downtown Denver Hotel
March 25 - 26

Present: Jan Kamphuis (President), Nicole Cain (President-Elect), Jill Clemence (Past President), Tayla Lee (Treasurer), Jaime Anderson (Secretary), Abby Mulay (Representative at Large), Jordan Wright (Representative at Large), Steve Finn (Representative at Large), Len Simms (Representative at Large), Jack Burke (SPAGS President), Ksera Dyette (DEISJ Committee Chair), Martin Sellbom (JPA Editor)

Absent: None

Partial Attendance: Matt Yalch (Representative at Large), Nathan Victoria (Executive Director)

1. Call to Order and Quorum

Jan briefly reviewed the agenda.

2. AMC Contract Negotiations

Nathan left the meeting for discussion of AMC contract negotiations.

The board discussed progress on moving to an AMC. Jan briefly reviewed the process thus far and reviewed questions the board had previously (e.g., fees, contract years, key performance indicators [KPIs]). Some of these items are in the process of being added to the contract. The taskforce has met numerous times, involved the financial committee, our attorney, and the executive committee. Members of the taskforce described growing enthusiasm, not only for long-term cost savings but also for the potential to grow SPA.

We have also now asked for references. Tayla and Nicole summarized their conversations with two references. Both references described T.J. and NextGen Association Management positively, highlighting his success at operationalizing KPIs and improving growth and revenue.

Jan then opened the conversation up to the full board for discussion. The board discussed several questions, including a process for feedback as well as determining a “north star” metric for success in this plan. Some board members believed we should be more specific about what our metrics for success are in the contract, whereas others felt we needed time working with NextGen to determine exactly what those metrics will be. Regardless, the board discussed needing more board conversation surrounding specific success goals and determining a plan B for the organization if we do not find success with NextGen. In addition, the contract currently states we will evaluate progress (and be able to opt out of the contract) after 6 months (in December). The board discussed moving that date to late March to provide more time to determine whether we are growing with NextGen as well as to get us through convention before deciding whether we need to make changes.

The board wanted to see a final contract before voting. Jan, Nicole, and Tayla set a meeting to talk with T.J. about these questions and changes so that the board could discuss, vote, and move forward with budgeting prior to ending the board meeting the following day.

Jan, Nicole, and Tayla were able to meet with T.J. and revised the contract according to board feedback.

Motion: To accept the revised contract with NextGen Association Management.
Motion passed 11-1-0.

Some board members noted they feel pessimistic about moving to NextGen. We have prioritized continuity in this process, but some board members would have preferred change. The board reiterated a need to have a plan B and explicit success metrics. The board discussed our current financial position—even if this does not work out in our favor, we will have around 1 million dollars in reserves. Although this is not without risk, we are currently in a good financial position.

3. Financial Materials

2024 Review

Nathan reviewed 2024 financials. This is the first year we really went through the budgeting process in Quickbooks for the whole year. We closed out 2024.

Overall, we were budgeted to have a deficit of \$236k and we ended up at \$219k. If you add in investments/condo revenue, our deficit was only \$95k. This has already been reviewed by the finance committee and will be also presented to the business meeting.

Budget to Actual 2025

Nathan reviewed our current budget to actual. We are under budget in some revenue areas—e.g., attendance numbers, etc. We should talk about this more as a board. Registration fees are very below budget. We have some other events in the future (MMPI, Expert Insights), but we are below where we should be.

One of thing we are experimenting with is trying to get a better sense of our budget across the year. We do not have steady expenses month to month—so we are re-looking at the cash flow document. The finance committee will be taking a deeper look at that as well.

Key Performance Indicators

Nathan reviewed performance for KPIs.

Workshop and registration are behind projections (by around 45 people). We will likely have lower than expected revenue for the convention.

HiTOP is doing fairly well. They have 101 registrants (94 last year). We did agree to help with their membership function and we are keeping 15% from that. They most likely will not be partnering with us next year. We need to consider where we would be without them. We used to be at 500 or so conference registrants and now we have 350 for SPA.

MMPI registration is open and going. We are doing some additional marketing in MN and the press is doing some of that too. Nathan expressed confidence numbers would increase from last year. However, this is the last trial year for MMPI—if it does not make budget we will discuss its viability again.

4. Tracking SPA's Growth & Budget

2025 Strategic Framework Updates

Nathan discussed our progress on various tactics for our strategic framework.

- a. Define the utility and impact of personality assessment and communicate its value:

We will be adding our definition of PA to the website. We are also creating a website for utility of assessment videos. The Assessment Practice Research Network (APRN) is also making progress in development and they will be advertising at the convention.

- b. Build a diverse profession by increasing students & professionals interested in personality assessment:

We have a new member engagement plan that Nathan and Christina will be working to implement. We have multiple programs happening at the convention—the sip and share for students/early career members, the mentorship program, and focus groups. We will be doing member highlight videos post convention, an annual report from SPA will be going out through JPA, and we will be working to increase our social media presence.

c. Become a comprehensive resource for personality assessment:

Culture webinar series is ongoing and we have already made budget. We have experimented with limited access to wealth pricing and this is going well (i.e., we are not seeing lower revenue by doing this). Part two of this series will likely be in fall. The Multicultural Psychologist podcast should also be posting its first episode soon.

2025 Revised Budget Approval

There are some edits to the budget given our vote to move forward with NextGen AMC.

Nathan reviewed various changes to the budget, such as decreased revenue expected from registration and workshop fees. The board discussed potential reasons why this may be the case (e.g., conference timing, budget, etc.).

December approved budget was \$795k in revenue. New proposed revenue is \$779k. Payment for the condo will come in August 2026 with a payout of \$168k. The proposed deficit was \$219k and is now \$207k.

We will need to revisit the budget again after determining severance costs for staff. Contracts will be terminated June 1st. We offer a PTO buyout and we will offer Monica a severance package. The EC will ask Nathan to research various severance options. The EC will then discuss and decide on the final package to offer to Monica. The deficit will likely increase 30-70k based on these changes/payouts. Legally, severance is not required, but we should consider how we ethically want to treat our employees given a choice that we have made as a board. We have no policy related to this and have never dealt with this, so the EC will be considering a wide range of options. The board will need to vote on approving the current budget and will vote again on a revision once these issues have been settled. This vote can likely be done via email.

Motion: To approve the revised 2025 budget. Motion passed 12-0-0.

5. Maintaining a Strategic Board Focus - Board Evaluation

The board discussed the previous self-evaluation. Evaluations were generally positive, though there were some criticisms as well. Some criticism themes included how we

handle diverging opinions, how we distribute speaking time, and mixed trust in leadership. The board then broke into small groups to consider concrete ways to improve our board process.

The board felt we did well at strategic thinking, considering financial implications of our choices, making progress towards goals, team building, and onboarding new board members. The board felt we could improve in our perspective taking, assuming others' intentions, personalizing processes/opinions, and making sure we have what we need to prepare for board meetings on time. Finally, the board discussed several methods for improvement—including considering more purposeful discussion of dissent (e.g., including a “why not” in every decision or an individual assigned to argue against a decision so we consider all sides), better identification of ruptures, ensuring difficult conversations happen in-person when possible, creating better systems for all voices to be heard, making EC meeting minutes available for all board members, more board engagement with the members, and creating a centralized communication process.

6. SPA Strategic Discussions

Journal Update

Martin reviewed the journal update. Submissions are doing fine. Taylor & Francis potentially wants JPA to increase U.S. submissions, but this is more about proportion (Martin worked hard to globalize the journal).

Martin discussed the status of the statistical developments and application section. Over time, these editors have decided to step down. The section has one co-editor and it is unclear if she will want to step in and take leadership. Many articles that win awards tend to come from this section (Klopfer) and some have been very heavily cited. Some of the papers may not otherwise fit the scope of JPA, so we would like to keep the section. We should put out a call for a co-editor for this section.

The board discussed potential ways to acknowledge service to the journal. In addition, Martin noted JPA received its first registered report.

Finally, Martin reviewed special issues. Matt and Katie are co-editing a special issue on trauma and personality assessment. They have called for full manuscripts to be submitted. A special issue proposal from the DEISJ committee should soon be finalized. There have been talks about ICD-11 personality disorder assessment and utility of personality assessment special issues/sections.

DEISJ Committee

Much of the committee work has focused around the political climate in the U.S. Being highly visible in this role is risky. What protections might we put in place for members

who are doing DEISJ programming? For instance, recorded content should be taken down if requested by the individual. We should find ways to communicate with membership that we care about their safety. The committee discussed writing another statement related to the current U.S. climate but decided that other actions being taken by the committee better demonstrated our commitment to these efforts.

Jordan worked on a statement through Div 12 about some of the executive orders—and the result is that people are taking some of these variables (demographics) out of research. The board discussed writing a statement about the importance of including demographic variables in our research. We cannot evaluate personality and mental health without evaluating the whole individual. There is a clear and direct link to our work. Jordan and Katie volunteered to help write this statement.

Finally, the board also discussed potential issues related to traveling to Canada. However, it is hard to predict what those issues may be at this time (beyond the student visas, for which we have already developed a scholarship).

CE Committee

Katie and Steve reviewed their report. Grand rounds program has been doing well. They will be starting to think about programming for the next year soon and will be doing a member survey about needs and priorities for education.

They receive requests for ethics content, which is difficult to find. The board discussed targeting people and asking them to discuss ethics in their area rather than finding individuals who typically present related to ethics. Some things we already have going on (e.g., Ksera's workshop) will count for ethics. She stated she would be happy to do that in another format.

We have tentatively agreed to do a third Expert Insights conference in the fall. We are getting a clearer idea that we should appeal to clinicians more. We made a little bit of money this year from it (around \$10k).

The CE committee was empowered to work on another Expert Insights for fall.

There was a suggestion to ensure we are not poaching from annual convention by doing this online conference. We may be able to offer a discount to the annual convention for attending Expert Insights as an incentive to attend both or convert virtual conference attendees to convention attendees.

Outreach

We have done some outreach by attending other conferences (e.g., NAN), but we should consider better ways to improve the standing of personality assessment in the

field and for the public. Many societies have a “for patients” page on their webpage. We could have a Youtube channel or other social media pages (e.g., TikTok).

The board discussed the need for an outreach committee and tasked Katie and Steve to put together a charge for this new committee. It was also noted that T.J.’s (from NextGen) background is in advocacy, so he may be able to help with these efforts.

We have struggled to take action on the education platform. What do we need to get forward movement on this education platform? The board discussed a potential separate ongoing committee for this as well. Martin, Tayla, and Len, and Jordan will create a charge for a potential education committee. Nathan will work to get meetings scheduled for these. Potentially by June they will have descriptions enough to approve these two new committees.

The board discussed the name of the society. In the real world—including in training programs—psychological assessment has stronger footing than personality assessment. Should we revisit this yet again? Membership has not been supportive of a name change in the past, but is this holding us back elsewhere? The board discussed a market analysis—our current membership provides good data, but it would be good to know what the potential outcome of a name change would be (e.g., who could we reach who we do not currently). Membership reaction to a name change may differ if we have data to suggest this would benefit SPA. The board would like to revisit this conversation. Nathan will figure out options for market analysis and will talk with colleagues who have worked on rebranding.

APA Liaison

Jordan reviewed happenings at APA. There was a webinar series recently with an episode on advocacy—it is free on society for counseling psychology’s website. On Tuesday April 15th at 1pm there will be an advocacy training from the head of advocacy for APA. The next webinar will be critical approaches to research and then the final will be critical approaches to clinical work.

Jordan sent out an email about what’s going on with the competencies process. They ignored the feedback and did not revise it. The proposal went to council and it failed. They don’t have a plan to revisit the competencies at the moment. They are focused on scope of practice. However, Jordan’s paper related to competencies just got accepted. He and his co-authors will be presenting to the CCTV. If they adopt it, it will basically strong arm the committee on accreditation to work and revise their accreditation standards to align more with this new model of competencies. The model has assessment as one of six core competencies (and ultimately APA training programs would have to improve their education in assessment).

The board discussed whether we need an ongoing APA liaison as a formal role. Unless it is formal, you cannot sit in on meetings with APA. If it were not Jordan (who is now a member at large), we could have someone else step in. We will consider this more broadly for the position in the future, but Jordan has a 3-year term and can continue providing updates during that time.

In our discussion in June, we should also discuss reasons why we should not continue having an APA liaison. This only applies to American psychologists. We could consider an accreditation committee that speaks to various people internationally. We can capitalize on Jordan's knowledge of APA and also consider more global outreach for the future.

SPAGS

SPAGS wants to take steps to demystify people on the board for graduate students. Board members were encouraged to stop by the social.

They would also like to better align their strategies with broader SPA initiatives. This will require help from staff for continuity, since leadership in SPAGS only serve one year on the board.

Annual Conference

Nathan will be creating a short list of future convention cities and we will make final decisions at the September board meeting. We discussed potential cost-saving options for convention, such as starting the convention on a Sunday, holding the convention in tier 2 cities, and hosting the convention on a college campus instead of city center at a hotel. We should source costs for these various options as well as survey members for their reactions. It is possible that cost savings for us also means cost savings for attendees, but we want to make sure that changes do not decrease enthusiasm for attendance.

The board should consider possible options for co-hosts in Toronto (e.g., a local psych association).

Finally, the board discussed whether we should source from conservative states (e.g., states with anti-transgender laws). We want to make sure that the locations we hold the convention are safe for all members to attend, so we should be mindful of the laws in various states when considering potential convention locations.

Revisiting SPA Membership Value

Nathan reviewed membership data. The percentage that we have retained has gone down, but we have a positive return for early career members. The board should

consider what we want to do with more detailed membership data.

7. Consent Agenda

- a. December Board Meeting Minutes Approval
- b. Student Matters Committee
- c. Interest Groups
- d. ABAP
- e. Other Updates?

Assessment throwdown is having trouble getting help this year. Abby will send something to Nathan to put it in the newsletter.

Motion: To accept the consent agenda. Motion passed 12-0-0.

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 2025 Board of Directors Meeting

Monday, June 9, 11am-3pm (eastern)

Present: Jan Kamphuis (President), Nicole Cain (President-Elect), Jill Clemence (Past President), Tayla Lee (Treasurer), Jaime Anderson (Secretary), Abby Mulay (Representative at Large), Jordan Wright (Representative at Large), Steve Finn (Representative at Large), Matt Yalch (Representative at Large), Jack Burke (SPAGS President), Ksera Dyette (DEISJ Committee Chair), Nathan Victoria (Executive Director), T.J. Cote (NextGen Management CEO)

Absent: Martin Sellbom (JPA Editor)

Partial Attendance: Len Simms (Representative at Large), Katie Lewis (Representative at Large)

1. Call to Order and Quorum

Jan welcomed everyone and reviewed the agenda for the board meeting. He reminded the board of our board culture commitments.

2. Financial Conversation

SPA's Financial Key Performance Indicators (KPIs)

Nathan gave a report of our activities and how they have been going. In terms of income, we are doing well.

We are below projections for registration fees; however, our current report does not include the MMPI symposium or Expert Insights, so there will be more registrations coming.

Convention: We made budget for convention registrations. This year we are scheduled to increase convention registration rates. We set a goal two years ago to decrease the convention deficit to under 100k. We increased our deficit this year but met the budget we set. Our expenses were due to AV as well as some food costs on site. We will get multiple bids for AV for the next convention. We were happy with the onsite event. We

had fewer people, but we had more people paying to attend. We will have another event in Toronto.

Membership: Nathan will be working with Abby and the membership committee to collect more information on our website ratings (i.e., where it asks you to rate SPA). Membership is fairly stagnant—there has been somewhat of a drop, but we have been stagnant since COVID.

Expert insights: Registration for Expert Insights should open up soon. The event will take place October 24-25 with a great line-up of speakers.

HiTOP: Expenses were hard to separate out this year because it was fully integrated. But after the breakdown, Nathan estimated our revenue was \$6k higher than budgeted. It is unlikely HiTOP will join again in Toronto.

MMPI: This was the second year for the workshop and symposia. We made the 31k and expenses are still coming in. We will probably make the budget and will have final numbers at the September board meeting. However, we may consider a pre- or post-symposium attached to convention in 2026 rather than a stand-alone event. The Minnesota Press will be conducting a survey.

Cultural webinar series: The cultural webinar series has already made budget for part one and they are in the process of scheduling part two (which will involve an updated budget request to the board). We have three more webinars that will round out through the end of July. We will launch part two in fall/winter (most expense/revenue will be in FY 2026).

Severance and Transition: The board was given an opportunity to discuss severance for staff and transition to NextGen. No concerns were raised. The transition to NextGen Management has been made. There are some final transitions on the financial side that Monica is still working on, but Nathan has taken over monitoring phone/email and we have otherwise fully transitioned.

Updated 2025 Budget: Although we attempted to complete an email vote, we were missing a vote. Because votes must be unanimous if conducted via email, we needed a live vote.

Motion: To approved the updated 2025 budget. Motion passed 12-0-0.

3. Taskforce/Committee Updates

2026 Annual Convention Update

Committee: The convention committee did an open call for committee members. Adam will be starting his final year as program chair. Jared Ruchensky will be co-chair this

year (and next year). Connor Adams will likely be the co-chair elect (to take Adam's place).

Content & Partnerships: We received positive feedback from splitting the deadline. Faculty particularly appreciated the time for students to submit a poster. Pre-conference deep dives were well-received.

We will try to better curate workshops. There were fewer dropped workshops this year. The committee worked with Katie and Steve to get us CE approved for Canada. This is retroactive (e.g., for cultural webinar series).

The board discussed the need to better vet presenters. We have feedback from CE sessions and workshops and we may want the program committee to review available information on presenters prior to finalizing a program (e.g., ensure we are not having speakers with consistently negative feedback).

We are finalizing a conversation with SITAR (the interpersonal circumplex society) about a partnership (co-location/membership-swap). There is a lot of overlap with SPA. SITAR has a large presence in Canada in particular, so this could be a good opportunity to bring them in. They have not been meeting in person since COVID and there could be some interest from them. We will have a meeting with them in a couple weeks to finalize what this will look like.

Pricing: We were scheduled to do a price increase. The board discussed the benefits and drawbacks of a price increase. The increase amounts to around \$12k in terms of difference/projections. If we do not do the increase, we have to consider where to make additional cuts (or increases in revenue) in our budget. Our meeting rates are still much lower than others and a small increase may not deter most people. This decision may be more about optics/sentiment than finances—everything has gotten much more expensive and members may appreciate that we do not contribute to this. Price increases would hurt early career members and students the most. The board discussed price increases to only some member categories. Nathan will compile some scenarios related to cost increases (or not) and budget impact. The board will make a final decision in September.

Schedule: We are moving towards the Tuesday/Wednesday model for the board meeting. Per the feedback, we will move the Sip and Share to Friday. Additionally, we may attempt to incorporate business meeting topics into other areas to increase engagement.

The board discussed the need for a pre-conference orientation. We have the SPAGS first-time attendee orientation, but perhaps we could also host a webinar for new attendees a few weeks prior to convention to orient new attendees to our event.

We have received consistent negative feedback about the web app for convention. We will try out a stand-alone app this year.

Off-Site Event: Staff will be sourcing options for an off-site event and will work with the EC and program committee to confirm this.

Featured Lectures/Plenaries: The board discussed plenaries. Several board members expressed that at least one keynote should be geared towards clinical interests (historically one speaker was clinical and one was research-oriented). Conceptually, most board members were ok with tangential (but related) topics to personality assessment, with at least one topic being clinically applied. Some members discussed a speaker who could speak to revisions to the APA ethics code. The program committee is meeting on June 23rd. They will get a short list and run that list by the EC before confirming.

Continuing Education Update

There has been a great response to grand rounds. Regarding Expert Insights, we brought in \$579 from non-members registering for the event in our first year of doing this. The board discussed that it would be helpful to have this type of information about non-member engagement for all areas (e.g., online learning platform). The board discussed current academic climate and whether it would be helpful to host a CE event or townhall that focused on conducting research in the current U.S. political climate.

New Task Forces/Committees

The board discussed a new outreach committee focused on auxiliary professionals and helping them understand the value of PA (and also to the general public). There is a proposal to establish a taskforce/committee (with a small budget) to develop things like brochures about personality assessment, assemble a panel of speakers to give presentations at different kinds of conferences, develop social media posts, rapid response team that can respond to inaccurate info about assessment, and perhaps reach out to journalists to talk to them about personality assessment.

The board agreed on this importance of this work, but some also cautioned us to ensure we did not spread ourselves too thin. We have several current goals that are still ongoing. The board opted not to create an open call for this committee until we determine the time/resources we can commit to this work.

The board also discussed a proposal for creating programming for education/training programs. This committee could also work with the CE committee to develop materials for our educational platform. This will be a heavy lift, so we want to make sure we have a committed point person in charge of this committee. In addition, the board will want to monitor progress closely given upfront expenses of creating educational programming. We may be able to rethink current board responsibilities to make room for this. Related to this work, the board discussed the potential need for a market analysis to determine we are spending money on something that will help SPA grow. We can ask Nathan

and/or TJ to help us with this if we decide we want more formal financial analysis. Jordan volunteered to organize this committee.

ABAP/ABPA Update

ABAP is behind schedule. Legal review is taking longer for the bylaws than anticipated, but they have drafted bylaws and they have a founding board. The next task is to finalize the website. They have renamed ABAP to ABPA (American Board of Psychological Assessment) since there is another ABAP without ABPP (Addiction). Jordan is working to draft an examination manual for the process of getting and maintaining diplomate status. The realistic timeline is probably taking in applications around January. In concert with this, they will be asking Nathan to spearhead a mechanism for accepting, sending out materials, scheduling orals, etc.

Membership Data

One of the things we have heard is that if you are a graduate student vs. a clinician vs. a faculty member, the benefits and experience at SPA are different. We will be delving deeper into the membership experience at the September board meeting.

We have notes from the focus groups. Abby discussed the feedback from early career members. They made tangible requests, such as a pre-conference zoom for new-attendees, conference events starting at 9am, among others. We need to continue to gather more data about early career retention.

Jack discussed themes from the student focus group. Students provided positive feedback about the culture of SPA. They also had specific feedback, such as negative reviews of the app, preferring email/text reminders for events/deadlines, etc. They discussed wanting content related to immigration and LGBT+ issues. In addition, the student group discussed the political climate and wanting a response from SPA.

From this feedback, SPAGS drafted a letter that touches on support for graduate students and the importance of equity in clinical practice. The board expressed that we should ensure that there are actions put behind this from SPA. The board will review and vote on the letter for September's meeting.

4. AMC KPI Process Update

The contract signing process took longer than intended. TJ and Nathan started to transition in May. A lot of the transition has been administrative—finances, etc. Nathan and Christina are onboarded into NextGen and all of SPA's operations will be moved over to NextGen throughout the remainder of summer.

T.J. then led a discussion regarding transition and KPIs with the board.

Structural support: Nathan and Christina have continued their roles and the op director has been warped into their roles. As NextGen is growing, they are trying to determine what other staff they need. TJ is meeting with Nathan more regularly about board support, organization planning.

KPIs: TJ wanted to get some feedback from the board. Given our financial deadlines and forecasts, TJ focused on KPIs related to finances.

He broke it down to four categories.

Revenue—what are other income streams the org can explore?
Expense—Where can we make cuts to save money?
Financial stability— how can we make a sustainable financial plan?
Engagement— how do we improve engagement?

The board will discuss more specific KPIs in September.

An issue that continuously arises is the society's identity—personality vs. psychological assessment. We should aim to talk about big directions along with small tasks simultaneously when thinking about the direction of the organization.

The board asked TJ his perspective in several areas, including projections for professional societies. Many are suffering, so what is their future? TJ suggested that organizations will survive when they are bold in how they make decisions. We will need to be creative and flexible in how we think about the future of our organization. For instance, some societies are doing away with membership entirely and selling products a la carte. He described it was the “Netflixification” of everything where we can increasingly build the experience we want. We should be open to new and creative ways to structure our organization.

Finally, the board discussed developing OKRs (Objectives and Key Results). We want to be careful not to get derailed, but we may be able to develop OKRs to better guide our decisions—checking in to make sure we are working towards our primary goals as an organization.

5. Consent Agenda

- a. March Meeting Minutes Approval
- b. Finance Committee Report
 - i. SPA's Current Financial Status (2025 Year Budget to Actual, Report on Investments, Profit and Loss [Totals & Detail, Years Comparison], Statement of Financial Position [Current Year, Across Years]).
- c. Diversity and Social Justice Update
- d. APRN Update
- e. 2025 Strategic Framework Update
- f. Leadership Development Committee
- g. Interest Group Report

Motion: To approve the consent agenda. 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

DRAFT



September 2025 Board of Trustees Meeting

Detroit Marriott at the Renaissance Center | Detroit, MI

September 12-13, 2025

Joliet A/B - 5th Floor

Present: Jan Kamphuis (President), Nicole Cain (President-Elect), Jill Clemence (Past President), Tayla Lee (Treasurer), Jaime Anderson (Secretary), Abby Mulay (Representative at Large), Jordan Wright (Representative at Large), Steve Finn (Representative at Large), Jack Burke (SPAGS President), Ksera Dyette (DEISJ Committee Chair), Nathan Victoria (Executive Director), Martin Sellbom (JPA Editor), T.J. Cote (NextGen Management CEO)

Absent: Matt Yalch (Representative at Large),

Partial Attendance: None

1. Call to Order and Quorum

Jan welcomed everyone and reviewed the agenda for the board meeting. He reminded the board of our board culture commitments.

2. Pre-KPI Discussion

Membership Analysis

Abby discussed membership analysis. We continue to have limited diversity as a society. Members noted they generally find us welcoming and accessible with good expertise. Members noted they love our CE offerings, particularly Grand Rounds. Seasoned members made comments about feeling disenfranchised and expressed concern about how social-justice-oriented SPA has become. Other comments noted the journal is not clinical enough or that SPA continues to have “camps” (e.g., MMPI, RPAS).

The board discussed this feedback. We could be more purposeful in making clinical presentations. We could also review previous conferences and review how many “camp” oriented presentations we had. We have purposefully attempted to better align presentations by content, but sometimes this is unavoidable based on what is submitted

by members. We can also explicitly ask that presenters speak to application and seek out presentations from clinicians more frequently. We should review past conferences to determine whether this is really a problem, and if it is, we can work with the program committee to determine ways in which we can better curate the program to address some of these member concerns. We do not want to overreact though—most responses were positive.

The board discussed concerns over the growing focus on DEI. We knew this focus may rub some members the wrong way, but we remain committed to these efforts.

Nathan will take some of this feedback back to the program committee. The committee and staff can put together a “preparing your presentation” guide to encourage application, etc.

New Task Forces/Committees

There has been discussion about an Outreach and Engagement Committee. Matt, Katie, Ksera, Steve, and Jan met to discuss goals of this potential committee and Steve reported on their meeting. Should SPA dedicate resources to raise the profile of personality assessment to allied professions, other areas of psychology, students, and/or the general public?

They came up with a few ideas for the public (e.g., adding a tab on the website, using social media, developing a podcast). For students, they discussed developing educational materials, syllabi, videos to help in courses, having a list of internship sites. For allied professionals, they discussed giving lectures to other professionals.

They felt this was worthy of a standing committee, with a budget, etc. It is essential that the committee be heavily weighted with SPAGS. It certainly fits the strategic goals and we have 4k in funds if we cut interest group funding.

The board will continue to consider whether to invest in this endeavor for the next year. We will need to ensure that the priorities of this committee are non-overlapping with other ongoing efforts (e.g., training content creation).

3. 2026 KPIs Discussion

The board discussed taking our finance and strategic goals and making them SMART goals. T.J. reviewed our various strategies.

Historically, we have not had financial goals and regularly ran a deficit budget. Now we have a finance committee and refined specific future goals. 2028 remains our dropoff year in our projections. This is also when the JPA contract is up for renewal.

We are currently using reserves for operations and we should use the reserves for strategic goals. We had a strategy of becoming more efficient from an operational standpoint and we have been doing that.

The board broke into small groups to create SMART goals for finances and link them to strategic planning. Small groups then reported out their smart goals from our current financial goals.

The board also discussed making financial cuts in the coming years to meet our goal of budget neutrality by 2028. We discussed realistic options for 2026 and ultimately decided we should attempt to reduce the investment draw by 12% (1/3 of the cut needed by the end of 2028). To accomplish this, the board will go line by line to determine which areas of the budget can be cut/reduced. This may involve making tough choices but is becoming necessary to ensure we maintain our reserves and financial viability.

In total, we will need \$200k more per year to be comfortable by year-end of 2028. This can be made up by cuts or increased revenue. The board plans to make up 66k by 2026, 132k by 2027, and 200k by 2028, recognizing that the process may not be entirely linear. Tayla, Nathan, T.J., and the finance committee will go through the budget and make recommendations to the board. The EC will discuss this in the November meeting and the board can make decisions in December.

4. Taskforce/Committee Updates

2027-2029 SPA Convention Selection

Nathan reviewed location sourcing options for convention. We will want to sign by December and Nathan will want to work with a subset of the board once he gets to the negotiation stage. The board discussed a variety of options, focused on cost-saving (e.g., sourcing a college campus, going to the same city more than once, holding the meeting during the week, etc.).

Generally, the board is open to creative solutions to decrease costs. Nathan will explore options and the executive committee will make a final call on options to take to the board.

ABPP Transition Update

Jordan reported on the ABPP process. The bylaws have been finalized and the examination manual is being finalized. There is a question about how to include masters level school psychologists. The biggest task now is to create an infrastructure to accept submissions, payments, etc. The plan is to be able to open up for new applicants in 2026.

APA Report

Jordan reported on APA. There are ongoing discussions about scope of practice. Model licensure act is still in process, which will lay out the scope of practice for MA psychologists in assessment. There is a tension between the guild issue vs. societal need for assessment. Jordan also discussed the issue of advocacy. Some particular areas of concern are pseudoscience/misinformation, reimbursement by insurance companies, promoting a representative workforce.

2025 SPA Awards Discussion

Len reviewed the awards committee feedback and the board voted to confirm various awards based on the committee's rankings. Those who were nominated for an award were asked to leave the meeting during the vote/discussion.

Graham Award: Motion passed 10-0-0 for Steve Finn
Service Award: Motion passed 11-0-0 for Tony Bram.
Exner Award: Motion passed 11-0-0 for Tiffany Russell.
Mary Cerney Award: Motion passed 11-0-0 for Taylor Rodriguez.
Mid-Career Award: Motion passed 9-0-0 for Nicole Cain.
Bruno Klopfer Award: Motion passed 11-0-0 for John Kurtz.

There was an error in administration with the Beck Award. Previous nominees were not forwarded and the awards committee considered someone who had already won. The committee will re-evaluate and make new rankings.

The board discussed whether we should have a policy that board members cannot win awards while serving on the board. Several board members were nominated for awards. We will discuss this more in December.

Journal of Personality Assessment Report

Martin reviewed the JPA report. The journal received a record number of submissions in the first 6 months (275). Impact factor for 2024 is down to 2, which is much lower than previous years (2.8 last year). There are other metrics for citations that are relevant (and potentially more important), but impact factor matters in many contexts (e.g., whether libraries will subscribe). Martin will be meeting with T&F to see if they can figure out what is happening.

Martin is still looking for a co-section editor for the statistics section but made an offer. He has a new editorial assistant. There are three special issues at various stages.

Martin also reflected on some of the feedback about the journal in the member survey. It is unclear what was meant by wanting more clinical papers—case studies would make the journal metrics decline. Martin also prioritized globalizing the journal and broadening the scope beyond just clinical assessment, which means we have greater variety in the journal. One idea was to be more lenient about the clinical applications section of the journal.

The board discussed the Exchange again. There was an open call for editorship, but no one volunteered. The DEISJ committee has been willing to take this on. The board will discuss more as a potential tactic for 2026.

SPAGS Convention Proposal

Jack discussed the SPAGS report. They put up a website with conference FAQs (e.g., conference etiquette). They also plan to put an undergrad on the SPAGS board.

SPAGS had a proposal for the president elect to attend the fall board meeting. However, the board felt we could not financially support this right now.

There was also a proposal to create an online space for students to connect with each other prior to the conference. Discord could be a good option for this—it is free or low cost and fairly secure.

Students are interested in having a student training certificate—something that demonstrates they have received extra training in the area of assessment. If we decide to create any sort of certificate, we would want to vet the content and consider how to evaluate student learning, otherwise the certificate does not mean much. One idea would be to better curate a learning track that focuses on coverage in a multitude of training areas. This could be helpful for general membership in addition to students.

We will be offering free workshop attendance to a student-centered workshop. Students also have access to all of our online learning platform for free. There is support to provide resources for student training, but we do not currently have the funds to support more free offerings for students.

Finally, SPAGS has been discussing supplemental training about getting an internship, applying for internship, etc. We could do a coffee break where internship staff can talk to students. We could do some virtual content and/or can do something at convention.

Membership Initiatives Generation

A couple years ago, we did some persona work (practitioner, academic, student) about how to reach different types of professionals. The board broke into small groups and each group reported out on their work.

Defining our Focus/What's in a name?

The board discussed a potential name change-- not only whether we should consider this (which we have discussed previously numerous times) but considering actionable steps to make this decision (e.g., what information do we need to decide, what steps would be involved). A name change would require a member vote.

T.J. noted we would want to consider strategic outcomes and potentially bring in marketing or PR professionals as we would want to consider logistics of the roll out and how to reach new people.

The board discussed whether this was the right time to make this change. The society has been through many major changes (including the recent move to an AMC). We may want to let the dust settle before investing in a new endeavor like a society name change. We can broaden our scope without changing the name in the meantime.

Each board member was given an opportunity to provide their thoughts about a name change. Generally, there was support from the board, but most felt this was not the time to invest what we need to make such a big change. We need to know what a change like this would require. Others noted we need to consider the implications of not changing and how this change contributes to our mission.

Ultimately, the board wanted more information on making this decision. It was clear that there is strong movement in this direction, but we need to consider all of the potential implications of the change. We should collect data, have conversations, open the issue up for public comment. The name change could also impact the journal.

We should keep the issue on the agenda, have purposeful conversation, and start gathering data. We could do purposeful information gathering in 2026 (e.g., townhall on the topic, incorporate it into the presidential address). Nathan will also speak with other organizations who have gone through a name change to gain insight on the logistics.

5. SPA Financial Conversation

Tayla discussed the current draft of the 2026 budget. Changes were made based on movement to an AMC as well as trends from 2025. Nathan then reported on various financial KPIs.

MMPI

This was the second experiment year. The net income was about 6k. The plan for next year is to make the MMPI symposium an extension of the conference (i.e., shared poster session on Saturday night and an all-day symposium Sunday).

Membership

Nathan reviewed membership numbers and the Net Promotor trends. We have an increase in “promoters” from the website survey. Students are up but full members have been decreasing for many years.

Expert Insights

Early bird registration is October 1. We currently have 13 registrants (not including presenters). We expect to make budget for this conference.

HiTOP

It is difficult to pull out specific numbers for HiTOP. We are not continuing the partnership, so deep analysis may not be necessary. All of the registration revenue came to SPA and we held at 15% fee for membership registrations. They will soon have their own membership setup.

Cultural Webinar

The current revenue projection is around 5k for this.

E-Learning

The E-learning platform has made about \$1200 with very passive marketing and no effort to curate content.

Convention Rate

The board reviewed proposed convention rates. We are proposing gradual increases for convention registration. Students are only getting a 10% increase. We will also be purposefully marketing low cost/cost savings options for students.

Sponsorship for Div 12/SCP

There is a request for SPA to sponsor the experience. From a budget perspective, we have earmarked sponsorship money to use. The board agrees to sponsor at the \$1000 level. No motion required because this money is already in the budget. We can support someone's registration.

6. 2025 Strategic Framework Report/2026 Strategy Discussion

Overview of Tactics from 2025

Small groups discussed tactics and created smart goals.

Tayla discussed committee structure. We should move membership back to the secretary and free up more committee space for the academic partnership and outreach and engagement committee. We will have to figure out how to budget for these committees. We are conceptually in support of both committees, but we will need to determine funding.

By December board meeting, we will have a charge to take to the board member for resolution. Committee chairs should write a charge for each committee. Budget to come later.

7. Consent Agenda

- a. June Board Meeting Minutes Approval
- a. Continuing Education Committee
- a. Interest Groups Report
- a. Leadership Development Committee
- a. APA Update
- a. Diversity/Social Justice Committee Update
- a. Finance Committee Report
- a. SPAGS Update

Motion: To approve the consent agenda as outlined in the board book. 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