



March 2023 Board of Trustees Meeting March 29, 2023 – March 30, 2023

Present: Jill Clemence (President), Jan Kamphuis (President-Elect), John McNulty (Past President), Tayla Lee (Treasurer), Jaime Anderson (Secretary), Nicole Cain (Representative-at-large), Abby Mulay (Representative-at-large), Len Simms (Representative-at-large), Kate Thomas (Representative-at-large), Kinshasa Bennett (Representative-at-large), Katie Lewis (Representative-at-large), Essie Asan (SPAGS President), Ksera Dyette (DISJ Committee Chair), Martin Sellbom (JPA Editor), Nathan Victoria (Executive Director)

Absent: None

Partial Attendance: Jordan Wright (APA Liaison), Lauren Hilger (Taylor and Francis Representative), Anita Boss (Convention Program Co-Chair)

March 29, 2023

1. Call to Order and Quorum

President, Jill Clemence, called the meeting to order, welcomed the board, and reviewed the agenda.

2. Board Meeting Operations

Jill and Nathan attended an ASAE board training event about how to work as a board with an ED. Having an ED changes the way we function. We as a board can be more strategic. As part of this goal, we will cover the consent agenda at the end of the meeting to increase the amount of time the board has to focus on big picture issues.

The board reviewed a new board manual and revisited our cultural commitments. Specifically, the board discussed legal responsibilities, including conflict of interest. Conflicts can be difficult to determine, so we should be aware of when we may have conflict. It is important to manage perception of conflict, but it is illegal to have an actual conflict and not recuse yourself.

3. Personality 2035, Foresight, and Drivers of Change

ASAE published factors that will impact professional organizations in the future. The board discussed factors they deemed most relevant to the functioning of SPA, including artificial intelligence, supporting mental health, higher education, and looking towards the next generation of professionals.

In regards to artificial intelligence, the board discussed the increase in programs like ChatGPT and how that could impact the practice of psychology, education, and our organization management. On the positive side, this could be used for improving access to therapy, suicide crisis intervention, and even diagnosis. However, these programs are fallible, and we have to carve out how we interact with this as a field (including the ethics of its use in practice). The board noted it would benefit members to have more knowledge in this area and proposed holding a workshop/series of talks related to this issue for members (e.g., at the fall virtual convention).

Regarding mental health support, the board discussed this issue from a management perspective—how do we consider mental health as an association? The board discussed several areas, including training and assessment for those with disabilities, models of learning at SPA, burn out (including assessment of burn out), and how to incorporate more wellness activities into the convention.

In higher education, the board identified the inclusion of MA practitioners as an important ongoing discussion for SPA.

Finally, the board discussed the role of next-generation professionals at SPA. We need to identify the incentives needed to join or stay part of SPA. We want to be inclusive of all generations, but shifting our values could also mean some membership loss.

4. Interest Group Discussion

Abby and Len created a survey for interest group members.

Most respondents supported more standardization to interest groups (e.g., term limits for leaders, elections, etc.). The board discussed various ways in which interest groups might be better structured, such as having regular meeting expectations, presentations at convention, structures for helping groups stay in connection, among others. Board members noted we do not want to impact functioning of groups that are doing well, so we should create a structure that these groups can continue to be successful in, while providing good structure for other groups too.

In addition, the board discussed a process for deciding when a group should be disbanded. The board decided we should create a structure to see if groups are able to succeed, but noted negative experiences at an interest group meeting could leave a lasting impression.

Abby and Nathan will come up with a base level set of expectations for interest groups, with a plan to finalize structures in June.

March 30, 2023

5. Leadership Celebration Breakfast

SPA leaders were invited to a breakfast and to stay for the beginning of our board meeting, as Nathan discussed our strategic plan and progress. Leaders were given the opportunity to provide feedback. Around 20 leaders were in attendance.

6. 2023 Strategic Framework and Executive Director Update

Nathan reviewed our vision, mission, and the strategic plan for SPA leaders. After SPA leaders left, Nathan also reviewed progress on various tactics thus far. He noted in the future he will not plan to complete as much prior to the convention, as he found planning for the convention took most of staff time at the beginning of the year. However, progress was still made in many areas.

The board also discussed the issue of whether board and/or taskforce members should be permitted to apply for the utility of assessment grant. The board determined that grant taskforce members should not apply for funding, but board members can apply and recuse themselves from deliberation and final voting.

7. Annual Convention Update

Anita discussed the conference program and thanked those involved in the program committee and CE committee. We are back to pre-pandemic numbers in terms of convention registration.

8. APA Liaison Update

Jordan reported on APA activities relevant to SPA.

Doctoral level competencies are going to be going out for public comment soon. We should comment as the SPA board. Following approval of the new competencies, COA will then develop implementation strategies and SPA should also make their voice heard then as well.

MA accreditation is happening at APA; there are programs that are going through the pilot process of accreditation right now. A taskforce focused on what they should be called and what licensure should look like. It is likely it will be somewhat vague about assessment. Training programs will have to revamp what they are doing for MA training in assessment. MA level professionals will need a lot of CEs to get them up to speed in assessment once this enters their scope of practice.

What do we want this to look like at SPA? We want to roll out CE opportunities quickly, so we can be among the first providers of this training. The CE committee could take a leadership role in this effort.

Importantly, many countries already have this training model and MA practitioners are the highest level of clinical practice degree. We should look at to them as models.

Finally, we discussed MA membership. The board is generally supportive of embracing this and allowing for MA level members in the U.S. The board determined a bylaw change is unlikely to be necessary as our membership definition already accounts for non-doctoral level members.

9. Financial Materials

a. 2022 Fiscal Year Report Out

Tayla presented the financial powerpoint. We spend more than we make; this trend has grown with our current model (having an ED, etc.). We as a board need to make it a priority to think about our financial health.

We are returning to pre-covid financial health, and we have recovered largely from the impact of the pandemic.

SPA is trying to sell the office condo, which will probably take about 2 years.

b. Revised 2023 Budget Approval

Nathan reviewed changes to the budget at this point. The resulting spending/revenue is roughly equivalent to the previous budget.

Motion: To approve the budget revisions. Approved unanimously.

c. Long-Range Financial Projections

Tayla and Nathan discussed a long-range financial forecast. The forecast assumes a lot of revenue growth, but we do not see ourselves in the black unless we cut both Nathan and Monica's positions. We need to think about if/then scenarios, whether our projections are realistic, and what we want management of SPA to look like.

The board should also think about what outcomes we need to see to be able to make financial decisions. We should approve a budget for one year, but also approve projections for 2 years afterwards.

We will need to make cuts, but also we do have opportunities to increase our revenue. As we think about initiatives, we need to think about the return on these "investments." Expense reduction is probably not the way out of this. Instead, we need to think about our revenue opportunities so that we can continue the initiatives we have already invested in.

Tayla is actively recruiting a finance committee.

10. JPA Update

The board was joined by Lauren Hilger of T&F. Martin reviewed the JPA report. Lauren reviewed some metrics from the journal (e.g., top articles, citations, downloads, etc.). We saw an increase of 24% in downloads from last year. The impact factor has increased and remained healthy.

11. Consent Agenda

- a. Board Meeting Minutes Approval
- b. Leadership Development Committee
- c. Student Matters Committee Information
- d. SPA Policies and Procedures Revision Update
- e. *Journal of Personality Assessment* Report
- f. Diversity and Social Justice Update
- g. SPAGS Update

Motion: To approve the consent agenda. Motion passed unanimously.

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

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



June 2023 Board of Directors Meeting

June 6, 2023 and June 8, 2023

Present: Jill Clemence (President), Jan Kamphuis (President-Elect), John McNulty (Past President), Tayla Lee (Treasurer), Jaime Anderson (Secretary), Nicole Cain (Representative-at-large), Abby Mulay (Representative-at-large), Len Simms (Representative-at-large), Kate Thomas (Representative-at-large), Katie Lewis (Representative-at-large), Essie Asan (SPAGS President), Ksera Dyette (DISJ Committee Chair), Jordan Wright (APA Liaison), Nathan Victoria (Executive Director)

Absent: None

Partial Attendance: Kinshasa Bennett (Representative-at-large), Martin Sellbom (JPA Editor)

1. Call to Order, Quorum, and Agenda Review

President, Jill Clemence, called the meeting to order, welcomed the board, and reviewed the agenda.

2. APA Doctoral Level Competencies Town Hall Review

Several members of the board attended an APA listening session on doctoral level competencies. Jordan reviewed the meeting for those who were not able to attend the session. The board discussed implications of the APA proposed model on assessment, including our role as advocates in psychology.

Public comment is likely to occur in early Fall and SPA will plan to submit a joint comment from the board.

3. Board Meeting Minutes Approval

Motion: To approve the March 2023 board meeting minutes with discussed edits. Motion passed unanimously.

4. SPA Financial Conversation

a. 2023 Budget to Actual Update

Nathan discussed an overview of the expenses and revenue for 2023 thus far. We are on par with expectations in terms of our budget thus far. The annual conference came in under budget from an expense perspective and our revenue was slightly higher than budgeted.

Tayla and Nathan have been working on developing the finance committee. The committee includes Tayla, Nathan, Jan, John, Matt Yalch, and Paul Arbisi (in an advisory role). Unlike other committees, the goal of this committee is not necessarily to represent various subgroups of SPA (e.g., student, early career), but to focus on members who have expertise in financial matters. Tayla discussed proposed tasks of the finance committee (e.g., budget procedures, financial forecasting, external auditing, investment management, etc.). Decisions ultimately rest with the board, but the finance committee will review potential financial decisions and make recommendations.

b. Future Financial Forecasting

The board has previously discussed that SPA was at a turning point as an organization. As such, the organization made large investments in changing the way the organization runs. The board generally feels as if we have moved in a positive direction, but that we are still in the earlier stages of this process.

The board discussed various impacts on future financial forecasting (e.g., the addition of MA practitioner members in the U.S.). Ultimately, our financial planning should hope for the best, but plan for the worst case scenario. Since we cannot afford our current model beyond 2026, it is important that we make changes that would allow us to maintain our current structure. However, much of the board also felt that these potential changes (e.g., increasing revenue and membership) would ultimately lead to growth in the organization. We need to balance our budget while maintaining strengths of our current model.

Related to this, the board discussed whether we have invested enough into the organization to change the staffing model (i.e., operate without an ED). The board began to discuss whether we could maintain our current level of programming with a different staffing structure, such as using an association management company. Nathan will be developing various staffing model options to discuss with the board moving forward.

The board discussed the issue of expense reduction vs. revenue generation. It was noted that revenue generation is our best goal, as there are not a lot of areas to cut expenses. However, several board members noted that SPA spends a lot of money on the convention. In many organizations, you cannot run a convention that is not net neutral. We carry a lot of the cost of the convention for our membership in order to keep costs low. Though we may be ok with loss for the convention (as it is the greatest value to our membership right now), we may want to cap that loss. There was general agreement that we should attempt to move in a more cost-neutral direction. The board discussed several options to increase revenue without pricing out certain groups (e.g., students, international members), such as increasing registration costs, applying for grants, tying some funding to revenue (e.g., student grants coming from donations), MA membership, among others.

c. SPA Condo sale

SPA put the condo on the market at \$250,000. We received an offer of \$220,000. We countered at \$240,000 and they held at \$220,000. This would likely amount to around \$200,000 in revenue. The condo costs around \$15,000 a year to maintain, so those expenses will continue to accrue if we reject this offer. Our realtor recommended accepting the offer.

Motion: To accept the 220k offer, with Nathan making efforts to continue to negotiate closing costs. Motion passed unanimously.

d. Transition and Continuity Planning Taskforce

The board discussed a need for a contingency plan related to Nathan's position. If something happened to Nathan (e.g., Nathan leaves the organization, goes on leave, etc.), how would SPA handle this? Nathan developed a draft policy pending something happening with the ED and what that will look like. The board decided the Executive Committee would work to solidify a policy with Nathan.

5. Taskforce/Committee Updates

a. Expert Insights Virtual Conference Update

The virtual conference will be mostly plenary speakers across various important content areas. Kinshasa, Katie, and Nathan have been working on a schedule together. We have secured two speakers already—focused on diversity and ethics. We will fill out from there and announce sometime this month.

Nathan discussed the proposal fee schedule for the conference. Thursday is free for everyone, which we hope will expose people to our content.

Motion: To approve the convention rates as proposed in the document. Motion passed unanimously.

b. 2024 Annual Convention Update

Nathan discussed changes to the fee structure for the 2024 convention. The aim was to keep convention rates lower for students and discounts for international members, but increase costs for full members in the USA. We can try to make non-member rates as high as we can, but will need to be careful that our fees do not compel membership.

The board discussed potential plenary speakers. There were varying opinions on the board about how specifically assessment-focused these plenary speakers needed to be—and ideas such as a short discussant following a lecture were discussed.

Nathan reviewed the proposed convention schedule.

Nathan has been working with the HiTOP group about setting up a co-occurring HiTOP convention in March, which would occur Saturday afternoon and all day Sunday. SPA would co-host a reception Saturday and would hold fewer workshops on Sunday. Assuming we make no changes to our current booking with the hotel, there is no additional financial exposure on SPA. If we found we needed more space, there would be some financial exposure (around \$10,000) for having a bigger space on Sunday and expanding our hotel block on Saturday night. We proposed to the HiTOP group that we would take all profit for this year, but they would get our resources (e.g., the space, marketing, registration system, staff, etc.). The board discussed the optics of co-signing HiTOP as well as the importance for both groups of making clear we are separate organizations partnering, similar to the Therapeutic Assessment pre-conference this year.

c. Leadership Development Committee

There are six representative-at-large candidates for two positions that have submitted materials. There are three candidates for president. Candidates will be evaluated and interviewed, then the committee will create a slate of candidates.

The election will occur in August/September and results will be available by the September board meeting. The committee will discuss voting options (e.g., rank order voting).

d. Interest Groups Proposal

The health interest group has been disbanded.

Abby reviewed the proposal for more structure in the interest groups (e.g., having co-chairs, elections, term limits, etc.). This has already been discussed with the leaders. Elections will start in 2025 and co-chairs will be staggered.

Motion: To accept the proposal for interest group model put forth in the document. Motion passes unanimously.

e. Professional Guidelines for Pediatric Personality Assessment Discussion

A member emailed about SPA putting together guidelines for pediatric personality assessment. The board discussed potential scope of this project and partner organizations.

The board generally felt as if SPA was not the ideal organization to organize this effort—that a broader assessment organization (e.g., APA Assessment Section) may be a better umbrella—and various other relevant organizations (SPA, NASP, etc.) could assist in creating guidelines. However, the board discussed

ways to move this forward, such as a potential taskforce or taking the member's proposal to another organization we feel would be better suited to lead this charge. The board will revisit this at a future date.

f. Awards and Recognition Discussion

There is a proposal for a new mentorship award commemorating Jack Graham's contribution to personality assessment. Several colleagues of Jack's have been working on fundraising and Jack's partner has agreed to match the funds up to 20k. They have raised 13k thus far, but expect some additional large contributions. In addition, they plan to kickstart a fundraising campaign at his upcoming memorial at the MMPI symposium. Ideally, this award would be announced at the 2024 convention.

Paul Arbisi and Tayla have worked the numbers on this. With a 40k investment in a small investment account, the society would be able to pay for the award indefinitely. This assumes the award is similar to others at SPA with a \$500 stipend and a proposed coverage of up to \$1500 in travel expenses.

The board discussed the issue of so many awards being geared towards research at SPA. This is not the intention of the award, and it can be awarded for mentorship across a variety of contexts.

Motion: To approve the award with edits to be clear that this is open to non-research mentorship. Motion passes unanimously.

Finally, the board also briefly discussed that there has been interest in a performance-based assessment award. This will be discussed more thoroughly at another time.

g. DEISJ Committee

There is a proposal to include a DEISJ track to the program. This would require proposals to speak to DEISJ issues in every proposal. There has been pushback in other societies that have done similar things (e.g., would proposals not be accepted if they were not diversity focused enough?). It seems the general outcome for other societies (e.g., SPSP) has been that they have more diversity focused proposals and that there has not been an increase in rejections for those that do not have a diversity aspect. We can emphasize this to our membership—it is not about rejecting good science, but instead encouraging us to think about these issues in the work we do. Of note, this is required for APA CEs. We have never asked presenters to address it in the submission process, but per APA, we should already be explicitly asking about this for any CE granting programming.

Board is generally very supportive of the proposal, but we will want to come up with some evaluation criteria from a program perspective.

The DEISJ committee is also implementing a new a structure— there will be a staggering co-chair, as well as having a past chair. The new co-chair will be Jenny Laney. A new member has joined the committee and there are some new applicants to join as well.

b. MA Membership

Jordan provided an update on where APA is at in terms of defining scope of practice for MA practitioners. Although licensure is likely several years away in many places, the need for training in personality assessment will come sooner. We should consider how to incorporate MA practitioners into SPA now.

There are many things to consider, such as voting rights, rules about board membership and leadership, whether to include counselors, etc. Several noted that a taskforce would be helpful for this purpose.

Motion: To move forward with a process and taskforce to include MA level clinicians in our society. Motion passes unanimously.

The executive committee will discuss this further.

i. Utility of Assessment Grant

Eighteen letters of intent were submitted. The committee is in the review process to determine which (if any) will be invited to submit full proposals for funding.

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

Respectfully submitted,

Jaime L. Anderson, Ph.D.

Secretary



September 2023 Board of Trustees Meeting
The Westin San Diego Gaslamp Quarter | San Diego, CA
September 27-30, 2023

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

Absent: None

1. Call to Order and Quorum

Jill called the meeting to order. She announced Kinshasa's resignation and discussed that the executive committee is planning on an appointment to finish out her term according to bylaws.

Jill reviewed the election results and congratulated those who ran for election in this cycle.

2. Revisiting Board Strategic Culture Commitments

Board Voting

The board discussed the process of voting, including what requires a vote. Specifically, the board discussed when to empower committees to make decisions vs. when the board should have decision power. Although there may be times the board may feel as if they need to step in, this can be minimized by providing clear instruction to committee chairs about what the responsibilities (and potential confines) of the committee are.

Jordan noted that APA votes in three areas: anything with a financial implication, anything public facing, and anything that changes procedure. The board generally agreed with this approach to voting.

The board discussed the role of ex-officio members in voting. ASAE has made a case for ex-officio members voting in order to have greater accountability. It was noted that ex-officio board members are not elected by the membership. However, ex-officio members can (and do) influence votes in discussion prior to voting. They are not held accountable for these decisions, but also do not have legal accountability as the board does. It was also noted that there is no limit to the number of ex-

officio members the board can have, so if they voted we would want to be careful not to wash out board votes.

Currently, the bylaws state that ex-officio members do not vote. This conversation was to assist in better understanding the board decision process and what the implications are of those decisions. No action to change the bylaws will be taken at this time.

Finally, the board discussed the issue of public dissent—and the ability to identify a reason for the dissent in the minutes. We also discussed a “role call vote” wherein specific board member votes are recorded. It was noted that this goes against our cultural commitment of “one voice.” Nathan noted that some of these issues relate to whether the board is a representative board, where public dissent would be more common.

Committee Roles and Decision Making

The board also discussed timing associated with decision making. For instance, some decisions may need to be made via email at times so that decision processes are not slowed. In addition, we should structure committee expectations around when decisions will need to be made or changes implemented. For instance, various committees should be given the expectation to report out or propose initiatives consistent with when board meetings occur. This will improve standardized procedure.

Several members of the board noted that we do not want to set such rigid expectations that we squash creativity. We should do a better job onboarding committees and committee chairs; it is often unclear to committees how they are supposed to interact with the board.

Ideally, we want committees to be mostly autonomous, but we may not yet have the right structure for full autonomy (though we are moving in that direction). Many organizations have manuals for committees and we may need written documents for onboarding new committee members and chairs. It provides the constraints and allows the committee to operate more autonomously. We have started asking committees to write procedures for their committees (including making decisions about adding people to a committee).

Most committees have a board liaison. The program committee does not, though it could be Katie (as part of CE) or Nicole (as pres-elect). This can be a December board meeting discussion.

Role of the Executive Director

The board discussed the role of the executive director, and how the board and ED should interact. We have been working as a board to figure out the best roles for SPA, and this is still a work in progress.

The board discussed areas in our culture commitment where they feel we may need to make potential changes in how we operate (i.e., what should be board vs. ED responsibility). Notably, the board discussed a need for additional communication, consultation, and awareness of what was happening behind the scenes. For instance, the board discussed sharing minutes from the executive committee meetings each month and having a monthly email that includes the progress chart on our ongoing tactics. The board discussed that we should be mindful not to micromanage—for instance,

Nathan has jumped at many opportunities that have been very helpful for SPA and we do not want to take that freedom away. We also do not want to take unnecessary staff time for documentation of their work, but we need to strike a balance that the board is comfortable with.

3. Defining Personality Assessment

The board conducted an exercise in which we attempted to come up with an operational definition for personality assessment. We make assumptions about what we mean—but members may have varying definitions which impact how we view the society (e.g., what should be represented at the convention, who should be members). By not having a definition, we allow others to define us.

The board discussed various definitions of personality assessment, and debated the pros and cons of various types of definitions, the level of specificity in definitions, etc.

4. Taskforce/Committee Updates

Annual Convention Update

Workshops were finalized by the convention committee. In addition, the committee confirmed two keynote speakers: Dr. Suzanne Pitama (University of Otago Christchurch) who will discuss an indigenous model of mental health, and Dr. Addyson Tucker (CEO of Wholehearted Psych) who will discuss transgender mental health. In addition, there will be a 1 hour opening slot after the presidential address and the Bruno Klopfer lecture.

The board discussed the way in which keynote speakers are chosen. Historically, one keynote was more clinical and one was more academic. However, if the board has specific aims for keynote speakers, we need to communicate that to the convention committee.

The board discussed a potential theme of “mentorship” at the convention, with an introduction to the new Graham mentorship award and potential resurrection of a mentorship program.

Nathan discussed several branding opportunities at the hotel (e.g., putting our logo on the building during the reception). He will get accurate prices to discuss in December.

SPA has also entered the final stages of the agreement with co-locating the HiTOP convention at the end of our convention. They expect the final agreement to be signed soon.

SPA Awards

Len discussed the awards committee rankings for various awards and the board discussed awards that are left to an ultimate board decision (i.e., Klopfer and Service awards).

Motion: To give the Bruno Klopfer Award to Greg Meyer this year. Motion unanimously approved.

We had no nominees for distinguished service. The board discussed possibilities for the award, including carrying over previous nominees, considering individuals who were not nominated but the

board thinks could be contenders, or giving no award at all. The board discussed the pros and cons of giving out the award using an imperfect or unplanned procedure.

Although the board initially wanted to give out this award, there was a lack of consensus on the top candidate. Following a straw poll between two candidates, some board members expressed discomfort with the unclear process for choosing a winner. The board again discussed the pros and cons of giving an award with an imperfect process.

Motion: To forgo giving a service award this year. 10 votes yes, 1 abstention.

The board discussed the issue of honoring those who have passed way—both with the Hertz Memorial lecture, but also with nominations for other awards (e.g., can we honor someone who has died with a service/research/mentorship award?). These are considerations to put in a procedures manual for the awards committee.

The board decided to honor Bob Archer with the Hertz Memorial this year and to honor Jack Graham via the new mentorship award. This way we are independently honoring both individuals and their contributions. The board discussed the details of the Hertz award (e.g., getting a plaque, paying for expenses, etc.). The board will decide a point person to contact, Jill will reach out regarding the award, and Nathan will manage the logistics.

More broadly, the board discusses the need for each committee to have manuals to review for the December board meeting.

Societal Statements

The board had a discussion about whether we should be responding to things that are happening in broader society. The DEISJ committee thinks we should be doing this. However, the board discussed that we should consider whether an issue impacts the field, if it is related to personality assessment, and whether SPA weighing in would be impactful for our members.

Notably, most of the issues we discuss or highlight are U.S. centric, and we need to consider international issues.

In addition, the board discussed the need for a better process on signing onto things as a society to ensure that we are properly vetting potential statements. When we are approached to sign onto a statement, this should go to the executive committee. The EC can then bring in someone with more expertise as necessary (e.g., DEISJ committee), followed by board approval.

5. SPA Financial Conversation

2023 Budget to Actual Update

Nathan reviewed the 2023 budget. There has been misalignment in the way we think about the budget, best practices for budgeting, and the way Quickbooks does the budget. Nathan has been trying to better align what we see as a board with how the budget actually works.

Overall, we are doing well in the budget. Taylor & Francis accidentally double paid us, which makes the JPA revenue look higher than it actually is. It will ultimately even out, but it means the budget will look different this year and next (e.g., we don't have to pull from reserves now when we normally would, but we will need to pull from reserves probably in February or March).

Convention funds are back to pre-pandemic levels. However, this was not enough to prevent the profit/expense gap we have coming down the line. We are on target to be at about \$650,000 in revenue and around \$900,000 in expenses.

The sale of the condo fell through. It remains listed and we will consider changing realtors if we do not receive more offers.

Staffing Models

The board discussed potential options for association management when Nathan's contract is up. Nathan explained several varying options.

Full Association Management Company (AMC) model: This would be a full service with no SPA staff. There are a few models, but essentially we would have access to various types of staff through the AMC (e.g., 8-10 hours of access to an ED, administrative hours, coordinators, etc.). This would cost around \$220k annually (compared to our current 340k in staffing costs). If we moved to this type of model, we would also change to their vendors—it could be changing a lot about the way SPA operates, as we have had our own staff for a long time. Notably, if we needed more time from the AMC than our contract allowed, we could also end up paying much more.

Nathan also discussed the option of keeping a staff member and an ED and working with an AMC to handle administrative tasks or having an ED and no staff, but working with consultants for everything else.

If we were to consider keeping our current model (all staff in house), we could rethink some of our staff positions and how they are organized. For instance, Nathan has been working with Monica's position—which is currently paying higher than the market value for this level of work. She would like to stay with SPA, so Nathan has been considering options (e.g., decreasing her salary to match the market, dropping her to part-time, etc.).

Financial Strategic Framework

Tayla has been working with the finance committee on long range planning. It is feasible to pay for our operations if we were to achieve some revenue goals. She reviewed a summary from our survey on financial planning.

We want to figure out how we can gain an additional \$150-200k in revenue in order to keep our current staffing model without dropping below our hard line of 1M in the reserves. Tayla reviewed various goal setting experiments. For instance, if membership increases (e.g., by adding MA members), what does that mean for the budget? If the conference grows, how does that improve

revenue? Much of this is a thought experiment, and we will need Nathan to review data on how achievable various financial goals could be.

The board also discussed the previous decision to maintain \$1M in reserves. Tayla will be working with finance committee to determine the best practices for setting this number (because it was somewhat arbitrary when we set it). We can explore setting this line in a more evidence based way. In addition, Tayla stressed the importance that we should not be dependent on the reserves for covering our operations—instead these should be used to meet strategic goals. We want a healthy balance where we may aspire for a neutral budget, but capping our reserves in an evidenced based way may be more realistic.

We draw from reserves in two different ways. We could have the planned 3.5% reserve draw, and then have a different conversation about how we want to draw from the reserve for strategic initiatives.

Tayla reviewed various recommendations for the staff from the finance committee.

The convention is a loss, but it is also the greatest member benefit. Some argued we should think of capping it and not reaching neutrality. Others discussed that it can still pay for itself—the registration should cover the convention and not member dues. Ultimately, T&F is covering a lot of the convention with journal revenue. We can also minimize cost by changes in conference location—for instance, looking into tier 2 cities and considering cost vs. risk of fewer attendees.

Fundraising is not addressed in the plan. We do a poor job of this. There were varying levels of comfort with board member expectations for giving to SPA. However, we could do more to highlight fundraising efforts.

In December, Nathan can present a longer range 2024 plan and embed that in the 2024 budget. We can use this as a pilot year for implementing these budget goals and changes. In future years we can talk 1-year and 5-year targets and how that works with the budget every September.

The board would like Nathan to put together a summary that has all of the goals together-- e.g., not just dollars but also member numbers, registrants, etc.— so we can see how we are doing over time in meeting our goals and assumptions. Nathan will look to 2028, and that will inform how we can set short term targets.

2024 Budget

Nathan reviewed a draft of the 2024 budget. We will see a final version and vote to approve in December.

MMPI Symposium

SPA was approached by the University of Minnesota Press to take over the administration of the MMPI symposium and workshops. Their leadership team would work on the content, but we would do the administration and contract work. They gave Nathan some financial history over the last

years; each symposium generates about \$47,500 in revenue and costs \$40,000 in expenses. Staff have capacity right now to handle this. We could maximize revenue because historically they have not done much marketing.

The board discussed the optics of coordinating with one test publisher over another. However, this is an opportunity for revenue for SPA and we can openly discuss any concerns that arise with membership.

One thing that is difficult to account for is staff time in terms of potential loss. If we started to operate as a miniature AMC, how do we account for time and staff budget? We need to find a way to calculate this when we consider these types of partnerships. Nathan should be tracking his time for these other efforts. In addition, we should consider opportunity cost—if he is doing these things, does that mean we do less on our end?

This also has implications for what SPA is—we have never done this type of work. It makes sense financially, but it is a shift for our organization. We need to think about mission-consistency in addition to financial implications.

HiTOP Convention

This collaboration has a tighter margin for revenue. It is unclear how many people are going to attend, as there is no precedent. We can cut costs; this is more about Nathan's time more than financial exposure. Staff are doing the administrative side.

Len shared that the convention had about 75 people last time, but that was 4 years ago. We also do not know how many people will attend from SPA. We could give discounts to SPA members and vice versa to attend both. There is not a lot of additional risk for SPA in doing this. The biggest risk is about \$6500 if the hotel block is not filled Sunday night.

For HiTOP there is also some additional time built in for Nathan to help them in becoming more established as an organization. Some expressed some discomfort around this; since there is limited projected profit and there is some financial exposure, we may want to remove this from the contract.

6. 2023 Strategic Framework Report and 2024 Strategy Discussion

Overview of Tactics from 2023

Nathan discussed progress on various tactics. It has been easier to achieve various goals when there was already a system/structure in place. We should consider whether some of our goals are the right strategies. For instance, we may want to put more effort into finances, MA membership, building CE content, member experiences, etc. in 2024.

Utility of Assessment Grant Update

There was an open call for applications. We received 18 applications; 3 were asked for an R&R and the committee then evaluated them in August. The committee found that all three were good interesting projects, but felt none fulfilled the mission of the grant. The amount of money may not really be enough to do the job. The committee ultimately decided not to fund any of the proposal.

One proposal was about creating a network of researchers and clinicians for assessment work. The committee did not feel as if this fulfilled the research mission of the grant, but thought it was an interesting concept that SPA might want to pursue. The EC wanted some additional information from the PI before moving forward with a full board discussion. Nathan will be coming back with more information for the full board.

The board discussed the optics of not funding a project. In addition, we discussed the amount of money that could be necessary to complete this type of work, as the committee believed some projects could have been successful with more resources. We will want to be clear in our messaging—that we learned through this process that the amount of money offered was not sufficient and that we will be revisiting this goal.

The board discussed allocating more funds to this project. The \$35k was chosen because of the existing funds tied to this goal. However, it is possible for the board to supplement this. The committee could consider how much money would be necessary, and the board should consider whether we want to make this a priority and supplement the funds. Of note, we would put out a new call for proposals if we increased the amount of funding.

Finally, the board noted that we may be able to use these funds for an initiative beyond a research grant, and we should consider other ways to use the funds or meet this strategic goal.

2024 Strategic Goals

The board discussed strategic goals for 2024 and chose the following priorities:

- Build a diverse profession by increasing students & professionals interested in personality assessment.
- Engage & collaborate with members and other Societies.
- Define the utility & impact of personality assessment and communicate its value.
- Become a comprehensive resource for personality assessment
 - o This is vague and broad, but is very important. We just need to be more clear about what this means and what the deliverables would be.

The board discussed the need for more accountability and clear responsibility attached to various tactics. We should also finish things that we have started. Finally, the board discussed the need to be clear about how our financial plan and strategic goals are connected. Not every tactic has to have a return on investment but we need to be careful to balance goals that do not have an ROI and those that do.

7. Consent Agenda

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

The CE Committee has an initial group of committee members. They had one meeting and oriented to the task of the committee. They will be working out how the committee should function and will be meeting again in December.

c. Master's Level Taskforce Update

Jaime reviewed MA taskforce efforts thus far. They will have a plan in place to present in December.

d. Leadership Development Committee

Kinshasa and Kate's positions are up in December 2024. However, Kinshasa's position needs to be filled by board appointment. It is best to go with a candidate who has already been vetted. The presidential trio met to discuss possible candidates and nominated Matt Yalch.

Motion: To appoint Matthew Yalch for rep at large to replace Kinshasa Bennett in her term. Motion passed unanimously.

e. Student Matters Committee

f. *Journal of Personality Assessment* Report

JPA should be a separate agenda item moving forward instead of being part of the consent agenda. We should consider inviting T&F from time to time as well.

North America is now the third leading continent for submissions, so we are getting more global attention. The journal has a 61% desk rejection rate (it is normally about 40-45%). The journal has only accepted 10 papers in the first six months of the year, but this seems to have picked up in the last couple months. IF has gone down slightly (now 3.4). Tess Neal stepped down as an AE and John Edens came on board. Martin is currently looking for a new co-editor for the statistical applications section. He is considering future special issues on DEISJ, the ICD, and perhaps evidence based assessment.

g. Diversity and Social Justice Update

There are currently 12 people on the committee. Ksera noted it has been difficult to maintain engagement with the committee.

They want to do a special issue with JPA and will be inviting Martin to a meeting so they can discuss with him how to go about doing this.

Ksera encouraged the board to consider the MAC conference.

Ksera and Jenny (co-chair) started a "Tea Time" video series and wants to put these on the website. The board needs to watch the video and then we can decide if we are comfortable with it being on the website.

h. SPAGS Update

There is limited engagement from students with SPAGS. They did not get enough people to join the SPAGS board and they had to reach out to people and ask them to serve. There are perks to being on the board, but the \$450 is not covering the costs associated with the convention.

The board discussed the prospect of having a SPAGS representative on every committee or every interest group. There has been movement towards that in an unofficial way. SPAGS proposed this to be a standing rule that is managed by the committees. Notably, we want to ensure that this is not a burden to students. In addition, this rule may not apply to some committees, such as the finance committee where students can serve but need to be able to contribute financial knowledge to be a member.

The student to early career pipeline was discussed. We need to provide bigger benefits to students and devote funds and energy towards converting SPAGS members to early career members. The prospect of targeting interns was discussed, as this is a heavy turn over time. For instance, we could have internship or post-doc specific programming.

SPAGS is interested in restarting a mentorship program for students. Benefits and challenges were discussed. Ultimately, the board decided it was valuable to try out a lower effort mentorship match program that would not require a substantial amount of time from either students or full members. If we choose to have a mentorship theme at the convention, announcing the start of this mentorship program could be on theme as well.

Finally, the prospect of changing the amounts for student scholarships was discussed. This would mean funding fewer students and the program committee believed it would be better to fund more students with a lower amount than to provide more money to a smaller number of students.

i. Interest groups

Most (75%) interest groups have planned a CE event for the convention because they now have program expectations (something at the convention, a CE educational program, and 1-2 meetups outside of the convention). The Forensic and Education/Training groups had social hours.

APA Division 12 (Society for Clinical Psychology) is going to have a convention in Atlanta in February. They are interested in some assessment topics being covered. The deadline for submissions is Oct 31. There will be an assessment track, tracks for students, early, mid, and late career. We could consider a membership swap for convention registration.

Motion: To approve the consent agenda, including Len's award recommendations. Motion passed unanimously.

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

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



December 2023 Board of Trustees Meeting
Zoom Meeting
December 5th and 7th, 2023

Present: Jill Clemence (President), Jaime Anderson (Secretary), Nicole Cain (Representative-at-large), Abby Mulay (Representative-at-large), Kate Thomas (Representative-at-large), Matt Yalch (Representative-at-large), Sarah Gottlieb (SPAGS President-Elect), Ksera Dyette (DISJ Committee Chair), Nathan Victoria (Executive Director)

Partial Attendance: Jan Kamphuis (President-Elect), Martin Sellbom (JPA Editor), Jordan Wright (APA Liaison), Tayla Lee (Treasurer), Katie Lewis (Representative-at-large), Essie Asan (SPAGS President), Len Simms (Representative-at-large), Adam Natoli (SPA Member)

Absent: None

8. Call to Order and Quorum

Jill called the meeting to order. She welcomed Sarah and Matt as new board members and the board introduced themselves. Jill reviewed the agenda for our December meeting. She recognized that this was our first meeting without John McNulty and the board reflected on this loss.

9. Taskforce/Committee Updates

Board Evaluation Process

The board needs a way to evaluate our own performance. Jill found a sample matrix, but the board should develop our own guidelines. The board discussed the sample and ways to apply the rubric to what the SPA board does. It is important to ensure that we are evaluating what we do as a board (e.g., completing tasks assigned) and what our expectations are (e.g., SPA event participation). This is largely for self-reflection and building expectations for board participation. However, it will also be important to consider how we can use this for accountability (e.g., this provides a basis for intervention if a board member is not meeting expectations).

Master's Level Taskforce

Jaime reviewed the proposal for MA level membership, which proposed a separate membership designation within the "full member" category. The board discussed the costs and benefits of having a separate category for MA members—e.g., being able to charge differently vs. creating a membership hierarchy. After discussion of potential scope of practice issues, APA's accreditation process, inevitable cultural changes at SPA, and international standards for practice, the majority of

the board supported expanding professional membership to include those with an MA, rather than two separate (doctoral vs. MA) membership categories.

Jaime will rework the proposal, with a plan to launch a membership vote for a change to the bylaws around the time of the convention.

SPA Policies and Procedures

Len discussed the policies and procedures proposal for the awards committee. There were several areas for board discussion.

The board discussed the make-up of the committee and whether someone from the presidential trio should serve on the committee, particularly given that we are giving much more autonomy to the committee to make decisions. The board felt most comfortable if we required one board member (not necessarily a member of the presidential trio) to serve on this committee.

In addition, the board discussed the way in which candidates are rated. The committee proposed rank ordering the candidates (rather than rating using a Likert scale), which brought about questions related to how to aggregate rank order voting. Sarah noted she may have some resources to aid this process.

The board discussed the issue of winning or being nominated for an award when deceased. Most agreed that someone should be living when nominated, but that there should not be a rule that a deceased person cannot win if they pass away in the time between nomination and winning the award.

Finally, the board discussed carry over of nominations. For most awards, the board felt as if nominations should be carried over until a person is no longer eligible (e.g., after 10 years post-grad for the Beck award, etc.), and nominators would have the opportunity to update nomination materials. This would mean some individuals would be carried over indefinitely (e.g., the service award or Klopfer award). However, there was discussion about what to do if this list becomes unwieldy. We should have a process for how to manage when a list becomes too long (e.g., top xx number of people get carried over to the following year).

Len will continue to rework this policy document and return to the board with updates at the next board meeting.

Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing

Jordan discussed APA's taskforce on standards for educational and psychological testing. Would SPA like to nominate someone for this taskforce—it would be good for SPA to have some influence. Jordan self-nominated to be a co-chair, but SPA could also nominate him in support of that. We could also see if Michael Cohen (who had contacted the board about child assessment guidelines) would be interested in being nominated as a taskforce member.

10. 2024 Strategic Framework Discussion and Approval

Overview of Strategies for 2024 and Corresponding Tactics

Nathan reviewed the timeline for various ongoing strategies, as well as potential strategies for 2024.

a. Assessment Practice Research Network

One of the proposals for our utility of assessment grant was for the Assessment Practice Research Network (APRN). Although the taskforce opted not to fund it as a research grant, they believed there may be merit in the idea for SPA more broadly. Adam Natoli was invited to discuss this proposal. He discussed the potential benefit to members, including recruitment for membership in the network through SPA. He discussed goals of the group, how SPA funding could be used, and his plan for securing funding elsewhere.

The board later discussed this proposal in the context of the 2024 budget. Board members posed numerous questions about the proposal—how open is the network, what is SPA’s relationship with the network, what would SPA funding be used for, etc. There was concern about using funds and staff time for members’ independent projects without clear ties to how this benefits SPA.

The board requested a formal proposal to SPA that clearly delineates the relationship with SPA, the benefit to SPA, and specific usage of funding and/or staff time. The board showed enthusiasm for the project, but not the process for approving funding without a formal proposal to the board.

b. Community voices

The board discussed an idea to record a series of videos called “Community Voices” to elevate the personal impact of assessment. Although our goal to fund a research study was unsuccessful, sharing how assessment has been important in the lives of clients or in terms of clinical practice for the clinician could be another way to address our utility of assessment goal. The board discussed a “teaser” of having a few videos by convention time.

c. Utility of Assessment Grant

The board discussed next steps for the utility of assessment funds, since the taskforce recommended funding for no submitted projects. Nathan tentatively proposed an additional \$50,000 for the 2024 budget to put towards this grant, since there was concern the original amount was not enough for a project of this magnitude. However, the board was unenthusiastic about putting so much additional money towards funding one research project. That being said, we will need to find a way to appropriately address this decision with the membership.

d. Mentorship program

SPA is piloting a mentorship program at the convention. We received more interest in members who were willing to serve as mentors than student members who wanted to be mentees. There is funding set aside for those who get matched to have lunch together at the convention.

Jan will mention this program in the presidential address and it will also be mentioned in the introduction of the Jack Graham Mentorship award.

e. Membership Engagement

The board discussed the process for surveying membership, including how to best receive feedback (e.g., multiple mini surveys over time). The board also discussed ways to better engage members at the convention—such as stickers, having a lounge, offering headshots, or other programming.

Finally, the board discussed membership retention and converting non-members to members at the convention. Why do some individuals attend the SPA convention but choose not to join?

f. CE Committee

We will soon be beta testing the online learning platform by inviting some members to test the system and purchase CE granting webinars at a lower cost.

The board discussed the Expert Insights conference. When you account for staff time, there probably was not a positive budget, but our overall revenue (not including staff time) was around \$7,300. There were 71 registered attendees (27 attended Thursday for free, 8 were presenters, and the rest were paid attendees). The board discussed reasons why the event was not more successful—including timing, marketing, and how the topics/presenters were chosen.

Despite having 71 registrants, live attendance was fairly minimal, and there was little board participation. This led to disappointment for some presenters. The board discussed format of the sessions (webinars vs. interactive). Some expressed reluctance to try the conference again given limited success and engagement.

We should consider how much our membership would value us continuing to do this conference again, and also consider metrics we want for determining its future—e.g., revenue, number of attendees, etc. An Expert Insights 2024 is proposed for next year's budget. Despite some hesitation, the board generally felt as if it would be beneficial to try this again—it was essentially net neutral and we have learned a lot from this year's experience in terms of marketing, scheduling, and format.

g. Partnerships

Nathan discussed continuing to seek out partnerships for SPA (similar to those we have built in the past with APLS, HiTOP, the MMPI Symposium, etc.). He is proposing \$25,000 towards these efforts (marketing, travel to other conferences, etc.). The board discussed the value in having SPA members (or board members) attend other relevant conferences in order to expand our reach. This would address our goals to become an indispensable resource for personality assessment—we need to be reaching out to other organizations and make our expertise known.

Motion: To approve the proposed 2024 tactics. The motion passed 10-0-0.

11. SPA Financial Conversation

Tayla introduced the agenda and goals for our financial conversation. The finance committee has been working to create an additional layer of oversight, so they reviewed budget documents prior to the board meeting.

2023 Budget to Actual Update

Nathan reviewed the 2023 budget. We are currently doing well, in line with the budget (and a little better).

2024 Budget Discussion & Approval

There are some areas of the proposed budget that we need to revisit in March (e.g., APRN) but for the purpose of approving the budget right now, we took some items out that we are unsure about funding. We will revisit the budget again once we also have conference numbers and a better idea of how 2024 will look.

The budget proposed a deficit of around \$208,515. This is 90k less than last year as well, which means we are moving in the right direction.

Motion: To approve the 2024 budget. The motion passed 10-0-0.

SPA Financial Planning

Tayla walked through our financial planning document. Of note, this exercise not about specific projections, but is about setting longer term goals and expectations for our financial position. We have set a fairly aggressive goal for 2024, which includes lowering convention spending and increasing revenue through convention and membership. Notably, there is a need to track our success metrics better.

The board discussed the process of financial decision making, such as setting longer term goals of where we want to be and considering spending and potential revenue in terms of how this shapes our financial future.

The board discussed staffing and a salary reduction for a staff member. Nathan has already discussed this with the staff member. Nathan and the board will continue to explore staffing options moving forward.

12. Executive Director Evaluation

Nathan briefly reviewed his self-evaluation with the board. Following Nathan's departure, the board discussed Nathan's 2023 performance evaluation, including strengths and areas for improvement. The executive committee will work to provide feedback to Nathan.

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

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