

SOCIETY FOR PERSONALITY ASSESSMENT

March Board of Trustees Meeting March 9th and 10th, 2022 Chicago, IL

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

Partial Attendance: Jordan Wright (APA Liaison), Callie Jowers (SPAGS President Elect)

Absent: None

I. Call to Order and Quorum

Joni called the meeting to order.

II. APA Update

Jordan Wright joined the meeting briefly to provide an update on APA. Currently, APA has four boards (Education, Practice, Science, and Public Interest). There is a proposal to add a 5th Applied Psychology board, which would include those psychologists who are unlicensed but engaged in some level of applied practice (e.g., industrial/organizational psychology, sports psychology). The proposal makes the argument that applied assessment is one of the areas that separates them from the other boards; therefore, this may be an area in which SPA will want to weigh at some point. There is a question of whether this should be separate or folder into the broader assessment landscape.

Jordan also provided an update on the APA accreditation of MA programs. APA will likely be accepting applications in the Fall and may accredit programs as early as next Spring, though it remains somewhat unclear what this will look like.

A taskforce is going to completely redesign the competencies at the doctoral level. They have decided 1) they will be rooted in social justice and diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) and that 2) they will take an overly inclusive approach in designing the content of these competencies. They are doing listening tours with stakeholders (e.g., training boards, major societies, SPA, etc.). We should consider what DI means when it comes to assessment—the diversity and social justice (DSJ) committee could be helpful here. More broadly, we have to consider what we want to see in these competencies. Are there things we need to maintain from the current competencies? What has been missing?

A taskforce developed competencies at the MA level, but stopped until the doctoral competencies were completed because it was difficult to differentiate between them. They are working on creating a title for these individuals practicing at the MA level and also working to figure out what the scope of practice is supposed to be. States do not really have to follow scope of practice recommendations, but they tend to when these standards exist. Jordan believes there are two neuropsychologists on that taskforce, but he is not sure if there are general assessment experts (he will look and check back). We should consider sending the taskforce thoughts and ideas (they will accept it even if comments are not being solicited).

The board asked Jordan what we could do to be helpful? Jordan noted that the best thing would be for him to know what is happening within SPA.

II. Approval of the December 2021 Board Meeting Minutes

MOTION: To approve the December 2021 Board Meeting Minutes.

John mentioned one typo.

Motion passed.

III. Annual Convention Update

Nathan reviewed the submissions and approval rate for the convention. We had more than last year, but not as many as 2020. There was some feedback that the call due date was too early, so we will be two weeks later for the next convention.

We have 231 in-person registrants and 81 virtual attendees. This includes 96 first time attendees in-person and 22 first time attendees virtual. We are about 40% down from our previous in-person convention rates.

There are 8 workshops that agreed to do their workshop virtually. We expect some additional revenue from this. It was noted that virtual workshops are going to be a very important revenue source in the future.

Anita noted that we are one of the only societies that have the president elect work as the program chair. We should revisit the roles that our board members play— we may be able to appoint a program chair outside of the board. This would also provide additional opportunities to our membership for leadership in SPA, particularly at the more junior levels. This is a good opportunity to learn how a convention comes together and the president elect will still oversee this. The bylaws say she can designate someone. So next year, we will do a call for a program chair.

The current call for the program committee asks whether or not they would be interested in chairing the committee. So we will have a list of names for Anita to choose from this call (which will close next Sunday). We should make sure all areas are represented on the committee (students, diversity committee, membership committee).

IV. Conflict of Interest/Board Operations Discussion

There was a “personal interest policy” document developed around 2009. We should update that. The presidential trio has talked to Peter about these issues. Certainly, we need to report conflicts related to financial benefits and affiliations with a particular practice. We should decide how we want to work around conflicts as a board.

We do not want to appear externally as if the board has conflicts. Perhaps it would be appropriate for us to have conflicts be visible either in voting for board members or by listing conflicts publicly somewhere (e.g., the website). It may be good if public facing documents show our various affiliations.

Financial conflicts are fairly easy to identify. But what would constitute a non-financial conflict? One example would be being a member of two different boards simultaneously.

This probably will not change how we really do anything, but we need to cover our bases legally and ensure we are properly acknowledging conflicts.

Nathan will send the progress that has been made on this from the policies and procedures committee. Should we acknowledge that we have a fiduciary responsibility to the society if you are an elected board member? This does not hurt to make this more explicit for both new board members and also to the membership of SPA. This can apply to our committees too. For instance, the program committee should not have people with a conflict.

Board Operations

We should continue to consider where SPA is moving in the future, including how staff can support the goals of SPA. Board culture commitments help, but it may be helpful to have more guidance on who is responsible for what. It is important to be open when we think there are conflicts and attempt to address them. It was noted that conflicts over roles will continue until we have better clarity in our roles as board members—e.g., what falls under staff responsibilities and what is our role as a board? We need to get more comfortable in our shifting roles and should be openly discussing these issues when they arise.

The board discussed where we go when we have concerns about implementation. Nathan has discussed giving updates on working towards goals, but where is the board supposed to go with concerns or need for clarification? In other organizations there is a personnel committee, though that may be more than what a society of our size needs. However, we may want to determine a person who we are supposed to go to with concerns.

As we continue to evolve as a board, we should be explicit about the roles of the ED, the core functions of the CEO, and what goals towards bonuses mean.

It was noted that we are still fairly early in the process of figuring this out and we need clarity in all of our roles. We did not have a set process for onboarding an ED and we did not have a formal process for onboarding new board members. We should do better to formalize these processes. It was suggested that we include standard operating procedures (SOPs) in our policies and procedures manual. For instance, we have been working towards creating SOPs for ED evaluation.

We need oversight as a board, but it is also possible that we could be more efficient and strategic—are we attempting to do too many operational tasks? This is a very old organization that has been run a particular way for generations. We are making large shifts in how the board perceives itself, and this is not a light switch—it is a process and sometimes this is a tight place to be.

One area that will be important is continuity—someone should be able to be onboarded and know what to do in their role. In addition, we need accountability in both directions (between staff and the board and also between board members).

Board members noted they are not always sure what staff are doing; however, it was also noted that in an ED model the board does not need to know about daily operations of staff, as the ED is in charge of staff. If the ED is not properly managing staff, that is a different issue with the ED's performance. This goes back to the larger question of whether or not SPA is large enough to have this structure and where the board wants to fall on the operational/strategic spectrum. We are continuing to figure this out.

There are different models for how we want to operate, and we can decide on this moving forward. Since Nathan's contract is up in 9 months, we need to think about the best way forward. Part of our plan is to grow the organization, and it will be difficult to do that without an ED. We have had a lot of growth and a lot of changes, and now we have to decide if we want to continue moving forward and it seems like we are unsure of whether we want to move forward with this path.

The context here is also important—when we hired Nathan, we did not anticipate a pandemic. Having an ED was a lifesaver for SPA during this process. So many things completely changed because of this, and we do not have a good sense of what having an ED looks like without covid.

In addition, this also comes down to finances—can we afford to do this and sustain this model? It seems like a pretty short amount of time to know whether or not this is working out. Paul noted that it is an experiment and we can afford it currently, but we need to turn things around in the future because it is not sustainable longer term. The board has to determine the financial cutoff for this experiment.

It was noted that for this experiment to work, we as a board have to trust to let go and allow the ED to do his job. We discussed ways to ensure that this was happening—how do we measure or ensure trust? Historically, the SPA board has been heavily involved in operations, but it is difficult to move forward if we do not de-centralize leadership and trust committees/staff/sub-committees to do their jobs.

The board discussed ways in which the board could improve their relationships—with one another and working with the ED. Board members noted that some of this tension seems tied to our movement away from operations and towards being a strategic board. We as a board need to determine whether or not we want to continue moving in that direction.

V. Taskforce/Committee Updates

Presidential Update

SPA Exchange:

Joni has an interest in creating a task force for reviving the SPA exchange/SPA newsletter. The board needs to approve, and we can create a taskforce to restart this endeavor. Various facets of SPA should be represented (e.g., education, DEI, etc.). The exchange would be a good place for pieces that are inappropriate for JPA, but relevant to SPA. Interest group leaders could write a column as well.

Taylor and Francis is contractually obligated to print copies, but we could let members decide whether they want a print or digital copy of the exchange.

Martin and Jill volunteered to be on the taskforce. We should also do an open call for members to join the taskforce. Becoming editor of the exchange could be a good opportunity for an early career member to get involved. The board also discussed having a structure of a senior and junior editor similar to the interest groups. Christina has started working on an overview of what it could look like and then we can make an open call for the taskforce. The board will receive an update by the June meeting, and we can try to have a newsletter by December or January.

Student Support:

Joni discussed with Jenn and Callie ways that we could support SPAGS. Callie will come to the meeting tomorrow for continuity. One thing that has been discussed frequently is the idea of a mentorship program, which we may be able to handle now with staff. Another initiative is an internship database.

Integration between the board and SPAGS could be improved. There are often things that are happening in the full board that SPAGS does not have much awareness of. It would be helpful to have a bit more integration in a more formal way. A board member suggested working from our broader strategic plan and having SPAGS operate within that plan as well. Another suggestion was for board members to take turns coming to SPAGS meetings so that SPAGS members get to know the board.

SPAGS is trying to get more membership involvement (the board members make up the committees). They want to try to promote engagement, including calls from SPAGS membership to be on student committees, etc.

Leadership Development Committee

John reviewed the leadership development committee. This committee includes the presidential trio, the SPAGS past president, the DSJ chair, and another 6 rotating members.

There was only one person to submit materials for secretary and treasurer, so they reviewed the representative at large candidates. Nobody else wanted to run for secretary, but one person was added to the ballot for treasurer. They had 12 rep candidates and narrowed it down to 9. The committee will interview the top 9 to narrow it down to 6.

We agreed to change the board term to a Jan 1 – Dec 31 term. When do we want to do this?

MOTION: The change to a January 1 through December 31 operating year be implemented immediately. Consequently, the newly elected Board members would assume

their responsibilities on January 1, 2023. Current Board members' terms that would have ended on August 31, 2022 or 2023 would be extended by four months.

Motion passed.

Board members questioned how we would discuss with candidates that two of the terms are 2 years and 2 of them are 3 years. The 2 year terms are filling a vacancy when Ron and Jill complete their previous foundation terms. The committee asked candidates about their preference for a 2 or 3 year term and decided they will work out who serves a 2 or 3 year term once the board is elected based on board member preference.

Nathan has been working on a document to onboard new board members. We could do breakout rooms to onboard people and let them meet with their replacement in the December board meeting.

Would we want to bring them to the September meeting? It makes sense to have the new board there in September for onboarding, but there is a huge cost (over \$10,000). It also means they essentially start 4 months early. We can continue to think about this and make a final decision in the June meeting. We should do something as early as September to onboard them, but we may be able to wait to include them in board meetings until our virtual December meeting.

Awards Revisions

Len discussed the task force efforts to revise the awards. This is a more final version based on previous board feedback and task force efforts. The taskforce added a new mid-career award and made Exner a research grant. Distinguished service removed the academic contribution in its description. Mid career does not have a name, so the board should decide that. Beck was extended to 10 years.

We should be descriptive in the name of the awards. For instance, the Beck award should include "Early Career" in the title. This is less important for the lifetime achievement, but may be helpful for early career and mid-career awards.

The committee will work on the awards packages and creating a bit more continuity across them.

MOTION: To approve the five awards as modified.

Motion passed.

MOTION: To make the Exner award a grant mechanism.

Motion passed.

The committee discussed the idea of the Gene Nebel award—for those who do a service to SPA. The board felt this should not be a formal award, but we can still formally honor individuals who are very helpful to SPA as a board. This can be spontaneous, which is what we did with Gene originally.

SPA Policies and Procedures Revision Taskforce

We need to figure out what we need in our policies and procedures. Nathan reviewed the timeline for this committee. The manual is currently an operational manual and not so much of a policies and procedures manual. Several issues for this manual were discussed.

Do we need a code of ethics for SPA? Though we should have a code of conduct, the board did not feel as if an independent code of ethics was necessary. We can use the APA ethics code as a default for those who do not practice within their own jurisdiction's ethics codes. Nonetheless, it may be helpful to review what a business code of ethics would look like to determine whether there are important areas not covered by APA.

We should work to have board role and committee descriptions. Many of these roles are pulled from the bylaws. Committees need to have terms and guidelines.

The board needs to decide whether we need an ED, and what a transition from ED to ED looks like.

In addition, we need policies related to finances. For instance, the treasurer should have involvement in signing off on expenditures over a certain level, there should be rules about who can use the credit card, etc. The treasurer should not need to sign off on every purchase, but should have some level of control and oversight. It used to be that treasurer had to sign off on expenditures over \$500, but we do not have that policy anymore. Currently, Paul gets quarterly reports. Some organizations make you also show you sought out multiple bids for vendors. Nathan thinks we are too small for that, but will make sure we are not required to do that as a C3.

Fundraising—in most boards, there is an expectation that we contribute financially to the organization. This would be a shift, but we should think about building that expectation into our culture. Part of this is being able to say that 100% of the board has contributed to SPA, so this is about participation rather than the value amount.

Paul, Ron, Anita, Ksera, and Lindsay volunteered to assist with building a policies and procedures manual. The board will see all of these before they are finalized.

Advocacy

Joni spoke with Virginia and Jordan about an advocacy committee. They drew up some guidelines. Having a committee would make this more formalized and could help maintain continuity. This is also in line with our membership requests for more involvement/advocacy.

Jordan and Virginia should help guide what we do with this because they have played these roles before. There needs to be more clarification on the advocacy committee vs. the liaisons. There are 4 APA directorates where we would want to have a liaison, but will that be the whole committee? Or will there be a broader committee that they report to? How will we keep them involved with the board? Are there budget considerations here?

The advocacy committee should also be connected to the other committees, to make sure we are not doing double the work that we need to do.

The chair of the committee could invite liaisons to the board meeting on an as needed basis. We could designate a board member to be in charge of advocacy. Previously we were going to have the committee chair be ex officio, but we could also make them direct committee assignments. If something is important to us, a board member should be in charge—but this is a matter of bandwidth for the board as well and the number of committee assignments.

MOTION: To approve this document for creating the advocacy committee. The chair will be an elected board member.

Motion passed.

JPA Report

JPA is doing well with submissions, with 425 original submissions and an acceptance rate of around 25%. Submissions come from across the world, though the U.S. dominates the number of submissions. Martin wanted to improve the number of submissions from non-western countries. They have been fairly successful in that.

Financially, the journal is doing well. Everyone is getting a pay increase because T&F gave us more money and the new editorial assistant is going to cost less. Martin has not had to get money from SPA to support the new AE he added a couple of years ago.

Martin's contract will be up in June 2023, and he has not decided whether he would like to request to stay on. However, he was wondering if there is a procedure for doing this formally? Nathan will discuss with the board how we want to handle that process.

Martin discussed a new option to submit registered reports to JPA. Board members asked whether there would be a different letter for reviewers for a registered report? T&F created a template for this and it is supposed to be different. No one really knows exactly how this is supposed to look because it is so new, but we will want to make sure that there are some sort of criteria/direction for reviewers.

Publisher's report: Martin reviewed the publication report. Most of the most frequently downloaded articles are open access, not surprisingly. He discussed article download rates. T&F has made attempts to do more outreach internationally—particularly Asian or African countries.

We need to promote our content better than we currently do. This may be a good committee for students or early career members to work with Martin to select articles that should be promoted more heavily on social media.

Other Updates

Student matters committee

Nicole received a concern about requiring volunteering and social media posting for travel award recipients. It was not clear in the application that this would be part of the process, so this should be made more clear. The board was unenthusiastic about the requirement for a social media posting, but generally felt a requirement to volunteer was fine if this was made clear in the application.

We should do something to address the issue this year because some people are unhappy. Nicole will send an email apologizing for the lack of clarity in this process.

The board discussed what this process should look like moving forward. It is also a problem that students have to cover their costs upfront. This is difficult because we need to ensure recipients actually attend the conference. One option is to receive checks at the convention when they arrive.

The board discussed the requirement for volunteering. Ultimately, the board decided that the student award should include a night in the conference hotel. The early career award and diversity award includes one night in the conference hotel plus the accompanying funds. In addition, everyone has the opportunity to volunteer at the convention for an incentive (either reduce registration or perhaps a gift card) separate from travel awards.

The board also discussed the increased workload for the student matters committee. Nicole currently handles all travel grants and research grants (which was just expanded with the change to the Exner award). These tasks should likely be handled by two board members, and the committee should be renamed as it is not exclusively related to student matters.

Overall, the board should consider the division of responsibility among board members (e.g., currently the CE chair does far less than the student matters chair). Some committees may grow, like the CE committee, but we want to ensure that work is divided more evenly. We should consider which committees require direct board oversight (e.g., those that involve finances). In addition, we should consider board member skill and interest when assigning committees.

We should also have a process where a task can be assigned based on current board member workloads. Perhaps the presidential trio can assign tasks and make sure that the workload is equal.

Finally, it was noted that the DEI committee may want to take on responses to social crises. This has come up multiple times in the last few years, and we do not have a good formal process for creating board responses in these situations.

ED/CEO Update

Nathan reviewed progress related to the strategic plan.

Joni discussed her idea regarding a systematic review of the utility of assessment literature. The idea would be to put some money towards this because it would be a very time consuming job to do. We would need to create a group of people who would be interested in being part of it. We have to have content and research experts do this (it cannot be staff).

Joni would be uniquely suited to do this, but would need paid students, and would potentially need paid time for herself as well. This is very resource intensive. The board discussed the mechanism to fund this type of effort. The board discussed an open call so as not to appear we are giving financial benefit to a board member; however, we also need to be mindful that this was Joni's intellectual idea—and she should determine whether she wants to lead this project.

If the board feels this kind of effort would be beneficial, we can identify funds for this type of purpose. We could have a process to review competitive grants in this area. Regardless, we should be transparent about the process.

This should be part of our long range financial plan—how do we want to support research in this area? This gives a focus of fundraising as well—research funding, grants, awards, etc. The previous utility of assessment money would be seed money. And the utility of assessment can be this year's focus.

We need to consider what the amount of funds will be. The board discussed a wide range of funding for similar projects, ranging from \$10,000 to \$500,000.

MOTION: The board sets aside funds (50-100k) per year for research or literature reviews that would promote the science and practice of psychological assessment. The board can designate the topics that the funds can be used for.

Motion amended below.

We can choose the first topic to be utility of the assessment. However, this has huge financial implications. We have to move towards a sustainable budget and prioritize what we want to do. The current deficit is not sustainable, and this is a good example—we cannot afford this proposal because of the long range budget that we are currently in. We cannot wait for all initiatives until we have that fixed, but we should certainly be cautious about what we spend.

Nathan asked if there is a point in the reserves that we would be uncomfortable spending. Our reserves have grown 200k. We will draw from the reserves this year, but we have not had to yet. We have never drawn down more than \$40-50k and we made \$106k net in 2021.

If we set our reserve not to drop down from a million (for instance), we would be able to do Ron's proposal until the end of 2023. We need to decide how long we can wait to see some turn around—and is there a stop? Paul thinks we should have a hard stop for our reserves. Reserves are not the rainy day fund, but can be seen as a strategic investment fund.

How do we make up the revenue shortfalls here? We have T&F, membership, convention, CEs, etc. There are not many revenue options for us, so we should attempt to better understand the scale of our future revenue. We made \$55,000 in workshops last year, but we typically make only around \$37,000 and we do not charge market value. This is something we should consider.

The board discussed adapting the previous motion to use the remainder of the utility of assessment funds. These funds are not currently included in the budget (because they are set aside for this purpose), so they do not change the overall budget picture.

MOTION: The board sets aside funds from the Utility of Assessment Fund for research or systematic literature reviews that would promote the science and practice of psychological assessment.

Motion passed.

MOTION: To approve the updated budget based on the previous motion.

Motion passed.

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

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

SOCIETY FOR PERSONALITY ASSESSMENT

April Board of Trustees Meeting

April 12, 2022

Virtual Meeting

Present: John McNulty (Past President), Jaime Anderson (Secretary), Paul Arbisi (Treasurer), Len Simms (Representative-at-Large), Callie Jowers (SPAGS President), Jill Clemence (Representative-at-Large), Jan Kamphuis (Representative-at-Large), Ksera Dyette (Diversity and Social Justice Committee Chair), Nicole Cain (Representative-at-Large), Ron Ganellen (Representative-at-Large), Martin Sellbom (JPA Editor)

Partial Attendance: Nathan Victoria (Executive Director), Joni Mihura (President)

Absent: Lindsay Ingram (Representative-at-Large)

I. Call to Order and Quorum

Joni called the meeting to order and asked John to begin with a review of the issues for discussion.

John noted there were two issues: board capture and conflicts of interest. Paul suggested the board go into executive session as we are discussing a personnel issue. Nathan was asked to leave the meeting.

The board entered executive session and remained in executive session for the majority of the meeting.

Nathan was invited back into the meeting. The board informed Nathan that Joni had resigned in executive session and we discussed our tentative plan moving forward according to the bylaws (i.e., that current board members should fill the president and president-elect positions).

Respectfully submitted,

Jaime L. Anderson, Ph.D.

Secretary

SOCIETY FOR PERSONALITY ASSESSMENT

May Board of Trustees Meeting

May 17, 2022

Virtual Meeting

Present: John McNulty (Past President), Jaime Anderson (Secretary), Paul Arbisi (Treasurer), Lindsay Ingram (Representative-at-Large), Callie Jowers (SPAGS President), Jill Clemence (Representative-at-Large), Jan Kamphuis (Representative-at-Large), Nathan Victoria (Executive Director), Ksera Dyette (Diversity and Social Justice Committee Chair), Nicole Cain (Representative-at-Large), Ron Ganellen (Representative-at-Large), Martin Sellbom (JPA Editor)

Partial Attendance: None

Absent: Len Simms (Representative-at-Large)

I. Call to Order and Quorum

John called the meeting to order.

II. Filling the President and President-Elect Positions

In the last board meeting¹ the board discussed having a special election for the next President Elect, with the term beginning in 2024 (with them serving as ex officio until that time). We also discussed Jill taking on the role as president and Jan taking on the role as president elect, as the bylaws indicate that executive committee vacancies should be filled with current board members.

It seems unnecessary to have the next president-elect serve as ex-officio since it increases their term to 7 years. Therefore, the board opted not to pursue a special election this year and will remain on the current election schedule. The next election for president-elect will take place next year as scheduled.

The board discussed potential reactions to this plan from membership. Though several board members were contacted by membership, it was largely asking general information about what happened and what will occur moving forward. There was some feedback from members about board members serving in positions for which they were not elected. However, there have been minimal concerns from membership and this plan is consistent with the bylaws. We will need to make sure that the membership knows that this is what the bylaws state we should do.

In addition, we want membership to know that the board is resilient. Though we have lost board members recently, this will not make SPA fall apart. SPA continues to be in good standing despite these losses.

¹ The board entered executive session for the majority of this meeting. Therefore, the details of these proceedings are confidential.

We should highlight that Jan and Jill are both doing a service to SPA by stepping in to these roles unexpectedly. We also want to make sure that they have an opportunity to share their visions for SPA. Jill plans to highlight that the presidential vision/goal is the strategic plan. In addition, she plans to highlight that we are solvent, we have funds, we are investing in our future, and we have grown our membership despite COVID and having a remote convention. We have done very successful things and we should not let other issues distract the work of SPA. Jill plans to draft a letter to the membership and will send it to the board for comment to make sure that we are all working towards one shared goal (tied to the strategic plan).

Motion: For Jill and Jan to fill the roles of President and President-Elect for the remainder of these terms (i.e., 4 and 6 years, respectively). Motion passed.

III. SPA Presence at the ISR Congress

Nathan questioned whether it would be helpful to have SPA presence at the International Society of the Rorschach (ISR) convention in Geneva this July. There are several ways this could look—a traditional booth (at \$1,000 or \$500 for a non-profit), an ad in the program (\$1,000), or leaflets in the attendee bags (around \$600).

The booth would include registration, but has the additional cost of travel, meals, etc. Some members believe SPA has become less open to the Rorschach, so this will allow us to discuss what SPA is doing and that we still have a community for the Rorschach. Nathan estimated this would cost around \$4,500.

Callie and Ron will already be in attendance and Jan may attend. Ron indicated he is happy to support and represent SPA in an informal matter. He is also a special section editor for the journal, which is beneficial. Martin questioned whether it would be helpful to have JPA representation there, as there are also rumors that JPA is no longer a place for the Rorschach, which is untrue.

The board supported using marketing funds to do an ad at ISR (either a program ad or flyers).

IV. Preview of the June Meeting Agenda

Nathan discussed the June agenda and asked for feedback.

Ron suggested we move the budget to the first order of business. We need to make sure we have time to discuss the budget moving forward.

The board discussed ways in which the board could improve their relationships—with one another and working with the ED. Board members noted that some of this tension seems tied to our movement away from operations and towards being a strategic board. We as a board need to determine whether or not we want to continue moving in that direction.

V. Election Update

Nathan provided an update on the ongoing election.

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

SOCIETY FOR PERSONALITY ASSESSMENT

June Board of Trustees Meeting

June 7 and 21, 2022

Virtual Meeting

Present: Jill Clemence (President), Jan Kamphuis (President Elect), John McNulty (Past President), Paul Arbisi (Treasurer), Jaime Anderson (Secretary), Lindsay Ingram (Representative-at-Large), Nicole Cain (Representative-at-Large), Callie Jowers (SPAGS President), and Ksera Dyette (Diversity and Social Justice Committee Chair)

Partial Attendance: Nathan Victoria (Executive Director), Ron Ganellen (Representative-at-Large), and Martin Sellbom (JPA Editor), and Len Simms (Representative-at-Large)

Absent: None

I. Call to Order, Quorum, and Agenda Review

Jill called the meeting to order and made opening remarks. She discussed the need to be one voice as a board, despite disagreements. She emphasized the importance of disagreement and discussion. In addition, she highlighted the importance of making sure we all feel as if we have enough information to vote on issues and encouraged us to ask questions before voting.

The board discussed the term “one voice.” Is this about making clear who we are speaking for (ourselves vs. the board)? We should use our judgment here—what is the purpose of expressing the disagreement and is it for the good of SPA? We should also be careful when we vote for something— we should not vote for something and then express disagreement about it outside of the membership. It is ok to vote “no” on things.

Perhaps “one voice” is the wrong term—we do not want to communicate that the board all has the same opinion. We do not want to overcorrect for previous events. We just want to be careful not to become a split board or undermine board decisions.

II. Board Meeting Minutes Approval

Motion: To approve the board meeting minutes for March, April, and May meeting minutes. Motion approved. Yes: 9, No: 0, Abstain: 0.

III. SPA Financial Conversation

a. 2022 Budget to Actual Update

We have some retention benefit from the CARES act for keeping our employees as a small business (14k in additional funds). We are making good money on our webinars.

We will still be in a deficit budget, but there will be some expense reductions from less spending on grants, the convention, etc. Nathan projects a deficit more like 267k instead of 339k.

b. Long Range Financial Projection Conversation

Nathan created a long range financial plan with John, Paul, and Joni last year. He tried to make projections about our budget long term (that we are not in a stable position long-term). They suggested having at least 1 million dollars in the reserve over the next 5 years. We can use this projection as a guideline that will shift as we consider our financial position each year.

Membership Dues

In the projection, Nathan proposed we would raise membership dues every other year and conference registration fees every other year (on opposite years). They did some research on other rates, and we are middle of the road in terms of our fees. It has been 9 years since we last increased the membership dues. We need to decide this soon because we start pro-rating membership fees in August, so we will need to know what the 2023 fee will be.

The board discussed that increasing every other year may be too much, particularly given the state of inflation. Increasing the rates this year may be beneficial, but we may not want to make the decision to increase dues every other year at this point. Nathan noted that we can make those determinations each year and decide not to increase rates in future years.

It was suggested that perhaps we skip raising it this year and emphasize to the members that we made this choice with them in mind—that we are not placing the deficit budget onto the membership and we know that times are hard. We can also make or save money in other ways. Perhaps membership increase can go into effect in a year instead. Several board members noted that they support the increase this year and that the increase is not that much. We can explain why we are making this decision—it has been many years since we had an increase.

It may be beneficial to highlight the value of our membership. We do not want to communicate that we are subsidizing people, but that there is value in this increase based on the new things we are doing with SPA. We can also discuss ways that we are cutting expenses this year in other areas as well.

The journal and the dues are our sources of revenue. We subsidize the convention every year with our investments. We should consider the cost/benefit of increasing membership dues (which would amount to about \$12,000 this year). That being said, we are keeping the increases low and is there a reason not to make this increase?

Paul has not gotten concern about the budget from membership, other than board members highlighting that we should not have a deficit budget for too many years (which we all agree on). However, some other board members have gotten some feedback from members (issues that we have discussed before—why do we have a deficit budget? Is it ok?).

How much should we focus on the narrative? We should be mindful, but we still need to make decisions as a board. We should not be overly influenced by individual comments that we have gotten as individual board members. We could survey membership about their thoughts on the deficit budget—it may be helpful to know what membership is thinking and how many members are really concerned.

We have been running a deficit for a long time if you do not include our investments, but we previously did not really communicate this to membership because there was not a clear budget to share. Part of this is the impact of being more transparent with membership. A town hall may be beneficial—it allows us to explain what is happening with our financial position, and we also get a sense of how much concern there is to the membership by the number of people that attend the meeting.

Motion: To raise the dues as outlined in Nathan's spreadsheet. Yes: 9, No: 0, Abstain: 0

SPA Condo

One point of revenue is that we could sell or lease the SPA condo. Monica is moving, so we do not even have staff that would use the central office. They did some research on selling vs. leasing the condo.

We would only make around \$5,000 a year from leasing the condo. We need some space to store some items, and we can find a better alternative. These funds could instead be in our investment. Nathan will look into what our net proceeds would be from selling the condo. Before making this decision, we need to know what is our tax exposure, and what can we get for it? And then what would we get in investments vs. leasing?

Some of the materials in the office are interesting—Exner's presidential note, JPA archived copies. Should SPA hold onto these or should we try to find another home for these items (e.g., a university).

Fundraising

Staff will present some fundraising activities at the next meeting. This will be a heavy lift for SPA—we don't have a tradition of fundraising, but we need to make better efforts. We could use the anniversary as a starting point.

Having a volunteer voice and not staff would be important so that it is not solely a push from staff. Paul indicated a willingness to serve on a committee for fundraising. Nathan set a goal of \$10,000 for next year. We would reach that if each of our life members gave about \$37 (they don't pay dues to SPA). We can build philanthropy, but we need to think about the right mechanism to make this happen.

The last push for fundraising (for Bruce Smith) we only received around \$2500, which was more than we typically get, but still not much. Maybe we could also highlight the names of those who are donating to SPA. The visibility may help.

We will continue to discuss potential fundraising ideas and the makeup of the committee in the September meeting.

Online Learning Platform

Based on board feedback, we will call it the "E-Learning Center" though there was some support for naming it after Gene Nebel. We could consider selling the naming rights, but we can call it E-Learning Center for now. We were mostly in support of free student access.

The board discussed whether featured lectures should be free to members. This would provide another reason to maintain your membership and it shouldn't really impact conference attendance—people attend in person for lots of other reasons (e.g., networking, CEs, easier to process, etc.).

We are on the higher side for costs. People have not complained about the legal webinar cost, which is the same as what Nathan has proposed and people will get a reduced rate if they become a member. However, some noted we should probably not base these prices off of the JPA special issue, because that is a specific audience. The board discussed finding a happy medium on the cost. We should lower the member rates, but not touch the non-member rates. We just can't have the difference in cost "compel" membership legally.

2027 ISR Congress

Nathan discussed the prospect of hosting the next ISR (International Society of the Rorschach). SPA has not hosted in 25 years and they are intrigued with it being hosted in the U.S. We would be able to name the percentage revenue split (Nathan would propose 70/30). We would look to host it on a college campus. Nathan could put together a budget for what this would look like.

Does staff have the bandwidth for this? Nathan says yes. They said every year it is a net positive event. We would want to make sure we would not lose any money on this. We wouldn't have the same fees if we did it on a college campus—this could be a significant revenue source. Nathan will need to put together some info on the costs and revenue projections.

c. Expense Reduction

The board discussed several avenues for expense reduction in our long-range budget.

Convention

We discussed trimming back some of the costs for the convention (e.g., coffee, etc.).

Grants and Awards

We could reduce the number of scholarships, etc. to equal the amount of fundraising that we do in the future.

Staffing

The budget projection assumes a staffing change in 2026 of around 140k. Part of the thought is looking to 2023 and 2024 to see how we are doing at that point. Our membership is consistent with 2016 and we also have more members now than we did in January (which has never happened before). Maybe the revenue is higher by 2026 that we don't have to trim staff, but if it is not, then removal of staff would be necessary at that point. We are discussing this in a candid manner—we are looking forward and thinking about whether or not we will need to cut staff, and this transparency is important. By 2026 we have a plan to not be in a deficit budget and have a million dollars in reserves—we have never been able to have so much clarity on our financial goals/plans/projections.

IV. Taskforce/Committee Updates

a. Annual Convention Update

Anita Boss, Convention Chair, joined the meeting.

Live-Streaming Component

Nathan put in a request with Marriott and others to basically replicate what we did in Chicago (e.g. featured lectures, etc. in one big room—with one additional room for live streaming). We would like to have a virtual attendance option with select sessions. We will be clear that this is available afterwards as well. We will then be able to re-utilize all of that content in the online learning library. The cost will be significantly cheaper than Chicago (it was around 45k in labor from the hotel). The other option is doing multiple rooms—we could live stream up to 4 rooms for no additional cost from the streaming company, but Nathan hasn't looked into what this would cost from the hotel perspective.

Ksera brought up that the DEI committee got some feedback that the room was too large for many live-streamed sessions. Perhaps we can live stream in 3 rooms and only use the big room for plenaries, etc.

The board discussed whether there is reason to believe live streaming could cut into in-person attendance. When Nathan has spoken with other colleagues, it doesn't seem like this is a concern. Anecdotally, it seemed like those who attended virtually were not going to come in person anyway.

85th Anniversary Gala

SPA typically celebrates anniversaries every 5 years. We have usually had an off-site and separately ticketed dinner. The board discussed the options for an event. We would want to do a ticketed event so that people would come (\$40-50... it wouldn't cover the costs). However, this makes it into somewhat of an exclusive event, which has some cons. The board had concern about the cost of the event to both SPA and to members.

We can also just fold this celebration into the convention elsewhere, maybe a signature cocktail or something like that. We could also have music (maybe SPA members performing), etc.

Featured Lectures/Plenaries Discussion

The convention committee would like to have a semi-structured forum as a plenary that is more interactive. The goal is to get experienced personality assessors in different walks of the profession to interact with earlier career attendees. If we make it a plenary session, there wouldn't be competing options.

The committee has been coming up with other options for plenary speakers—one more academic and one more practice oriented. The board thought all options were good choices.

b. Leadership Development Committee

We need to think about orientation/onboarding. John suggests that everyone should reach out to the incoming board members. We will also need to think about starting the presidential election. Nicole and Len's terms will be up—Nicole is done and Len can run again.

This committee is also going to consider how we evaluate our CEO and also thinking about how the board evaluates its own process.

Three of the current LDC members will be rolling off, so they will need to be replaced. It will be a busy 2nd half of the year.

c. SPA Policies and Procedures Revision Taskforce

We are not as far as we wanted to be, but we can still have a draft as of the September board meeting. Nathan will be following up with the committee next week with next steps.

There are some things we need to be doing as a C3 (that we probably should have been doing with the foundation), so there is a lot of paperwork to consider including in the policies and procedures.

d. Diversity and Social Justice Committee

Ksera reviewed the board report. They are planning to propose a special issue for JPA (hopefully by August). They also plan to have DISJ track for the convention (started last year). They are considering how we can encourage people to think about how their projects are related to DISJ. There is an ongoing wish for internship database with DISJ focus— they plan to work with SPAGS on this.

They are also considering a policy for how we would respond to social crises. We shouldn't respond to *everything*, and we want to be action-oriented and not virtue signaling. The board discussed a request to sign on a petition related to data on LGBTQI+ Data Inclusion Act. Nathan will forward the info and then we can decide if we want to formally sign on to this. We should highlight these actions to the membership in our newsletter.

e. SPAGS

Callie reported on SPAGS. SPAGS has put a strong focus on membership retention and engagement. It has been difficult to get people to run for positions. They are thinking of developing webinars for students only and they continue to work on the internship database. Otherwise, they are in the process of planning their regular convention events (e.g., DISJ, career development).

They were previously concerned about the SPAGS numbers, but they are now back to where they were pre-covid. Membership spans across 61 different universities.

f. Logo

Nathan showed the board some options for a new logo and the board voted.

V. ED and CEO Contract/JPA Editor Conversation

a. ED and CEO Contract

Nathan presented his requests for a difference in contract through 2025. It is an edited version of the previous contract, and it is a proposal from Nathan. He is requesting a salary increase to start Sep 1.

The board later met without Nathan present to discuss the proposed contract as well as formulate a counter offer.

b. JPA Editor Conversation

The board heard from Martin about his interest in continuing on as JPA Editor. After careful consideration, Martin indicated he was interested in continuing as Editor for another term. He reported the journal is doing well, but he has unfinished business he wants to continue (e.g., increase in forensic submissions, PA in healthcare, increasing I/O representation, etc.).

The board later discussed Martin's request to continue without Martin present. There was broad support for him continuing as editor. The publications committee will move forward with this process.

VI. Strategic Framework Update and Discussion

a. Strategy 3- Develop a Membership Recruitment/Retention Plan

Membership Report

We are looking really great on membership. Currently we have the highest number of students that we have ever had. We are back around 2018 numbers in terms of membership overall. A lot of this is without intentional efforts related to membership. A lot of it comes from APLS. People are seeing that we are doing more and choosing to join.

During the September board meeting, we will think about what the board wants us to prioritize. Staff will then take all that feedback and operationalize it. At the December board meeting, the board will have an overarching view of deliverables, plus the budget. This is the google document that we have. This is where we can see information about all of the progress on the strategic plan.

Assessment Training Project

One of the things that Nathan has heard is that training sites don't have time to teach assessment. Should we prioritize trying to make an "assessment in a box?" The board wants to consider who our target audience for this content would be, and how we would market the content, particularly for non-members where we may not have brand recognition.

The board was supportive of creating more basic assessment related content, but wants to consider logistics.

SPA Exchange

Nathan discussed a proposal for a new committee related to the exchange after the board had decided to create a task force for this in the March board meeting.

The proposal suggests we have a committee overseeing the exchange, but that the editor would change for each issue depending on the topic of the issue (e.g., a therapeutic assessment issue, a DISJ issue, etc.). Each editor would need to cover particular areas in each issue, but the general topic would change depending on the issue and the editor.

- b. Strategy 2- Improvements on the Digitalization of the Society

Google for Non-Profits/Workspaces

We are Google for non-profit approved. Google has project management software “workspaces.” Part of the hope is that our interest groups and committees can go into the workspace and have everything all in one place.

We also do want to go into google ads. We get \$10k in free advertising every month, so we should use it.

- c. Strategy 1- Moving Forward the Impact and Utility of Personality Assessment and Communicating its Value

Personality Assessment Marketing Campaign

Now that we have the website, better branding, etc. Nathan wants to start explaining who we are, what we do, and why what we do matters. The staff want to propose a marketing campaign. They want to do 30-45 second video of members answering various questions about personality assessment. We will use this for marketing, membership campaigns, social media, etc. Nathan wants a hashtag to go along with this as well.

Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of Utility of Assessment Research

We authorized funding in the March board meeting.

This was the motion: *The board sets aside funds from the Utility of Assessment Fund for research or systematic literature reviews that would promote the science and practice of psychological assessment.*

The board will continue to discuss a call for proposals.

VII. Next Steps and Future Meetings

Nathan and the presidential trio meet after each board meeting to come up with action items.

Future meetings include:

- Fall Board Retreat, September 9-11, Denver, CO
- December Board Meeting, December 13, 2pm-7pm (eastern)

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 2022 Board of Trustees Meeting
Sheraton Denver Downtown | Denver, CO
September 9-11, 2022
Director's Row H (1st Floor, Plaza Building)

Present: Jill Clemence (President), Jan Kamphuis (President Elect), John McNulty (Past President), Paul Arbisi (Treasurer), Lindsay Ingram (Representative-at-Large), Nicole Cain (Representative-at-Large), Callie Jowers (SPAGS President), and Ksera Dyette (Diversity and Social Justice Committee Chair), Martin Sellbom (JPA Editor), Len Simms (Representative-at-Large)

Partial Attendance: Nathan Victoria (Executive Director)

Absent: Ron Ganellen (Representative-at-Large), Jaime Anderson (Secretary)

1. Call to Order and Quorum

Clemence

Jill called the meeting to order and welcomed everyone to the meeting. She wished the colleagues not in the room well and then established there was quorum for the meeting to continue.

2. Agenda Review and Goals Clarification

Clemence

Jill highlighted the new structure of SPA board meetings. Specifically, September is a time to reflect on the past year's accomplishments in relation to the strategic framework, as well as look forward to the following year and start planning our action plans and budget.

An idea was shared about the consent agenda, and that is that each individual would be able to share either highlights or go in-depth in their section. For example, it could be that "My report is contained in the written documents, I have no further comments/I want to draw attention to a few things."

Because of the amount of material and when it was delivered, Jill shared that this would be a working meeting of going through the information as a group.

Jill reiterated that her role as President is to manage the meeting dynamics. She clarified the various agenda items, noting the fluid nature of this meeting and what needs to be accomplished versus what can be moved to future meetings.

3. Revisiting Board Strategic Culture Commitments

All

The board reviewed the Strategic Culture Commitments that were established and approved in July 2021. Jill noted that there may be some contentious conversations during this board meeting, asking the board to lean into hard conversations and, as comfortable, being as transparent and open with one another to build trust. A goal of this board meeting is about nurturing our culture, making sure everyone is heard, even if we disagree.

Jill invited the group to offer any feedback, suggestions, or changes to the document at any point. Nathan talked about how we are trying to make this a living document by revisiting the document before every board meeting.

4. Board Meeting Minutes Approval

Anderson

There was a discussion about the way that minutes get shared with the membership and the purpose of the minutes for different groups of SPA. Members need to know information, while future and past board members may need to know additional details, while SPA staff may need more operational details.

There was a friendly amendment to look at the language of the motion related to the Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of Utility of Assessment Research. We want to augment the motion to not look like we are soliciting outcomes. New suggested language for the motion:

The board sets aside funds from the Utility of Assessment Fund for research or systematic literature reviews examining the science and practice of psychological assessment.

John McNulty motioned to approve the minutes.

Unanimously approved with the above amendment.

5. SPA Financial Conversation

All

a. 2022 Budget to Actual Update

Nathan presented the budget-to-actual report through August 31. It was reiterated that financial controls need to be established to ensure best accounting practices, and Nathan, Paul, and Tayla will work to establish these guidelines and have them available for review at the December 2022 SPA Board meeting. These guidelines include clarification between ED and Treasurer responsibilities (i.e. signatory authority for checks and contracts), quarterly meetings to go over all the financials, ensure GAAP principles for our systems, looking at the concept of a finance committee, and policies for reimbursements/payments to board members.

It was confirmed that although JPA used to be tracked separately in the budget, it can be combined with the overall operating budget for the Society. Additionally, for budget purposes, there was a request to distinguish between actual number of paid registrations versus how many registrations are being gifted away.

b. 2023 Draft Budget and Proposed Changes

Nathan spent time talking about potential areas of revenue generation or cost savings within the 2023 budget. Overall, the Board had no major concerns with the proposed budget or ideas generation.

c. ED and CEO Contract and Job Description Conversation (if needed)

The Executive Committee is taking leadership on creating a counteroffer to Nathan's proposal.

6. Taskforce/Committee Updates

a. Annual Convention Update

i. Dr. Apryl Alexander and Dr. Jaime Pennebaker have been confirmed as two of the featured plenary speakers. Additionally, the Program Committee is finalizing the panelists for the Carving Your Path: Career Development Panel.

ii. *Activism in Austin*

Nathan presented a list of organizations that SPA could partner with for intentional civic engagement and volunteerism on-site in Austin, TX. Although SPA may not be ready for a full day of service, as a few board members expressed they've seen at other conferences, it may be worth experimenting in Austin with some service opportunities.

iii. Is there an opportunity to connect with local award winners or leaders in the TX area, such as McAdams. Staff will look into doing a special invite for these individuals.

iv.

b. Thoughts around Texas and Letter of Action/Town Hall

There was concern raised by a few members of going to Texas and a request to pull out of the meeting. Concerns raised were students not feeling comfortable expressing discontent and because of the current political climate, it would show our commitment to social justice by financially boycotting the state. Additionally, some individuals may not feel safe because of the climate and limited rights they may have in the state.

After a robust conversation, it was determined that the convention will continue in Texas, ensuring a virtual component for those not comfortable traveling to TX. If we look at broad social justice issues, every state would need to be boycotted, and it was determined that we will continue to do some intentional advocacy and civic engagement during the convention. We also clarified our Statement of Action and Framework of Action that the SPA Board released in August, and reiterated our thanks to Ksera and the entire Diversity and Social Justice committee for their work.

c. Fundraising and SPA

Nathan presented a document which overviews the future of fundraising within the Society. It talked about the process and structure for future fundraising, as well as some specific tactics and changes SPA should look into.

d. SPA Policies and Procedures Revision Taskforce

At the December meeting, Nathan will present the overview of the Policies and Procedures.

e. 2023 SPA Awards Discussion

- i. The SPA Awards committee is reviewing the nominees for the various awards, and the SPA board will evaluate the nominees at a later board meeting. It was established that moving forward, all but the Bruno Klopfer and the Distinguished Service Awards will be evaluated and ultimately decided by the board. For these two awards, the committee will identify the finalists, and the board will make the final decision.
 - ii. The Committee needs to have knowledge of the Society, as well as the overall work of personality assessment.
 - iii. Finally, it was decided that if a board member is a nominator of the award candidate or a candidate for the award, that is when they would need to recuse themselves from the selection of winners.
 - f. Diversity and Social Justice Committee
 - i. The committee is working on their own Policies and Procedures, in particular how the leadership structure should work. More information coming to the board at a later date.
 - ii. Additionally, the committee is still interested in a JPA special issue, and Ksera will be meeting with Martin to continue to move this initiative forward.
 - g. Student Matters

The Convention Scholarship budget has been adjusted up to accommodate the higher cost of hotel, while the Research Grants budget will stay the same.
 - h. SPAGS

Callie listed the different initiatives of SPAGS, including the programming at the SPA Convention and ways to better incorporate SPAGS throughout SPA.
 - i. Leadership Development Committee

John shared more information about the Leadership Development Committee and the initiatives they are focused upon. The Board then discussed how it should better distribute the work of the committees across all representatives-at-large, rather than pre-assigning the reps at election time. It allows the organization to be more flexible as SPA shifts and changes, and it gives potential future executive leadership the opportunity to see multiple parts of SPA.
 - j. JPA Reports

Martin reported on the operations of JPA
 - k. BEA

The Board discussed the report from Jordan about the initiatives currently going on with BEA of APA.
 - l. Membership

Nathan reported out on Membership numbers, as we are the highest we've been membership wise to date since 2018. Additionally, now that we are one

full year within Novi (our database), we will be able to better utilize their reporting features. It was also confirmed that the Board has approved requiring demographic questions during the member application.

m. Interest Report

A Board discussion was led by Len about how to better support the SPA Interest Groups. Topics discussed were the process of identifying leaders, what programs we expect Interest Groups to coordinate, and budget implications. A meeting with the Interest Group Chairs will occur in October to discuss these ideas.

n. Transfer of Assets

- i. Two official votes happened to confirm the electronic votes that occurred.
- ii. Paul called the Foundation Board together, which at this point is just him, Jill, and Ron (who wasn't in attendance but affirmed in an electronic vote).
Paul moves to ratify electronic vote of what was emailed in the resolution that was unanimously approved on August 8, 2021.

Unanimous approval

- iii. Paul resigned from position of President and Treasurer of the SPA Foundation. Jill resigned as representative of Foundation.
- iv. We then transitioned to the SPA Board, and Jill called for a vote for the attached Resolution to finalize the transfer of assets and membership from the c(6) to the c(3) which was unanimously approved electronically on August 26, 2022.

Unanimous approval.

7. 2022 Strategic Framework Report and 2023 Strategy Discussion

a. Overview of Tactics from 2022

- i. Nathan presented a document which gave an overview of the work of the Society in 2022 that achieved the 3 strategic framework items of Continue and improve the digitalization of the Society; Develop a membership recruitment/retention plan; and Define the utility & impact of personality assessment and communicate its value. A version of this document will be shared with the SPA Membership as an annual report.
- ii.

b. Imagining a 2023 Framework

- i. What, if any, strategies should continue in 2023?
 1. The board discussed the three strategies, and although digitalization and membership recruitment and retention are important, it was noted that strategic focus on these two items does not make sense for 2023; however, the Board did agree that the Clinical Utility of Assessment does still need to be a focus for 2023.
- ii. What, if any, new strategies should we try to move forward with in 2023?
 1. The Board discussed a few different strategies, and ultimately, these will be the four strategic foci for 2024:

- a. Promote diversity-focused research for the advancement and application of personality assessment.
- b. Define the utility and impact of personality assessment and communicate its value.
- c. Diversity, Inclusion, and Social Justice Plan remains at the core of robust diversity lenses in all facets of profession's focus.
- d. Become a comprehensive resource for personality assessment.

An open call will go to the Membership inviting them for comment on these four strategies, and the Board will be invited to continue to brainstorm tactics. Staff will take all this feedback and then create an action plan, with a corresponding budget, for the board to approve at the December Board Meeting.



December 2022 Board of Trustees Meeting

December 13, 2023

Present: Jill Clemence (President), Jaime Anderson (Secretary), John McNulty (Past President), Lindsay Ingram (Representative-At-Large), Martin Sellbom (JPA Editor), Len Simms (Representative-At-Large), Nicole Cain (Representative-At-Large), Jan Kamphuis (President-Elect), Paul Arbisi (Treasurer), Ksera Dyette (DEI Chair), Callie Jowers (SPAGS President), Nathan Victoria (Executive Director)

Absent: Ron Ganellan (Representative-At-Large)

Partial Attendance: Jordan Wright (APA Liaison), Abby Mulay (Representative-At-Large-Elect), Tayla Lee (Treasurer-Elect)

1. Call to Order and Quorum

Clemence

Jill called the meeting to order.

2. Agenda Review and Goals Clarification

Clemence

Jill introduced new board members, thanked outgoing board members for their service, and discussed the timeline for the meeting.

3. Revisiting Board Strategic Culture Commitments

All

Jill reviewed our culture commitments briefly.

4. Board Meeting Minutes Approval

Anderson

Motion to approve board meeting minutes from September: approved unanimously.

5. Consent Agenda

All

Annual Convention Update

Nathan reviewed the convention registration so far. We are doing well at this time and expect a good turn out in Austin. Although there were some delays in getting acceptances out, everything should run smoothly from here.

Report out of Giving Tuesday

The Giving Tuesday campaign raised \$2,700 in November, including donations from 5 non-board members. There are two recurring donations (\$125 a month total). Nathan discussed the potential for an end of the year ask for donations.

6. Interest Group Discussion and Next Steps

Simms

The board discussed interest groups and their leadership structures. There is concern that some groups do not have enough interest from potential leaders. The board discussed surveying the members of interest groups regarding how to choose leaders, term limits, etc. In addition, the board discussed a more centralized set of procedures for interest groups. The board wants to be careful about setting too many expectations since the interest groups vary in their level of activity and overall purpose. However, having a bit more structure would be helpful and would provide opportunities for new leadership.

All interest groups should do something each year, but they can set their own goals and have a report out where they say what they plan to do/what they have done. The central office has resources available for funding, hosting webinars, etc. We have started given \$1,000 to each group, though we should ask each group what they need and what they hope to accomplish. If they need more funding, they can request this. Finally, the board discussed the possibility of a fall conference for interest groups.

7. Board of Educational Affairs Discussion

Wright

The board of educational affairs focuses on accreditation of various programs. Several giant issues at APA

- 1) The great cliff—an upcoming significant drop in students in higher education.
- 2) MA level accreditation and scope of practice. Currently MA level clinicians cannot vote at APA (but grad students can), so there will probably be a reckoning in the future. This could be a huge boom to SPA's membership numbers.

- 3) Redesigning doctoral level competencies: a set of competencies that psychologists at the doctoral level should be able to do when they graduate with a doctorate. We should consider competencies for all assessment (not just clinical) and beyond the individual level (e.g., systems, cultural). The competencies will be rooted in DEI principles and will be as transparent and inclusive as possible.

APA will make this policy, and then it is the responsibility of COA to then come up with how this should be implemented in programs (though they are technically a separate independent entity).

What role should SPA play? The board discussed various prospects for SPA's involvement, such as being a leader in assessment, being more present at APA, the potential for assessment to distinguish us from other fields, the need to increase access to mental health care (which extends beyond doctoral level clinical psychologists), and determining the value of getting a doctorate.

8. 2023 Strategic Framework Discussion and Approval All

The board approved the plans for 2023. Nathan reviewed the tactics and the timeline for meeting specific strategic goals.

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

Utility of assessment grant (one time of around \$36,000). Ideally we will be able to launch the call in February and approve grants at the June board meeting. There should be an external committee for reviewing grant submissions. Martin and Len agreed to write the call for grant submissions.

Promote diversity-focused research for the advancement and application of personality assessment.

The board discussed a webinar series related to diversity in personality assessment. For instance, we could have a webinar series focused on various instruments and their use in diverse populations or have a webinar focused on the clinical process of diversity considerations when assessing test data.

The board also discussed research grants related to DISJ, perhaps allotting \$10,000 per year for diversity research. This would be separate from the utility grant.

9. SPA Financial Conversation All

2022 Budget to Actual Update

Nathan reviewed the projected budget for 2023. We have more members than we have had since 2017, so we expect a greater profit from membership dues.

Convention costs should be lower than projected in September. This is due to lower labor cost and savings for one speaker who is local.

2023 Budget Discussion and Approval

The board discussed various aspects of the 2023 budget. This included a decision to reallocate unused scholarship funds (e.g., early career scholarships) to other scholarship categories as well as the need for president and board member training.

Based on this budget, going into 2024 we would have approximately \$1.2 million. If we spent the same in 2024 that we intend to spend in 2023, we would drop below our decided cutoff of \$1 million dollars in reserve. Therefore, we know we need to see changes in the next year, either improvement in profit or cuts to the budget. Nathan will be continuing to review personnel needs and other potential spending cuts.

Motion To approve the budget as presented. Motion passed unanimously.

10. **Executive Director Evaluation**

All

1. Executive Director Contract Renewal Approval

Jill reviewed Nathan's contract renewal. The remaining 7 members present in the meeting approved.

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