**Executive Board Meeting I**

**Thursday, 9/18/14, 5:00-7:30**

**Notes**

Attendees: Ann Kring (President), David Miklowitz (President Elect), Sheri Johnson (Secretary), William Horan (Treasurer, delayed), and board Members at large: Sohee Park (delayed), Tim Trull, Elizabeth Hayden, Angus MacDonald, Steve Silverstein, Scott Sponheim, Bob Krueger, Diego Pizagalli

Invited and present as observers: Jutta Joormann (Secretary Elect), Kate Harkness (Treasurer Elect), Wendy Heller (Membership chair, delayed), Shaun Eack (Web Management chair), Martin Harrow (Financial Investments chair), Jennifer Tackett (elected board member at large), Emily Durban (publications committee), Vijay Mittal (publications committee), Stew Shankman (local host),.Alex Cohen (program chair), Greg Strauss (FABBS representative), Tom Oltmans (mentorship award committee chair)

The meeting was started at 5 pm with a call to order by Dr. Kring.

***I. Updates/ Reports***

1. **Opening Remarks** (Ann Kring)
   1. Welcome to Continuing and Soon-to-Join Executive Board Members

*President-Elect*: Sheri Johnson

*Secretary*: Jutta Joormann

*Treasurer*: Kate Harkness

*Members-at-Large*: Jennifer Tackett and Ted Beauchaine

*Archivist:* Michael Young

* 1. By unanimous vote of the board, the agenda was approved.

**B. Local Host Report:** *Stew Shankman*

1. The 2014 conference is the largest in SRP history, with advance enrollment exceeding previous years by 50%.
2. A second room for posters was added.
3. The hotel contact person is new to her role in the past month.
4. Dr. Shankman expressed thanks to his committee: Ali Delizza, Allie Hodges, Ashley Huggins, Sarah Yurinich, Huiting Liu, Lynne Lieberman, Casey Sarapas, and Andrea Katz.
5. He did not use Jennifer Watson to help with the event; Alex Cohen has done so and found it helpful.
6. He noted anticipating that registration income would cover the meeting expenses.

**C. Program Committee Report:** *Alex Cohen*

1. The program committee received 331 posters and 100% were accepted (about 13-14 withdrew due to issues such as finances); this is an increase from 188 in 2013.
2. The program committee was able to accept only 5 of the (extremely well rated) 14 symposium presentations, and 18 of the 33 paper submissions. The 35.7% acceptance rate for symposium is a shift from the 70% acceptance rate last year. The rate of acceptance for paper submissions was close to that for last year. There were 23 oral presentation submissions in 2013, and 35 in 2012.
3. The symposia and oral presentations were rated highly by the program committee.
4. Dr. Cohen thanked his committee: Martin Selbourn, Amy Pinkham, Robin Nusslock, Renee Thompson, and Deborah Walder.
5. The invited symposium (RDOC) was new this year.
6. The board discussed the need to plan ahead for the growing number of attendees and posters. Dr. Cohen reassured the group that the New Orleans hotel can accommodate 300-500 posters, but Dr. Mittal could face more constraints that could require rejecting posters or reconsidering formats. There is a need to check in with the Baltimore hosts (Drs. Schiffman and Gold) about space constraints.

**D. Secretary’s Report:** *Sheri Johnson*

1. Current membership email list includes 237 full members, 102 associate members, for a total of 339 members.
2. We need each outgoing committee chair to update their handbook and then send to Jutta for uploading and forwarding to the incoming committee chair
3. In the past year, we passed several changes to bylaws that were discussed at the board meeting in 2013.

The wording for associate membership has been changed to read:

Applicants for Associate Membership shall produce such specific evidence of appropriate educational and qualification as the Society shall require.

Membership voted in favor of allowing individuals with a Bachelor’s degree who are currently occupied in a paid or unpaid position focused on psychopathology research to apply for associate membership.

Membership voted in favor of forming an Investment Management Committee. This Committee shall consist of a Chairperson, the President, and the Society’s Treasurer, with the Chairperson appointed by the President in consultation with the Executive Board.  This Committee has oversight responsibility for the management of the Society’s investments.

1. After discussing these changes in by-laws, the board agreed that the investment management committee would meet this year, with Drs. Miklowitz, Harkness, and Harrow. Harrow noted that he had found working with the treasurer, Dr. Horan, to be very helpful.

**E. Early Career Award Committee Report:** (presented by Ann Kring)

1. Thanks to the committee: Patty Deldin, Bill Hetrick, Elaine Walker

2. The committee received 14 applications. The applicants were above threshold and an impressive group of young scientists.

1. Winner is Brian Hicks, well-rated by entire committee for his exceptional scholarship and productivity.

It is hoped that the applicants who did not receive the reward will re-apply

1. Dr. Miklowitz noted the absence of an early career award manual on the handbooks website; Dr. Johnson will work with the previous chairs to get this posted.
2. The Early Career Award Committee reviewed our list of early career award winners and chose Alex Burt as the SRP choice for the FABBS Early Career award.

**F. John Neale Mentorship Award Committee Report:** *Tom Oltmanns*

1. Committee: Tom Oltmanns, Sherryl Goodman, Connie Hammen

Howard Berenbaum was initially serving on the committee, but he was nominated for the award, and so Connie Hammen was brought onto the committee to avoid conflict of interest.

2. 10 nominations (3 carried over from prior year). Dr. Oltmanns noted the many, many deserving individuals who were nominated, and stated that it was an extremely positive experience to review these contributions.

3. Winner is Bill Iacono

4. Ray Knight is going to chair the committee next year.

5. Dr. Kring asked whether there is any pressure forming around the carried over nominations, but Dr. Oltmanns did not feel as though this is a major concern yet, although could be revisited in the future.

6. Dr. Oltmanns thought that the manual could be improved to note the need to contact those who made nominations to update them on the decision.

**G. Treasurer’s Report:** *Bill Horan*

1. **Two accounts:**

**Chase Bank account**

Managed by Dr. Horan

Checking account: approx. ave. balance $30 – 50k

Credit card: automatic payment to Linode.com for web hosting ($20/month)

**Fidelity Investments account**

Managed by Dr. Harrow

Approximate average balance: $120,000

1. Typical **Expenses ~$55,000-75,000**

Monthly web hosting fees ($20/month = $240/ year)

PayPal fees: ~ 2.4% per transaction for dues, registration (~$1500)

Annual dues to Federation of Associations in Behavioral & Brain Sciences (FABBS): $1300

Annual meeting: $66,000 Oakland/ $50,000 Ann Arbor

1. Typical **Income**

Annual membership dues

Annual meeting registration fees

Fidelity investment income

4. Total Net Oakland 2013 SRP Meeting: **$7,210.31**

1. Dr. Horan and Harkness scheduled a meeting for the next day at Chase bank to establish the paperwork for her transition to treasurer.

**H. Financial Investments Report:** *Martin Harrow*

1. *Fidelity Asset allocation*

*Stock: 95%*

*Bond: 5%*

*Beginning value as of Jan 1: $111,951.30*

*Change in investment value: +27,715.48*

*Ending value as of Dec 31: $139,667.78*

*\*\* Value on 9/15/14: $149,240.94;*

*-- 9/15/13: $129,295.10*

1. There have been no major withdrawals or deposits in the past year.
2. The investment account would be sufficient to cover some of the annual expenses, such as insurance, if warranted, or to provide a buffer if a particular meeting loses money. We should consider how to use this money to support the mission of the society.
3. On average, Dr. Harrow’s investments for SRP have performed better than the S&P index across time, although not in every year.
4. Dr. Pizzagalli asked whether there were any thresholds that would be of concern for our non-profit status. Dr. Harrow reassured him that this was not of concern and verified that we do not pay taxes on our earnings.

**I. Membership Report:** *Wendy Heller*

1. We decided in Fall 2013 to allow individuals with a BA or BS who were working in a research lab to join as Associate members. Some who had not completed their bachelor’s degree applied and had to be turned down. The website lists that a bachelor’s degree should be completed, and Dr. Heller recommends that we keep this guideline in place.
2. The website was improved, so that applicant’s name was listed in the email header, and the sponsor email also had a clearer header. In the summer, there was a period in which security configurations (in response to the heartbleed bug) blocked incoming applications; to address this the improved headings had to be removed, which has made the process more difficult again. Dr. Heller is working with Dr. Eack to address this concern.
3. One applicant email was not valid. This was resolved, and hopefully no other glitches interfered with effective submissions.
4. There was a big jump in Associate Membership applications this year, likely because we make it more affordable for associates to attend. About 13 are people in the new category of having a BA or BS and working as a research assistant in someone’s lab. Even accounting for those it still seems to a relatively large increase, continuing a trend from the year before (see table).

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **2009** | **2010** | **2011** | **2012** | **2013** | **2014** |
| **Associate** | 10 | 9 | 12 | 13 | 37 | 64 |
| **Full** | 6 | 27 | 16 | 18 | 17 | 22 |
| **Total** | 16 | 36 | 28 | 31 | 54 | 86 |

1. Although most members seemed to understand that elaborate letters of recommendation are not needed, it remained the case that many members needed reminders to submit the recommendations.
2. Dr. Heller presented applications for the following 23 full members:

Anna Docherty, Sarah Morris, Ashlea Klahr, Christian Webb, Naomi Tabak, Aprajita Mohanty, Sarah Tarbox, Stacie Warren, Elizabeth Martin (Bailey), Lauren Bylsma, Katharina Kircanski, Seung Suk Kang, Laura Tully, Stuart Quirk, Lauren Papp, Arielle Baskin-Sommers, Brady Nelson, Jimmy Choi, Randy Auerbach, Christopher Conway, Leslie Horton, Rebecca Waller, Nestor Lopez-Duran

Dr. Heller presented the following 64 applicants for associate membership:

Tara Miscovich, Kevin Haworth, Cale Wardell, Alexandra Lipinski, Caitlin Eggleston, Elana Schwartz, Laura Germine, Ashley Schnakenberg, Hye in Cho, Allison Letkiewicz, Luis Flores, Jennifer Gowins, Lisanne Jenkins, Ema Tanovic, Ivan Ruiz, Kelly Brandstatt, Ariel Wilson, Katrina Bridgman, Daniel Stout, Kenneth Bennett, Leah Hecht, Meghan Quinn, Megan Ichinose, Tina Chou, Abraham Van Voorhis, Amanda Shamblaw, Autumn Kujawa, Joshua Kenney, Derek Novacek, Daniella DeGeorge, Kayla Whearty, Kelly Ryan, Ellen Kessel, Samantha Anderson, Ryan Carpenter, Hailey Dotterer, Sabrina Ereshefsky, Nicole Jameson, Zachary Millman, Emily Wald, Gabriela Khazanov, Ryan Cardinale, Lindsey Sherdell, Joshua Mervis, Melissa Chairfadi, Cristina Garcia, Haijing Wu, Arielle Ered, Kaila Norman, Konrad Bresin, John Purcell, Rebecca MacAulay, Eleanor Stahura, Mike Niznikiewicz, Sarah Sperry, Narun Pornpattananangkul, Rachel Carter, Aaron Neis, Mindy Westlund, Robert Reinhart, Clementine Edwards, Samuel Cooper, Timothy Lano, Laura Hieber

1. No concerns were raised about the applicants. By unanimous vote of the executive board, all full and associate members were accepted.

**J. Smadar Levin Award Report:** *Kristin Naragon- Gaine*

1. Committee: Vijay Mittal, Michael Pogue-Geile, and June Gruber (last year’s chair)
2. Number of submissions 164 (well over half, has been closer to 100 in the year before) ; 16 on short list
3. Short list people notified by June 3, and others were notified that they were not selected for the short list in July.
4. Dr. Naragon-Gaine recommended that in the future, it would be helpful to have the candidates include a statement about their role in the project and where in the process they joined the research process.
5. With the high number of submissions, Dr. Naragon-Gaine recommended that four people be included in the committee.
6. Criteria state that they should already be enrolled in graduate school; one person who had been accepted into graduate school was allowed to submit as she would be a graduate student. There was a discussion that this award should be specifically for work that was done during graduate school, in remembrance for Smadar Levin’s graduate student work. It was noted that this should be clarified in the call for submissions.

**K. Publications Committee Report:** *Vijay Mittal and Emily Durbin*

1. There were 11 volunteers to help with the newsletter
2. All SRP members asked for interviews have agreed (the award winners and Jim Gold).
3. Dr. Pam Butler volunteered to help with the writing post-interviews.

**L. Diversity Task Force:** *Jutta Joormann (Elizabeth Hayden, Steve Silverstein)*

1. The committee would like to implement giving the award this year, but members of the committee were contacted during the year by a member of SRP who was concerned that this is more based on diversity than recognition of achievement, and as such could have a negative rather than a positive effect; this member is researching how other societies have considered these complex issues, and she is still in the process of gathering that data so is not ready to present alternatives.
2. Another concern raised was that the diversity committee does not have a member who is a minority individual.
3. As currently planned, the committee had hoped to award three travel awards of up to 1000 to encourage and facilitate the participation of young scholars from diverse backgrounds to attend and take part in the society. The award was considered as a way to encourage and foster greater diversity than we currently see in our membership, and it had been approved at the business meeting last year. As planned initially, the awardees could be members or could apply for membership, but only full-time graduate students would be eligible, and the applicant should be from a racial or ethnic group that is traditionally under-represented at SRP. The planned process was for the applicants to submit a poster, and as with Smadar Levin applicants, would indicate a desire to be considered for this award at the time of their poster submission.
4. Angus raised a question of whether there is some misunderstanding of whether the award includes merit; he noted that with increasing engagement, the merit component would become increasingly present. One idea is to work on strengthening this part of the award.
5. Dr. Hayden raised the idea of calling it the president’s award, to focus on any under-represented groups, with the person providing their information about how they fit with an under-represented group.
6. Dr. Mittal asked whether we could name the award after someone that inspires us. He also noted that there may be heterogeneity in responses, in that some minority students were quite excited about the potential award.
7. Dr. Joormann agreed to talk more with the member who was concerned during the meeting, and the board decided to revisit this issue on Sunday.

**M. Associate Member Committee:** *Scott Sponheim**and student Casey Sarapas*

1. The committee is comprised of a rotating roster of graduate students. This year’s committee included: Casey Sarapas, Kyle Mitchell, Jessica McGovern, Janelle Caponigro, Cait Listro, and Derek Dean.
2. Key events planned:
   1. Luncheon with the Faces of the Future speakers from this year and last year has 80 attendees (12 faculty will join to enhance networking and career support)
   2. Student Social at the World of Beer has space for about 100 attendees
3. The student social costs about 2000. SRP board members had agreed to contribute about 400 to the lunch, but an additional $90 was requested to allow the cost of lunch to be set to $5 per trainee. This additional allotment of funds was was approved by unanimous vote of the executive board
4. Future goals:
   1. Lunch was listed in the program as by invitation only; Dr. Kring noted that in the future, this could state “Only for those who RSVP’ed in advance”.
   2. Consider additional ways to email associate members in advance about this lunch.

**N. FABBS Report:** *Greg Strauss*

1. FABBS is a group of 22 affiliated scientific organizations. One representative from each affiliated organization attends the annual meeting.
2. Dr. Strauss noted that FABBS has a highly active set of policy initiatives, and there have been some recent changes in leadership.
3. SRP was given the opportunity this year to select the Early Career Award for FABBS, and Alex Burt was chosen by the early career award committee.
4. FABBS organized neuroscientists to meet with the chairwoman of the senate appropriations committee.
5. 2014 appropriations have increased compared to 2013, but 2015 budget projections appear more grim, with particular concerns about the 2015 NSF budget.
6. Senator John Rockefeller introduced America Competes which suggests sustained increases in NSF budget.

**O. Reminder of Board Decisions that happened via email in last year**

1. Invited symposium this year

2. Pending full member applicants eligible to present talks at the meeting (\*\*\*This needs to be added to the Call for Abstracts for the 2015 meeting)

***II. Old/ Ongoing Business Discussions (6-6:30pm)***

1. **Future Meetings**

*2015 New Orleans, LA: Alex Cohen (10/15/15—10/18/15; Astor Crowne Plaza).*

*\*\*NEW DATES FINALIZED NOVEMBER 2013 without charge\*\**

*2016 Baltimore, MD: Jason Schiffman (9/29/15-10/1/16; Hyatt Regency Baltimore)., Jim Gold*

*2017 Boulder, CO: Vijay Mittal (9/14/2017 – 9/17/2017; Boulderado Hotel). Does have two neighboring hotels with rooms blocked; the toughest barrier would be increasing the number of posters.*

*2018 Indianapolis \*\* WAITING TO HEAR ABOUT DATES FROM DON LYNAM\*\**

*2019 Potential Volunteers:*

*Sohee Park will discuss whether Vanderbilt would sponsor with Steve Hollon and Judy Garber.*

*Steve Silverstein: Rutgers, New Brunswick.*

*Jutta Joormann: New Haven*

1. **Website Development and Oversight Committee Report:** *Shaun Eack*
2. Committee: Angus MacDonald and Len Simms.
3. Dr. Eack noted that the website he inherited has some ongoing limitations, most notably in membership management and conference applications. The committee would like to find a website solution that does not require entirely customized programming (because fewer people would be available to support and understand the functionality, and also then less likely rapid response to a problem that emerges, or a crash that happens). For comparison, they have been examining canned software and customized bids. There does not appear to be one piece of software that manages membership applications, conference applications, dues, etc, with the full functionality that we would like.
4. Canned software solutions

Some of these groups want about $295 per month to manage our online membership.

1. 123Signup

$150 per month for membership management and conference submission applications and management.

Major concern: when people submit an application to be member, they cannot upload any documents (such as CV or documents). Awaiting costs of customization.

2. OpenConf, which we have been using for our meeting.

Ugly interface, but seems to work. Sometimes have concerns.

Alex Cohen had some of the same concerns that Alex Burt; a lot of variability in how people fill in open fields (e.g., 50% of students left blank the “who was your sponsor”).

Shaun has the major concerns compiled last year and can recruit quotes from Open Conf about how much they would charge to customize.

$300 per year.

1. Scholar one is 8-10k per year.
2. Memberclick. Just identified, gathering more information.
3. Bids for custom solutions: 51 bids. Restricted to those from the US and the UK.

Bids ranged from 5000 to 25000 (which is comparable to what Dr. MacDonald has found in the past). Dr. Eack has done more review of 3 that he thought would be “halfway” decent.

One concern is that we would need continuity, back-up if it breaks. If we want responsiveness regarding a customized system, we may need to consider having a programmer on retainer for about 10,000 per year.

c. Moving forward

Dr. Kring noted that it might be easier to get canned software for conference submissions or certain key features, and that might then limit the degree of customization we need.

Dr. Trull noted that he has had good experience with Chicago Software.

Dr. Mittal has worked with conference organizers who offered to host registration, but it seems as though that part of the software difficulty is easier to address.

Dr. Eack has started independently to program a data base that allows us to check on whether members have paid their dues. Would not be fully filled in this year, but it is on the horizon.

Dr. Eack will continue to look for canned and customized solutions for membership management, website updating, and other core aspects of functionality. He will be working with established companies (who have the ability to provide back-up) to see if they can adapt key features for us. As he does so, he will work with Dr. Cohen on the concerns about openconf, to consider whether this can be customized.

Dr. Kring recommended that we have some board discussions during the year, and that we commit to making changes if we can find viable solutions. Dr. Eack will have more information from the companies in the next couple months.

**C. Awards Ceremony/Reception**

This year, there will be an awards ceremony rather than a banquet. The banquet has been expensive, particularly for the students, and so was not inclusive of the full range of members.

**D. Thanks to outgoing members**

a. Past-President Deanna Barch (but you chair the Nominating Committee next year!)

b. Members at Large Diego Pizzagalli and Bob Krueger ,

c. Secretary Sheri Johnson

d. Treasurer Bill Horan

***III. New Business Discussion (6:30 – 7:15pm)***

**A. Program Considerations**

1. There has been some concern that with the growth of the society, it is increasingly difficult for members to gain an opportunity to present. Dr. Kring noted that Dr. Cohen spent considerable time trying to juggle how to create the best set of opportunities possible. After Ann Arbor, we had polled membership about triple track format, and the idea did not gain broad support. Historically, even introducing double tracks had met with some concern. Dr. Miklowitz received requests from a few people to increase the number of sessions. The board weighed the pressure to increase the number of talks against the value of people attending the same talks and sharing the experience with their colleagues.

* 1. There was some discussion of starting earlier in the day, starting earlier on Thursday, or ending later on Sunday. There was a sense that this was difficult given time zones and commitments, and people noted that Sunday talks at other conferences are poorly attended, even when the speakers are terrific.

* 1. Dr. Krueger noted that the lack of personality coverage has been of concern for those in that field. Although the idea was discussed of trying to consider the top talks in each psychopathology, Drs. Silverstein and Park argued that it seems important to try to enhance transdiagnostic presentations, and so that segmenting by psychopathology would interfere with this goal. Dr. Hayden argued for prioritizing symposia that cut across disorders, and several expressed agreement with this idea.
  2. Dr. Johnson noted that one option is to preferentially schedule members to speak who have not presented in the prior year.
  3. Dr. Cohen suggested that we consider a broader range of talk formats, including Ted talks or flash talks.
  4. Given the diversity of dimensions to consider, Dr. Kring suggested that it will be important for the board to provide some guidance to the program committee on how to accommodate our growth, our goal of a shared community, and the diversity of science we represent. The board agreed that the program committee could consider one triple track. The program committee should be aware that there is a need to achieve balance across topic areas, but has discretion for how to achieve that (e.g., the motivation syndrome last year on animals to treatments was very well received, and quite cross-cutting). There was not consistent enthusiasm for a quota system of selecting one symposium from each psychopathology domain; rather, the program committee could use strategies such as a call for abstracts that expresses a goal of “cross-cutting symposia”. There was some enthusiasm for prioritizing talks from speakers who had not presented in the prior year. The program committee should be empowered to consider new formats. Beyond this, we want to allow the program committee opportunities to adapt to the unique constraints and possibilities each year. The board understands that the program committee faces difficult pressures, and so they should be empowered to make creative solutions.
  5. Dr. Silverstein noted that as our membership grows, it is inevitable that we will need to revisit formats, and that we may need to reconsider triple tracks more broadly in the future.

1. ECA and Faces of the Future symposium (Alex Cohen)
2. The Faces of the Future symposium consists of the early career award winner with three other young investigators selected from the pool of people who submit oral presentations.
3. Some of the most accomplished young investigators are already submitting talks as part of symposia with established investigators, so it is not clear that these terrific young candidates always need a special opportunity to get onto the program. There were also some concerns that there was a gender imbalance in the pool of early investigators that had submitted separate oral talk applications. Dr. Tackett explained the history, which started in Ann Arbor, and fit well for the submissions that year. The faces of the future submissions were already among the most highly ranked; these talks might make it onto the program without consideration.
4. As the nature of submissions may vary year by year, the executive board recommended that the program committee be empowered to use this mechanism or not in the future; it should not be considered a requirement to combine oral presentations from other early career members with the early career award winner’s talk.

1. Videotaping talks at the conference
2. Dr. Cohen raised the suggestion that we videorecord SRP talks, perhaps to upload to a youtube channel with speaker consent. Dr. Trull thought that some might decline to give consent because they are sharing unpublished data. Priority could be given to award or presidential addresses if we were to mobilize.
3. Dr. Eack noted that talks would have to be released under a creative commons license, which means that users would have freedom to use in any way they saw fit.
4. Dr. MacDonald asked if people being video-recorded might change their content, and that could interfere with them giving us their most forward content.
5. Dr. Horan expressed flexibility, but didn’t see how posting it on youtube would truly benefit the society.
6. Dr. Kring suggested that we table the videorecording for now but then could consider it in the future.

**C.** **Proposal for the Support of PCSAS (Dr. Krueger and MacDonald)**

Background: As many of us already know, PCSAS ([http://www.pcsas.org](http://www.pcsas.org/)) is an independent, non-profit body incorporated in December 2007 to provide rigorous, objective, and empirically based accreditation of Ph.D. programs in psychological clinical science (the terms psychological clinical science and scientific clinical psychology are used interchangeably).  The Office of Veterans Affairs is in the process of amending its regulations to recognize students and graduates of PCSAS accredited programs as eligible for VA internships and staff positions. PCSAS's campaign to gain recognition by state and provincial licensing boards has been endorsed by the Association for Psychological Science (APS), the Academy of Psychological Clinical Science (APCS), the Association for Behavioral and Cognitive Therapies (ABCT), and the Society for a Science of Clinical Psychology (SSCP).

Dr. Trull mentioned that having these statements can be helpful in changing state legislation.

Motion: As a society made-up of established researchers in the field of psychopathology across a wide variety of conditions, dedicated to the well-being of people with mental illness and to strengthening the science of clinical psychology for understanding and alleviating these illness, be it resolved that the Society for Research in Psychopathology (SRP) fully supports PCSAS's campaign to gain recognition by state and provincial licensing boards, and that SRP encourages states and provincial licensing boards to revise their standards to reflect parity between PCSAS accreditation and APA's CoA accreditation in the training of clinical psychologists.

By unanimous vote, the executive board expressed their support of this motion, and agreed to present the statement to the membership for vote of support.

**B.** **SRP Voting via Qualtrics**

1. It is possible to vote more than once on qualtrics (although we have no reason to believe this happened).

2. It was difficult to identify alternatives.

3. Dr. Hayden noted that Survey monkey may allow for user authentication if you input a list of members (they would be provided with a personalized link). It was agreed that this would be investigated, and pursued if it did not seem to create other major barriers to voting.

**D.** **Having “formal” or “official” SRP events** to honor past members (Sohee’s request for Phil Holzman)

1. There was some discussion by email about this possibility. One concern was that we could experience years with many losses. Dr. Park noted that Dr. Holzman was a founder of the society, and so that was why there was a question of whether SRP should have a specific event for him.

2. Dr. Silverstein reminded the board that we did hold a symposium in honor of Susan Nolan-Hoeksema.

3. Perhaps we do not need a formal policy as these are relatively rare requests.

**E**. **Signing/ Endorsing the 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom**

Several other societies (Society for Neuroscience, SPR) have endorsed this. Dr. Kring received an email recommending that we endorse these principles. Dr. Kring will forward this to the board to review on Sunday.