**Executive Board Meeting II: Sunday, 9/22/13, 8:00 am to 9:30 am**

**Agenda**

*Executive Board Voting Members in Attendance*:  *President Ann Kring, Past-President Deanna Barch, Secretary Sheri Johnson, Treasurer William Horan,President-Elect David Miklowitz, Treasurer-Elect Kate Harkness, Secretary Elect Jutta Joormann, Executive Board Members at Large: Elizabeth Hayden, Diego Pizzagalli, Steven Silverstein, Scott Sponheim*

*Non-Voting Members in Attendance: Alex Cohen, local host*

***Updates/ Reports***

**1) Welcome by President** Ann Kring

**2) Announcement of New Committee Chairs**

 **Program chair 2013-2014:** Alex Cohen

 **Smadar Levin:** Kristin Naragon-Gainey

 **Mentor:** Tom Oltmanns

 **Early Career**: Elaine Walker

 **Program Chair 2014-2015:** Ben Hankin

 **Local Host: S**tuart Shankman

 Dr. Kring will notify all chairs from 2012-2013 that they should serve on committees for the current year to provide continuity.

**3) Secretary’s Report:** Sheri Johnson.

No updates.

**4) Local Host Report:** Ann Kring and Sheri Johnson

1. 280 people registered (40 onsite) but there were a few cancellations.
2. The conference earned roughly $2000, although final bills and reimbursements have not been fully tallied.
3. For the future, the local hosts recommend that onsite registration cost slightly more than tiered registration fees so that members would pay slightly more for onsite registration. It was suggested that this not be done for associate members, as many of them do not seem to receive our emails. It was also recommended that we provide mike stands in the audience.

**5) Program Committee Report:** Alexandra S. Burt (not present)

 Board members noted that the lack of triple track sessions worked well.

**6) Smadar Levin Award Report:** June Gruber **(not present), reviewed by Dr. Kring**

a) Committee: Dan Klein, Don Lynam, Lauren Weinstock,

**b) Smadar Levin Award:**

The Smadar Levin Award was awarded to Wern How Yam, Mentor: Leonard Simms, *Comparing the Experimental DSM-5 Personality Disorder Diagnostic System to DSM-IV*

1. **SRP Travel Awards (4 total)**

Ashley Kendall, *Low Trait Positive Affect as a Risk Factor for Emotional Disorders: Results from a Ten-Year Latent Trait-State Model Study*

kendall@u.northwestern.edu

Mentor: Richard Zinbarg

Sunny Dutra, *Monetary and social reward processing in bipolar disorder: Neural correlates and prognostic significance*

Sunny.dutra@yale.edu

Mentor: June Gruber

Kathrin Herzhoff, *Structural analyses of Oppositional Defiant Disorder and confirmatory evidence from latent class analysis*

kherzhoff@uh.edu

Mentor: Jennifer Tackett

Nicole Karcher

*Dopamine and Salience-Related Dysfunction in Individuals At-Risk for the Development of Psychotic Symptoms*

nrkc68@mail.missouri.edu

Mentor: (TBD, Emailed)

1. Several changes were suggested for the future. Dr. Johnson will email Dr. Gruber to request these updates in the Smadar Levin handbook:
* notify those who are not being asked for a fuller report that they are not on the short list promptly;
* to notify those who do not win after the final selections are made.
* give more time to the people submitting a fuller report.

**7) Associate Member Committee:** Scott Sponheim

1. Dr. Sponheim reported that 52 associate members or students attended the luncheon and 65 attended the social.
2. It was recommended that the call for abstracts do more to highlight that you can ask faculty to attend your poster by noting this in the comments field.
3. The associate members noted several assets to sustain: the off-site student social, the associate member luncheon, the affordable meeting costs for associate members, the opportunities for student and faculty networking, the associate member engagement in the newsletter, and the poster sessions.
4. Potential changes that associate members asked us to consider included: providing more awards, more clarity on the website that you can register at the reduced rate as soon as you have submitted all the materials to apply for associate membership; better webpage overall; more information about internship and postdoctoral opportunities; and free lunch opportunities. They also requested the opportunity for oral presentations.
5. Dr. Kring recommended potential lunchtime student presentations with free lunch provided.

**8) Passings:** Susan Nolen-Hoeksema

***Old/ Ongoing Business Discussions***

**1) Future Meetings**

 *2014 Evanston, IL: Stew Shankman* ***(9/18/14—9/21/14; Hilton Orrington*** *; dates updated to avoid conflict with SPR*

 *2015 New Orleans, LA: Alex Cohen (10/1/15—10/4/15; Astor Crowne Plaza) \*\*DATE MIGHT CHANGE TO*

 *SEPT 17-21 (hurricane?) or OCT 8-11 (more expensive?)*

*The repercussions of moving into hurricane season seemed too extreme. To keep costs low for students, we will maintain our original dates of 10/1-10/4 unless the October 8-11 dates can be offered at the same price.*

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

 *2017 Boulder, CO: Vijay Mittal*

 *2018 Volunteers? Dr. Kring will explore Vancouver or Indianapolis (Lynam) or Nashville (Garber).*

**2) Banquet**

Dr. Kring noted that attendance has steadily declined, while banquet costs have gradually increased. For 2014, she proposed that we try a Special Awards Session and Cocktail Reception instead of Banquet. She suggested that we pair the Zubin award talk, the presentation of mentor and Smadar Levin awards (and recognition of Early Career award winner but retaining Faces of the Future symposium), and a cocktail reception. We could also consider ideas for enlivening the event, such as a contest where people match faculty photos to their baby pictures. It was suggested that we fold the cost of the reception into the registration costs, and then provide nice h’or doerves/food, one or two free drink tickets. The best time to do this might be Saturday night before dinner. The costs are not anticipated to be much different for the overall food and beverage budget, and so the local host should be able to make their minimum contract agreement. Our ability to offer this would be contingent on the availability of a room at the local site. The executive board was in favor of the proposal and recommended that we try this new approach for one year. We can poll people about preferences after we try this for one year.

**3) Mentor Award Committee**

 Discuss proposal to rename the Mentorship Award to the John Neale Mentorship Award.

 Pros: could give it a bit more prestige because of his eminence

 Cons: there is a limit on how many of our prestigious members can be honored with named awards.

 By unanimous vote, the executive board passed the motion to rename this award as the John Neale Mentorship Award.

**4) Creation of a committee that would provide grant review support for junior members**

1. Dr. Miklowitz raised the potential for creating a committee that would provide grant review support for junior people. This would facilitate the careers of our postdoctoral and junior faculty. The committee could provide support around grant applications, tenure review, consideration of job opportunities, and career management. Other societies, such as Biological Psychiatry, provide this type of support. At Biological Psychiatry, there is a reception for mentor: mentee pairs.
2. To facilitate this, we would need a way to define and identify the senior members who might be appropriate mentors, such as those who are tenured and have received an R01, and to ask those members if they might be willing to provide consultation and support of this form. Mentors should not be chosen if they would be serving on the review committee for a grant submission. We would also need a way to define and identify the appropriate class of junior members. We also need a way to protect senior members from too much demand; it may help to think about how much lead time a mentee must provide, and some guidelines for how much consultation is expected. One question is whether we would try to facilitate the mentorship meetings during the conference or throughout the year. Dr. Kring suggested that she and Dr. Miklowitz work out some potential details and circulate a proposal to the executive board by email or discuss again at next year’s board meetings. It may take a survey of membership after that point to determine interest and availability.

**4) Increasing Dues:**

 a) Members approved increasing the dues.

 b) Dr. Johnson will work with Dr. Eack to the website to $75 for full members.

**5) By-Laws Changes**

 a) Proposed by law changes did not elicit any negative response at the membership meeting.

 b) Dr. Barch has created a summary of the potential changes. Dr. Johnson will create a qualtrics survey and send these to the membership for a vote.

**Membership wording and criteria for Associate Membership**

**ISSUE 1**: The by-laws don’t actually list criteria for full membership. It is for board to decide, and is listed on membership page. Thus, we need to either put all of the membership criteria in the by-laws, or make by-laws more general and keep the specific criteria on membership page. The board suggested doing the latter.

**ISSUE 2**: The Executive Board, based on suggestions of SRP members, voted to expand the category of Associate member to include individuals with a Bachelor’s degree who are currently occupied in paid or unpaid positions focused on psychopathology research.

*Current:*

*Section 1. Members. Members of the Research Society (hereinafter “Society”) shall be individuals who have made demonstrated contributions to research in psychopathology. Members shall ordinarily be holders of the doctoral degree although, in extraordinary circumstances, other individuals without this qualification may be admitted to membership from time to time. Applicants for membership shall produce such specific evidence of appropriate education and qualification as the Society shall require, and shall be engaged in teaching, and/or research in psychopathology. It shall be a requirement of membership that the member’s scientific work reflect the standards of integrity that are expected of a scientist.*

*The Executive Board may at its discretion establish other classes of membership for individuals who do not meet the criteria for admission to regular membership.*

*At Executive Committee Meeting of 9-26-96 in Atlanta, Georgia the category of Associate Member was established. The following conditions apply:*

*Eligible individuals will include students in Ph.D. training programs or recent PhDs. Applications must be supported by a letter of recommendations from at least one member of SRP. The requirement of at least 2 first-author publications is waived. Associate members are treated the same as non-members regarding eligibility to present.*

*Proposed:*

*Section 1. Members. Members of the Research Society (hereinafter “Society”) shall be individuals who have made demonstrated contributions to research in psychopathology. Members shall ordinarily be holders of the doctoral degree although, in extraordinary circumstances, other individuals without this qualification may be admitted to membership from time to time. Applicants for membership shall produce such specific evidence of appropriate education and qualification as the Society shall require, and shall be engaged in teaching, and/or research in psychopathology. It shall be a requirement of membership that the member’s scientific work reflect the standards of integrity that are expected of a scientist.*

*The Executive Board may at its discretion establish other classes of membership for individuals who do not meet the criteria for admission to regular membership.*

*At Executive Committee Meeting of 9-26-96 in Atlanta, Georgia the category of Associate Member was established. The following conditions apply:*

*Eligible individuals will include students in doctoral training programs or who have recently completed doctoral training.   Applicants for Associate Membership shall produce such specific evidence of appropriate educational and qualification as the Society shall require.*

*At Executive Committee Meeting of 9-19-2013 in Oakland, California the category of Associate Member was expanded to include individuals with a Bachelor’s degree who are currently occupied in a paid or unpaid position focused on psychopathology research.*

The membership page for Full Members would then read:

Membership and permission to present papers at meetings are limited to established psychopathologists. Criteria for full membership in the society include 1) a doctoral degree, 2) recommendations from two current members, and 3) a credible record of publication in areas of relevance to psychopathology, including two papers of which the applicant is senior author, in refereed journals.

The membership page for Associate Members would then read:

There is also a category of membership in SRP, called Associate Member, that is available for either 1) students in recognized academic graduate programs who are actively studying psychopathology; or 2) individuals with a Bachelor’s degree who are currently occupied in a paid or unpaid position focused on psychopathology research. In addition to meeting one of these two criteria, an application for Associate membership must be sponsored by a current full member of SRP. Associate members will receive all membership mailings and are encouraged to attend the annual meetings. Meeting presentations are limited to posters sponsored by a full member.

To join SRP as an Associate, please submit this application along with a brief letter of sponsorship (i.e., one-paragraph) from a full member.

**Investment Committee**

We have had one individual managing our investments (Dr. Marty Harrow). We would like to formalize this into a committee that consists of a Chairperson (right now it would be Marty Harrow; going forward it will be whomever is the Financial Advisor), the President, and the Treasurer. The proposed wording would be:

Section 7: Investment Management Committee. This Committee shall consist of a Chairperson, the Financial Advisor, and the Society’s President and 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.

Section 8. Ad Hoc Committees. The President may appoint Ad Hoc Committees from time to time as deemed necessary to further the purposes of the Society.

**6) Diversity Task Force:** Jutta Joorman,

1. The diversity task force reviewed recommended changes to the Diversity award proposal. The committee agrees with recommendations that we open up applications to those who are already associate members, and that we use procedures in parallel to Smadar Levin Award for application (e.g., at the time of poster submissions, applicants note their desire to be considered for this award).
2. It was also suggested that the award be named after an individual who has made substantive contributions to cultural issues in psychopathology. The committee will work on a potential name.
3. Although currently designed for graduate students and postdoctoral fellows, it may be worth considering expanding eligibility to anyone who would be eligible for associate membership in the future.

**7) Need a new archivist**

1. Dr. Stuart Steinhauer is not able to continue in this roll.
2. Dr. Ray Knight is considering taking this role.
3. Dr. Michael Young was suggested as a potential archivist if Dr. Knight is not able to take on this role.

**8)** **Discussion of program printing for 2014**

1. Dr. Kring raised the question of whether print copies of the program are still needed as we now have an online program available. Some members had stated clearly they still want printed copies.
2. Dr. Barch recommended that we print hardcopies of the program, but make them considerably shorter by not printing abstracts (but include titles, authors, history of SRP, future meetings). The executive board supported this proposal.

**Other business**

1. One board member raised the question of whether the second poster session could be held before Sunday. Other board members noted that this has been frequently considered, but there are a number of logistical issues to doing so.
2. It was decided that the Smadar Levin committee should decide on their short list by June 1st. This would allow mandatory scheduling of only the short list posters for Thursday and would allow the short list candidates more time for preparing their longer report.
3. Dr. Kring raised the idea of inviting a student representative to attend the Thursday and Sunday board meeting; to facilitate transparency and better communication. The idea was supported by the executive board, and it was recommended that we invite the student working with the local host of the next year meeting.