

CDSPP—Meeting of the EC (8/7/07)

All members of the Board were present (Beth Doll, Mike Furlong, Jean Baker, Stacy Overstreet, and Steve Peverly). The 2 new members were also invited to participate and both were present (Kathy Fiorello and Kathy Bradley-Klug).

1. The agenda was reviewed to determine if anything needed to be added.
2. The meeting opened with a brief report on the preparations for Jon Sandoval's dinner. Steve Peverly reported that everything is set with the restaurant. Since Steve cannot attend the dinner, everything will be coordinated on-site by Mike Furlong and Stacy Overstreet. There was a brief discussion about speakers: how long for each person (5 minutes), and whether or not we should indicate on the name tag if the person is speaking (yes). Mike will present Jon with a framed letter from CDSPP thanking him for all of his contributions to School Psychology.
3. We need to nominate 3 individuals (each name must be accompanied by a CV) to replace Ed Gaughan, as one of CDSPP's 2 representatives to the CoA of the APA, by September 15th. Three qualifications were discussed: must be a recognized leader, must have some experience doing site visits, and must be recognized within the School Psychology community for service to the profession and/or scholarship. The term is 3 years, the person can serve 2 terms, and the committee meets 3 times a year (approximately 4 days per meeting), with significant amounts of preparation time for each meeting. Several names were mentioned as candidates. Beth Doll will begin the process of contacting those whose names were mentioned, to determine who is willing to be considered. Jean Baker will continue the process once Beth's term as president ends after the APA convention.
4. Model Licensing Act—CDSPP had an opportunity to provide input early in the process. However, the turn around time was rather quick (10 days or so), there was not a lot of member input, so Beth submitted a letter that raised issues rather than taking a position. Beth sent an email asking the membership to comment on the Act by 10/15. There have not been any responses yet. We need to provide feedback from the membership by 11/1. Are there ways we can get input from the membership at APA? Jeanne said she has a couple of hours in her suite that are not booked yet; we could use the time to have people come by and talk about the issue. The EC agreed that would be a good thing to do. Jean offered to consolidate feedback from members and send it to the EC as a first draft.
5. Feedback is also due on the Benchmarks. Although less contentious, they may be more important in the long run, since they will be the criteria used to judge the quality of programs. They were posted for 60 days beginning August 1st. We have received some feedback but little of substance. Ed agreed to summarize the comments that come in and to circulate a first draft to the Board. Given that the initial email went out at the end of the summer, and may have been ignored by much of the membership, Ed will send out another email to the membership asking for comments by September 10th. The intent is that the Benchmarks will have been approved by the time of the 2010 meeting (hopefully, by 2009), which is still in its planning phase.

6. PsyCorp had mentioned at the mid-winter meeting that it was in process of creating procedures to disseminate test protocols free to training programs. The procedures have been created and they have requested the email addresses of programs that attended the meeting. Given that this is a service to programs and not a sales pitch, it was decided that it is reasonable to put information about the program on CDSPP's list-serve. However, vendors who support the mid-winter meeting are routinely given the email address of the programs who attended the meeting. A question was raised if members know this. It was suggested that we state our policy over who gets email addresses and who does not.
7. Mike proposed a dues increase at the mid winter meeting. Although the treasury is in reasonably good shape (\$17,000 three years ago and \$24,000 now), we charge less than other major organizations, and we deliver a great deal of bang for the buck. It was mentioned that the attendance at the upcoming meeting and the 2010 meeting might be very light and a dues increase could help compensate for that. A motion was put forward to increase the dues to \$175 to go into effect in 2008. The motion was passed.
8. Procedural timelines—Everyone will send a draft of the procedures used for all of the Board's tasks (e.g., setting up the annual meeting, setting up the annual dinner) to Ed by September 7th.
9. Next meeting, Friday, 9/14 at 3PM. Suggested topics for the meeting: Benchmarks, Model Licensing Act, planning for the mid-winter meeting.