



EASTERN PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION
Established 1896, Incorporated 1962
www.easternpsychological.org

President

Jeffrey Lamoureux, PhD
Boston College

President-Elect

Jennifer Tickle, PhD
St. Mary's College of Maryland

Past President

Patricia Brooks, PhD
College of Staten Island, CUNY

Executive Officer

Paul Schnur, PhD
Montgomery Village, MD

Treasurer

Maryellen Hamilton, PhD
Saint Peter's University

Historian

Elissa Rodkey, PhD
Crandall University

Program Committee Chair

Jennifer Thompson, PhD
University of Maryland, Global Campus

Board of Directors

Justin Bonny, PhD
Morgan State University

Catherine Caldwell-Harris, PhD
Boston University

Elaine Congress, PhD
Fordham University

Shaun Cook, PhD
Millersville University

Fanli Jia, PhD
Seton Hall University

Lindsay Mehrkam, PhD
Monmouth University

Ashlee Moore, PhD
State University of New York, Oswego

Eric Thrailkill, PhD
University of Vermont

Travis Todd, PhD
University of Vermont

Minutes: EPA Annual Board of Directors Meeting

2/26/2026; Boston, MA

Attendees: Jennifer Thompson, Maryellen Hamilton, Fanli Jia, Paul Schnur, Patty Brooks, Jef Lamoureux, Jennifer, Travis Todd, Byron Nelson, Shaun Cook, Ashlee Moore, Tamarah Smith, Catherine Caldwell-Harris, Eric Thrailkill, Justin Bonny

President Jef Lamoureux began the meeting at 12:55pm.

Introductions were made. Thanks were given to outgoing members Lindsey, Fanli, and Shaun.

1. Reports (see linked reports for details):

a. PC Chair

- i. This is a great sized conference. 43% larger than last Boston and more than NY. The program committee was excellent. There are many undergraduate posters.
- ii. We need a new Program Chair and several PC committee members.
- iii. Question/response: Can poster sessions at 8am be avoided? Poster sessions at 8am were because of the number of posters; 8am sessions were needed even after adding space to accommodate more in each session. An evening poster session was mentioned as an alternative to the early time.
- iv. Question/response: Can the same topics not be spread across poster sessions? This was also a consequence of having all sessions be full and not having "perfect" numbers to fill each session. This is avoided when possible.
- v. Comment was made about the conflict with other conferences at the same time (e.g., SPSP).
- vi. Big thanks to Tamarah for coordinating the conference planning this year.

- b. EO
- i. Bylaws edits were proposed.
 1. Article III: Motion made to approve the revisions to Article III. They were seconded and approved unanimously.
 - a. Application is not how we accept members, so the first Article III edit was deleted.
 - b. Addition 9 is a practical addition—we need to remove members who are not active from the active email list. They will still be in the database and can still renew, but they won't get active emails. We changed to 3 years of not being active before inactive status is marked. This was accepted as a friendly amendment.
 - c. Change numbering in Article III.
 2. Article VI: Motion made to approve changes to Article VI. The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.
 - a. Change to President-Elect duty to issue annual call for Fellows nominations.
 - b. Change "Issuing" to "Initiate" in part a (friendly amendment).
 - c. After discussion, we agreed to update a procedures document to set a due date for Fellows nominations 2 weeks prior to conference and to move the date for the call for nominations to be sent out to December 1.
 3. Article VIII: Motion made to approve changes to Article VIII. The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.
 - a. Article VIII: Similar to point 2, update wording to "initiate" as a friendly amendment.
 - b. Change timeline to December 1 for calls for officers and board members to be sent out.
 - ii. Sponsorship was higher this year (some were in the hallway for space). We might want to reconsider sponsorship levels (we've never had a Platinum level sponsor) and what we offer them. (These sponsorship levels have been in effect 3 years.)
 1. Board members should visit with the sponsors and let them know how much we appreciate them.
 - iii. A letter was attached at the end of the report from a member (Dr. Specht) about the shift toward undergraduates at the conference. The letter was from last year, but may still be relevant.

- iv. Following this, a discussion about how to address conference concerns ensued and the following points were discussed. Many of these are discussed further in later agenda sections (see below).
1. Undergraduate submissions appear in area programs (not just undergraduate sessions). Further discussion may be needed in the program committee about when a proposal should be accepted in an area or reassigned to undergraduate sessions.
 2. A reduction in keynotes could have contributed to the perception of enhanced undergraduate focus. A later agenda item addresses the number of keynotes.
 3. Discussion of the length of “talks” within talk sessions. Is 10 minutes enough? Too little? This has been a decision of area chairs and how they want to divide the time they have. Is there additional guidance? Should we allow submitters to select their “ideal” length at submission? Should we add presentation types (e.g., data blitzes) to allow for shorter presentations and allow the talks to be longer?
 4. Can Thursday night be more effectively used for a poster session (with a sponsored reception and cash bar)? Could evening times (until 6 or 7pm) be used to reduce early morning loads and spread out posters without adding too much cost? Would smaller posters (2 on each side of each board) help with poster sessions being full to capacity?
 5. May need additional guidelines on the online submission page to clarify that the advisor should be an author on undergraduate posters, what the role of an “author” is, and to define more clearly the submission types (especially if new types like workshops or data blitzes are added).
 6. Travis agreed to work with a subcommittee to further develop some of these suggestions.

b. Treasurer

- i. The budget is strong for this year. We are financially sound across the board (see report for details). Of note, keynotes (originally 13 but now reduced) were kept more local so travel expenses were less than anticipated.
- ii. We exceeded the profit surplus expected in NYC (increase in membership and a concerted effort to reduce costs over time).
- iii. Expenses were expected to be higher this year (shadowing EO, accountant), but expenses were slightly lower and sponsorships

were higher (thanks to Paul). Current projections look great for Boston and may be higher than reports show.

- iv. Proposed budget for next year at Philadelphia also looks good and it will be presented at the Business meeting.
- v. Plans: Motion made to establish separate accounts for Diversity money; motion was seconded and approved.
 - 1. A separate account for Diversity will be opened in April when accounts are transferred.
 - 2. For Weiss awards, we get money and we pay it each year (\$4000) so it will stay in the operating budget.
 - 3. Contribution options given during the online registration process will be changed to be the diversity travel fund and the general operating budget (clarified language online).
 - 4. It may make sense to open a money market account for excess funds to yield some interest. Maryellen will see if AV costs might go up for next year pending conference changes before moving funds to a money market.

c. Historian

- i. Report from 2 years ago was circulated. There was minimal discussion, but the issues will be discussed in a follow-up virtual meeting with the historian present. (See item 16 below.)

d. Diversity Award (see report)

- i. Amy Hunter is willing to continue to administer the award and the Board approved this nomination.
- ii. Donations this weekend will be matched through Sunday by an anonymous donor.

2. Dates & Deadlines (addressed above in bylaws changes)

3. Fellow nominations

- a. Robert Alexander—not approved for Fellow status 0-9-1
- b. Adam Fox—approved for Fellow status 10-0-0
- c. Jessica Nolan—approved for Fellow status 10-0-0

4. Fellow membership... should they need to maintain annual membership?

- a. The approved bylaws addition will make fellows “inactive” if dues are not paid, but Fellow status is not revoked.
- b. Selections letters set the expectation of their continued involvement as a Fellow.
- c. We could plan a Fellows event to bring folks together? Would not have to be an EPA funded event, but could be a Fellows lunch out, or a social.
- d. Could target outreach to people whose accounts are about to become inactive unless this is challenging for the EO logistics.

5. President's Circle – continue? If so, logistics?
 - a. EPA did not pursue this for 2025-26 (and maybe not last year either). Past-presidents report it is uncomfortable to solicit. In the past, EO would reach out to President's host institution for a donation, but this practice stopped years ago. A previous President introduced the President's Circle and the President's institution would feature a person from the institution and talk about institution history. It involved an annual donation, but this was very hard to solicit.
 - b. Motion was made to end this program. The motion was seconded and approved. Presidents can choose to approach their institutions about donating and advertising their programs.
6. Thursday night: Are we using it effectively? Related to above point, can more than Psi Chi benefit from this prime keynote slot each year? Are there other uses for Thursday night? Informal networking, workshops, unique presentations (e.g., 5 min data blasts), other?
 - a. Travis and planning team will be working on this. See 1.b.iv.4 above.
7. Psi Chi relationship: sponsor vs. associate?
 - a. Psi Chi currently is its own area in the Program. It has as much space/content as other areas in the program including a room for two days (9 sessions) plus a keynote that we pay for on Thursday night, so it is at a cost for EPA.
 - i. Psi Chi PC member is a guest of Psi Chi on the committee. They operate independently and presenters don't "submit" proposals for review because they are invited, so there is limited oversight.
 - ii. Students can choose PsiChi as a program area for review. Must submit to Psi Chi to be considered for the award.
 - iii. Would a Psi Chi "hub" available for one day help maintain real estate in the conference schedule?
 - b. Background: Psi Chi said they weren't going to pay this year \$1500 for a booth. We eventually agreed on a booth for \$1100.
 - i. \$8K paid by EPA for Psi Chi keynote on Thursday. Plus the room for regular sessions and A/V for all events.
 - ii. They provide students with \$7K of travel support for conference. So they are more of an associate and they advertise with us. And the focus on UG education is important in higher ed and for graduate school.
 - iii. Paul says other regionals have a Psi Chi track (Thurs night especially) but it's more integrated, and no "singular" event the night before.
 - c. Next step:

- i. Research whether it is common to have an MOU (or any type of working guidelines) for how more independent groups (e.g., Psi Chi or International) interface with EPA. Jef will work with Justin on a possible agreement (MOU) with Psi Chi so expectations are transparent. What's being paid for? How many sessions are there? Submissions dates agreed upon and PC process.
- 8. Workshop vs symposium formats defined
 - a. There was support for adding a workshop category to the submission system. This should be done with cautious planning about how adding a category might put a different constraint on the schedule and the room setup.
 - b. We would need to define workshop and symposium (and roundtable?) online in the submission system. What is expected of each type? This needs to be clarified if added to the program. Catherine is going to work on definitions with the PC.
 - c. Specify tech constraints (e.g., roundtables are low cost). Could roundtables share a room with Psi Chi that's in a table format and add some workshop events that could use that space.
- 9. Keynotes...
 - a. History: EPA has reduced them over time (saves money to have fewer) and we often had keynotes in big rooms with small attendance because of so many conflicts. Are we good with the current number?
 - i. General consensus is that it is best to not overlap programming, so the number of keynotes seem fine to the Board. We will monitor attendance at these sessions this year.
 - ii. The keynotes are the draw for many so they are related to the health of the program. UG posters at the same time as keynotes may reduce attendance because of how many people are involved with UG posters (students, mentors).
 - b. What about the named keynotes (Solomon, Staudt-Sexton, Keller)? Keep them? Are the names still relevant? Should we consider renaming? What is our *process* for these? (It has always been rather vague.)
 - i. There is one named keynote per year, they rotate. People are supposed to talk about the person named in the award as part of their talk.
 - ii. Are topical, so we should figure out what named awards to have and what areas they should be in.
 - iii. No information on how they were set up or if we need to keep them—someone will need to research this before changes are made (historian?).

- iv. Refocus on newer people? Rename?
 - 1. There was a suggestion that members could vote on who should have named awards and new names could be solicited after a certain time period?
 - 2. An idea: Move Weiss award to Weiss lecture time slot.
 - v. Will work on a process (Jef, Jennifer, Eric, Paul): Set a time limit (e.g., 15 years) and then change name. Write up some guidelines about who's eligible, etc.
10. Professional event manager... should we hire someone to help us out?
- a. It might help to have an event manager at the registration table and to assist with staffing. Volunteers are hard to obtain. Would we consider self-registration?
 - b. How better to handle this was not discussed extensively. The PC may need to consider whether a recommendation to the Board makes sense for the next conference (it is not budgeted).
11. Uses of the website and other outreach throughout the year. Do we want to have a newsletter? A student form? History briefs? A quarterly virtual talk series? Something to keep EPA on folks' minds throughout the year...
- a. Social media. Patty has been handling our Linked-In presence. Is there a succession plan? Where do we go from here? Would this be a way to bring in younger (potentially more tech savvy) members into leadership?
 - b. Jennifer T shared "Presentation Cards" with Board members to be given out to encourage people to share their research with EPA following the convention (perhaps on LinkedIn). She's the current contact, but if this works well, it can be carried forward.
 - c. There was no resolution, and no extensive conversation, so social media presence/management may need to be revisited.
12. CE credits? Should we offer? (seems like a perennial question)
- a. This type of program requires more information like learning objectives in the submission process, so it may not be something to pursue right now. In the future, it could use the different format room. The Board did not feel that adding CE programming be a priority for now.
13. Speaking of perennial questions... how can we create a pipeline for PC and Board members? Is there research on involvement that can guide us here?
- a. It's hard to get volunteers, so maybe we need to better incentivize volunteers (see item 14)? Brainstorm other ways?
14. Should we compensate PC members with free annual memberships, when the budget allows (as determined by the Treasurer and a vote of the BOD)? Note: this was approved during executive session last year but was not acted upon. If we agree to do this, should we do so retroactively for the 2026 PC? Finally, does

this include the PC Chair? Does the Chair get more, or is the bonus (if possible) enough?

- a. This was voted on last year in executive session. Sunday PC session is removed so an extra one night stay is no longer required, but we can still thank them for their work. The Board agreed to reimburse PC members from this year for their registration fee as was voted on last year. Board also agreed going forward give PC members a free registration. This will cost EPA about \$1000/year (\$100 x 10ish PC members with the chair).
 - i. There was a suggestion to make this a room night instead of registration. Paul suggested tabling the plan to increase the waiver to a room night until Maryellen can weigh in.
 - b. Board members get one night reimbursed (have to arrive early).
15. Community college outreach. Can we do something impactful with the resources we have available?
 - a. Did not discuss this.
16. EPA history. What is the role of the historian? Answer questions as they arise? Or more . . . e.g., record minutes of Board Meetings, keep a running history of EPA, changes to the bylaws changes to the composition of EPA. Write and post a history of EPA every 5 years? See [email from Elissa](#).
 - a. Will discuss this at a later Zoom board meeting.

17. Executive session agenda (not recorded for these minutes)

- a. Election results and nomination challenges
- b. Bonuses

The Board approved the minutes, including the following amendment (April 28, 2026):

The Board of the Eastern Psychological Association officially recognizes that Jennifer Thompson (Executive Officer) and Maryellen Hamilton (Treasurer) are the authorized signers for all the Eastern Psychological Association Vanguard Brokerage accounts (6509XXXX). This includes VRIRX (VANGUARD SHORT TERM TREASURY ADMIRAL CL) and VFIJX (VANGUARD GNMA ADMIRAL CL).