

PTC-SC

Meeting Minutes

March 4, 2009

I. Call to order

Matthew Escobedo called to order the regular meeting of the PTC-SC board/officers at 9:35 a.m. on March 4, 2009 at Luminarias restaurant in Monterey Park.

II. Roll call

The following persons were present:

J. Allen	A. Herrera
A. Brody	D. McBride
D. Denning	M. Mihalevsky
M. Escobedo	B. Tietze
A. Forsberg	A. Tompkins
D. Friedland	

III. Approval of minutes from last meeting

J. Allen distributed the minutes from the last meeting. M. Escobedo moved to approve the minutes from January 30, 2009. D. McBride seconded the motion; All concur verbally.

IV. Open issues

1. There were no open issues addressed.

V. New business

1. CPS Sponsorship
 - a) M. Escobedo explained that Shelly Langan had proposed the idea of CPS sponsorship to Amy Gurjian. M. Escobedo moved to approve.
 - b) M. Mihalevsky asked if there were any guidelines available.
 - c) A. Forsberg asked about the inclusion of other companies or organizations.
 - d) B. Tietze indicated that he had compiled a list of companies/organizations that could be approached about conference sponsorship (i.e. NEOGOV, I/O programs, CODESP, etc.). He said he would contact them regarding the conference and that this may not require a motion.
 - e) M. Mihalevsky indicated this would be ok as a directive of the Board without a motion.
2. Membership Fee Structure
 - a) M. Escobedo proposed a revision to the membership section of the officer's manual. He distributed a copy of the proposed changes. The changes would allow/clarify that joining at the conference would apply to the following calendar year.

- b) M. Mihalevsky proposed the idea of having membership around the fiscal year instead of the calendar year since it would be closer to the conference.
- c) B. Tietze agreed that this might be a good idea since the fiscal year is tied to budgeting.
- d) A. Tompkins identified that the revision is basically saying what we do in practice.
- e) M. Escobedo said that last year there were about 12 people who signed up for membership at the conference and the process was confusing and hard to explain.
- f) D. McBride clarified that people who paid for membership at the conference would receive the member price for the conference and membership for the following calendar year.
- g) D. Friedland wanted to address the differential between what members and non-members pay for the conference.
- h) B. Tietze indicated that the differential should be an incentive to purchase membership. He also recommended having membership based on a 12-month period from the time the member joined.
- i) D. Friedland proposed the concept of prorating the cost of membership and also indicated that a calendar year is a standard membership practice.
- j) B. Tietze proposed having more membership options.
- k) J. Allen indicated it would be very difficult to follow-up with a large number of people multiple times each year to remind them to renew their memberships when the cost of membership is only \$40.
- l) A. Tompkins proposed a structured prorating process (i.e. ¼, or ½ year) that would provide more membership options.
- m) M. Escobedo indicated that Joan Stiegelmar was on board to implement whatever changes the Board approved.

3. Revisions to the Officer's Manual

- a) M. Escobedo asked if the Board wanted to approve revisions to the officer's manual or vote on all items when Amy Gurjian returns.
- b) D. McBride stated that at the last meeting it was agreed that the Board would review the entire package of revisions and vote at one time.
- c) M. Escobedo moved to implement the revisions to the membership wording of the Officer's Manual.
- d) D. McBride said she would like clarification and additional wording. She said she would draft proposed language and e-mail it to everyone.

4. Officer's Reports

Communications

- a) A. Brody – The website has been updated including the removal of old job postings. The LinkedIn site has been created and members have been invited and approximately 76 joined so far. LinkedIn seems to have good exposure including in the private sector and with professors and interns. A discussion was created about handling large applicant pools and has shown to be a good collaboration tool. Anyone can join the PTC-SC group on LinkedIn and membership is not required.

- b) D. Denning inquired about who is responsible for maintaining job postings on the website. She indicated that jobs/employment opportunities are very important and there should be a person in charge of this.
- c) A. Tompkins indicated that it has been rare to be asked to post a job.
- d) J. Allen stated that e-mail is often used to disseminate job openings to the entire e-mail distribution list.
- e) D. Denning proposed the idea of a placement coordinator.
- f) M. Mihalevsky identified that LinkedIn will be used for job postings and this may grow the number of jobs posted.

Programs

- a) A. Herrera – He will discuss membership at the current luncheon.

Conferences

- a) B. Tietze – He has been contacting presenters and finalizing hotel dates. He plans to confirm the dates in April and to start advertising in May with the conference dates in early November. A theme is still under development and he is exploring the sponsorship concept. Anaheim is the top choice right now for the conference location and is good for negotiating prices because of the competition in the area. California School Personnel Commissioners Association (CSPCA) proposed a joint conference (i.e. some joint/overlap with presentations and payment incentives). B. Tietze indicated he was not in favor of this proposal.
- b) A. Tompkins indicated that CSPCA members are non-technical and not very involved in the details of HR testing.
- c) M. Mihalevsky said it would be too complicated to manage a joint conference.
- d) M. Escobedo indicated that since we only have one conference per year at this time we should keep ours independent.
- e) D. Friedland said this might be a good outreach tool to raise testing awareness.
- f) D. Denning said we should decline but propose to CSPCA that PTC do a panel at CSPCA (to clarify what D. Friedland proposed).
- g) M. Mihalevsky thought a WRIPAC collaboration would be interesting. She also thought we might want to absorb more of a loss on the conference to provide a low cost service/training. SCPMA is charging \$99 for their conference.

Secretary

- a) J. Allen – the e-mail distribution list has been updated. When someone wants to send out an e-mail they should check in with the Secretary to ensure the list they are using is current and includes all paid members.

5. Scholarship Committee

- a) D. Denning stated that the announcement has not been written and wanted to discuss the distinction between an award and a scholarship.
- b) M. Escobedo stated that either verbiage would be ok.

- c) D. Denning wanted to know who was eligible since the timeframe is an important aspect in determining if it is a scholarship or award. D. Denning believed there were two roles with the first being a person to garner application interest and the second being a person to coordinate the evaluation committee. She understood her role as being the person who would put the committee together. It was her understanding that Matthew Escobedo would be handling the advertisements.
- d) M. Escobedo understood that the scholarship was open to all even if the research had not been completed.
- e) D. Denning remembered that eligibility with regard to Board members had been discussed at the last Board meeting; however eligibility as it pertained to school progress/thesis completion had not been discussed. D. Denning thought it would be ok if the degree had not been conferred since that is an administrative issue, but the research should be complete. D. Denning also specified that there should be one winner with up to two runners up because we may want to withhold the award if the research is not strong enough. For example, we may have a winner with no runners up.
- f) D. Denning indicated that SIOP has a list of all school programs should we want to advertise nationally.
- g) M. Escobedo indicated that it was not the initial intent to publicize the scholarship nationally.
- h) J. Allen stated that the language needs to be strengthened so that we do not have strong research submissions from across the country with the “winner” declining to present but accepting the award.
- i) D. Denning and M. Escobedo will discuss these issues and communicate via e-mail.
- j) B. Tietze thought that research proposals may be acceptable (i.e. unfinished research) and we may have more competition with this option.
- k) D. Denning indicated that this would become an award if they were out of school. She also indicated it would be difficult to compare finished and unfinished research. The research is only useful to PTC members if there are results. D. Denning stated that maybe we would have to refocus the entire thing on research proposals to be able to award the money to conduct the research.
- l) M. Escobedo proposed meeting with D. Denning and discuss this again at the next meeting.
- m) D. Denning stated that there are two people interested in being on the committee: Roxanne Cochran and Denise McGee. D. Denning said she would discuss the program with both of them.
- n) D. Denning stated she would be willing to present at a luncheon. Because statistical validity can be confusing, she could present on this and have it target entry-level people.

VI. Adjournment

M. Escobedo moved to adjourn the meeting at 10:50 a.m. and A. Thompson seconded the motion.

Minutes submitted by: Jennifer Allen