

DRAFT 1**MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY
DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY
East Lansing, MI 48824-1117**

Phone: (517) 355-7503
FAX: “ 353-4873
e-mail: ilgen@msu.edu

**Daniel R. Ilgen
John A. Hannah Distinguished
Professor of Psychology and
Management**

TO: SIOP Executive Committee

From: Dan Ilgen

Subject: Report on annual council meeting of the FEDERATION

Date: December 5, 2006

The Federation of Behavioral, Psychological, & Cognitive Sciences held its annual council meeting on December 4, 2006. SIOP has two representatives on the council—myself and John Campbell. I was the only one that could attend so this is the only report.

SIOP is in the first year of a three-year trial membership with the FEDERATION. During the three years, SIOP's status with the organization is the same as that of full member organizations with the exception that a reduced membership fee is applied during the three years and that reduction decreases over the three years. At the end of the trial period when SIOP's membership will be that of a full member.

Since this was the first time SIOP meeting in which SIOP was represented, I will (1) briefly describe the association and goals, (2) report on the annual meeting and (3) offer my reaction to what membership in it offers SIOP.

I.

FBPCS was formed in 1981 as a nonprofit organization of behavioral, psychological and cognitive sciences to advocate, educate, and communicate for its member organizations to their constituencies. Its member organizations are listed in Appendix 3. At the present time the targets of advocacy are primarily elected officials and government agencies that do or could potentially fund

research and practice of member societies. Education and communication is also directed to these agencies as well as to the public at large in the spirit of making the public more aware of the value of what behavioral, psychological and cognitive psychology does and can do.

Structurally, FBPCS has a foundation (Foundation for the Advancement of Behavioral and Brain Sciences, FABBS) that is a 501C(3) organization allowing it to receive tax deductible contributions. The educational activities of the FEDERATION are coordinated primarily through FABBS. FABBS also has a program through which distinguished senior scientists can be recognized as part of its fund raising efforts. Marv Dunnette was one of its recent nominees and is listed on its web page.

FBPCS has three full time staff members with Barb Wanchisen, Ph.D. as the Executive Director. At present only one of the other two paid positions are filled.

As mentioned earlier, the key activities of the FEDERATION are *advocacy*, *education* and *communication*. **Advocacy** is short term and long. The staff work to build long term relationships with staffers on the hill and with federal agencies (e.g., NSF, NIH, DoD, DHS, etc.) so that key persons in those agencies know better what member societies can do and to be available to provide these agencies with information when they need it. In the short term, the FEDERATION reacts to needs and concerns of members with respect to trying to influence policy supportive of behavioral, psychological and cognitive sciences.

Educationally, the efforts are directed both at the same audience as advocates and in addition to the broader public to show what we can do. Primarily through FABBS, the FEDERATION organizes science fair, public lectures and other events annually. For example, in 2006 Michele Gelfand's (I/O Psychology, University of Maryland) cross cultural work was featured in an exhibition held in the Rayburn Building where members of Congress and their staff could see examples of her work and talk with Michele about it.

Communication is directed both to outsiders and to members. A weekly newsletter is, in my opinion, extremely valuable for learning about funding and other issues important to psychology. Often these have direct relevance to I/O psychology. This newsletter will be distributed to all of SIOP eventually. Members not interested in it have the option to cancel it.

II. Annual meeting, December 4, 2006

The activities of the annual meeting were of two kinds. The morning session involved invited presentations from three agencies followed by an open discussion with the board and representatives. The invited speakers were:

Deborah Olster, Deputy Director of Behavioral and Social Sciences Research, National Institutes of Health

Robert Croyle, Director, Division of Cancer Control and Population Sciences, National Cancer Institute

Michelle Keenaey, Science Advisor, Human Factors Science and Technology, Department of Homeland Security

These discussions were quite valuable and had more potential value for I/O psychology than I had expected. For example, there are several ongoing initiatives that are closely related to I/O at the National Cancer Institute. The more important long term issue is that I have every reason to expect that if SIOF would want to target some agency for the morning session of this meeting next December, I believe a good faith effort would be made to try to accommodate our needs.

The second part of the meeting was a business meeting. This had little worth reporting here other than the fact that a dues increase passed. For a period of approximately 10 years dues were not changed. The angst surrounding the need for a large increase after that 10 years (in 2005) led to the decision to have small increases more frequently that kept up with expenses. Implementing this incremental plan led to an increase of from 2-3%. The by-laws (see Appendix 4) call for dues increases to be put in effect one year after approval. Thus, the increase will go into effect in 2008.

III. Value of FEDERATION Membership for SIOF

At the SIOF strategic planning retreat in the fall of 2006, the issue was raised as to whether or not the membership in the FEDERATION was likely to be valuable to SIOF. My impression is that it can be. But, to take advantage of its benefits, SIOF needs to be proactive in seeking services through the FEDERATION and working through it. The organization has an infrastructure for advocacy, education and communication, and I believe Barb Wanchensen will enthusiastically provide support *if* SIOF understands what the FEDERATION can do *and goes to it for help*. The key here is that SIOF must be proactive in soliciting support from the FEDERATION.

All of these functions (advocacy, education, and communication) of the FEDERATION are also available at APA. Thus, a legitimate question is why not simply rely on APA. This question was raised at the SIOF retreat, and I raised it with Steve Breckler (APA's Science Director and also an APA representative to the Federation). The question from me admittedly put him in a somewhat awkward position, given his APA role. Yet, I thought he was very helpful.

In my opinion having the FEDERATION as a source for these services helps us for several reasons. First, from an influence standpoint, having both agencies (the FEDERATION and APA) advocating for psychology increases our voice. Second, the FEDERATION, in my opinion, is more nimble. Its small and can focus more on us when need be than can APA. Third, although APA wants to represent all psychology, the demand of clinical gives us less power in it. Our clout can never equal clinical. Furthermore, to other psychologists, we get lumped in the "applied psychology" category along with clinical so are not only small in comparison but also seen as having similar needs to clinical even if we do not. Fourth, in the FEDERATION, we are one of the few that have a strong applied focus. Thus, we and the Society for Human Factors, can, in my opinion, provide a strong voice for the relevance of psychology in the FEDERATION. I think our value to them is as quite positive. We can take advantage of that. Fifth, the members organizations in the Federation strengthen our psychology roots. Sixth, I think we can learn a lot from what others are doing about what can be done to increase the visibility of our field, and the FEDERATION can provide infrastructure for doing it. For example, I was very impressed with how the Human Factors and Ergonomics Society was using the FEDERATION to show what they could do. This year a one day workshop was held that showcased the work of 2-4 human factors researchers by having them present their work to an invited list of 30-40 people whose agencies dealt with their problems. The presenters gave talks with ample discussion in the morning and the afternoon there were break-out session with panel members and attendees from agencies to discuss common needs and issues. Next year the Society for Human Factors is planning a similarly structured session on the topic of "voting machines." The responses to these from the HF society's perspective have been very positive, and the FEDERATION very much appreciates the visibility it provides for them as source of information about human factors information for agencies and for staffers on the hill.

Another advantage of the association is the weekly FEDERATION newsletter. This can be set up to go to the SIOP listserv giving all SIOP members a copy and the option to continue to receive it. I will work with the FEDERATION and with the SIOP administrative office to get this set up.

In sum, I believe association with the FEDERATION can be valuable but to be so, SIOP must be proactive in working with it. SIOP must educate the FEDERATION staff in what it does and, in the near future, put on some form of education/outreach through it. By actively availing itself to the FEDERATION's services in the next two to four years, SIOP should return to the question of value added and should be able to make a reasoned decision about payoff. But if SIOP is not proactive in seeking its services and providing volunteers for advocacy when called upon, it is unlikely that the relationship will be valuable, in my opinion. To make a decision prior to giving our association with the FEDERATION a chance to develop would, in my opinion, be a mistake at this point.

Appendices: (see separate .pdf files)