

# **SICB Executive Committee**

## **2 January 2002**

### **Anaheim, California**

Present: Miriam Ashley-Ross, Al Bennett, Ron Dimock, Martin Feder, Craig Frank, Steven Hand, Penny Hopkins, Michael Moore, John Pearse, Wendy Ryan, Kathleen Smith, Stacia Sower, Marvalee Wake, Miriam Zelditch

BAI Staff present: Richard Burk, Brett Burk and Micah Sauntry

#### **Welcome**

Marvalee Wake welcomed the group and called the meeting to order.

Wake noted that several of the Officers had a strategic planning meeting this Fall. The meeting was part of an ongoing strategic planning process that will incorporate the input of the Executive Committee. There will be additional information provided at this meeting. Wake pointed out that Burk & Associates has been wonderful to work with this year.

Wake described our financial accomplishments for this year as significant. More will be discussed later in the meeting. Several of our committees have also been quite active this year.

#### **Minutes**

Approval of the minutes will be deferred to the second Executive Committee meeting.

#### **Archivist**

Wake stated that she would like to look into the role of archivist and to designate a new one. It has recently been noted that we have 8 linear feet of files at the Smithsonian – we would like to know what is in them. In addition, we have had an offer to add to the SICB archives.

#### **Conservation Committee**

Wake pointed out that there is some overlap between this committee and the AIBS public affairs program

#### **Education Council**

Wendy Ryan has put together an ambitious agenda for the coming year. Ryan stated that Science as a Way of Knowing II (SAAWOK II) is one direction that the Council is looking into, but that it would need broad based support before proceeding. The support could be in the way of volunteerism. Penny Hopkins noted that this has traditionally been a method of bringing in people that might not ordinarily join the SICB.

Ryan noted that traditionally SAAWOK was very focused and that there were some additional workshops and presentations that went on outside of the core functions.

Wake asked if the Council could work with Trish Morse's initiative.

Ryan requested names of people who might be interested in volunteering for the Education Council. Martin Feder pointed out that the bylaws were amended such that the Council could appoint additional volunteers if desired.

### **Electronic Communications Committee**

Craig Frank stated that the Electronic Communications Committee has been serving as the beta testers for the SICB website improvements. The original role of the committee has largely been accomplished. Frank stated that future responsibilities for the committee will need to be established. Stacia Sower asked if the committee would be interested in working on the SICB Newsletter. Frank indicated that they would be interested.

### **Membership**

Al Bennett related the actions of the Membership Committee this year. The committee sent a variety of letters and received a positive response. Bennett stated that we had an uptick of membership of about 130 members. Bennett does not recommend sending out similar letters again. John Pearse noted that giving membership to non-member attendees at the meeting should help with membership numbers.

One ongoing problem noted for SICB is getting reviews back from reviewers. One idea put forward was to invite non-members as reviewers and confer membership as a benefit if they perform their role in a timely manner. This is a means of accomplishing two goals at once. Sower surmised that by approaching new people in the field, we could help to generate life-long members. Wake suggested that we do this as a designated experiment with a cap on how many from each area would be invited. Feder agreed that the cap is an important part of this proposal. Wake tasked the Editorial Board with creating a proposal for Executive Committee approval.

### **Nominating**

Wake reported that the Nominating Committee is still being constituted at this meeting, and is partially complete. Wake requested any nomination suggestions.

### **Program Advisory Committee**

Wake noted that there is a list of the funding commitments in the packet for the program innovation fund (administered by this committee). Wake stated that the intent of this committee was to develop innovative ideas for the program. Wake, Sower and Pearse have outlined some additional core functions for the committee. Wake pointed out that the new chair is enthusiastic about the focus of the Committee.

Ron Dimock noted that the funding (program innovation fund) has been an issue this year. Dimock stated that symposium organizers are encouraged to make an external funding application – if they do, their registrations are reimbursed. Some symposium organizers were confused about whether funding from this committee satisfied the external funding requirement – it does not. Wake stated that the funding for the program innovation fund for 2004 is still an open question.

### **Public Affairs Committee**

Miriam Ashley-Ross asked the Executive Committee about the level of interest in the Evolution Town Meeting being held again this year. In addition, the committee is hosting a media workshop and a media breakfast. The latter is generally sparsely attended so we are trying to entice them with food this year

Wake noted that this committee has been very active all year. Kathleen Smith suggested that we monitor the Evolution Town Meeting and then decide how to proceed.

### **Student/Post-Doc Affairs Committee**

Wake stated that the chair has rejuvenated this committee and has been asked to serve a second term. He has agreed.

### **Student Support Committee**

This committee is going well and has been funded at \$24K for this year.

### **Ad hoc Committee for Increasing Diversity in SICB**

Wake has been forwarding contacts to this committee.

### **BioOne and AIBS Public Policy (appended)**

Wake noted that SICB has opted in on both of these programs. Brett Burk gave a brief overview of the BioOne program and how it functions.

Wake noted that the public policy program has come on line nicely and is very proactive. Burk added that SICB originally agreed to a three year commitment on this program.

### **Program**

Pearse stated that the meeting is looking very good so far. Pearse reminded the Executive Committee that this is the second meeting that is totally topical which is a change from the past. Pearse stated that being the Program Chair is too much work for someone who is not retired, so they are recommending a new approach for next year.

Pearse stated that they would like to put the entire program together in one meeting as a collaborative effort instead of having it come together over a long stretch of time. The proposed cost for this program meeting is \$20K. The venue would be either Toronto or Chicago depending on price. In future years, another benefit would be to push the abstract deadline later. It was noted that Burk & Associates (BAI) supports several such meetings and that they work very well.

Feder pointed out that we have rejected such meetings in the past due to the cost and the ability to connect electronically. Feder agreed that this is worth trying as an experiment. Another benefit of this type of meeting is that it will have some visionary work on programmatic direction. Yet another benefit of this meeting would be to control overlap since all of the divisions will be represented.

Pearse noted that the number of symposia has been fairly stable over the past few years at 15. It was stated that some in NSF have been critical about the number requests for funding that SICB generates for a meeting of our size.

Pearse reported that Sower handled the proposals for the Toronto meeting. Pearse and Sower are interested in changing the Program Officer term so that you do not spend two years without an elect for support. The change in term would require an election every two years.

### **Constitution and Bylaws Revision**

Wake found 38 areas in which we are out of compliance. It is now time that we revisit them and some significant changes to the entire document. Wake requested that Hopkins chair the ad hoc committee. Wake will be ex officio on this committee. The Executive Committee agreed by consensus to proceed on this.

### **Symposium Speaker Reimbursement**

Wake read the current policy and noted that it must be clear that speakers are reimbursed when there is an application for external support. There was a motion to amend the handbook to reflect current practice – this will be brought to the second meeting.

### **Finances**

Dimock noted that we experienced an increase in assets of about \$100K in the last year. Dimock highlighted some of the points in the financial spreadsheets.

Dimock reminded the group that the lower dues revenue is intentional and is tied to the reduction in membership costs that we can now afford. Dimock noted that this reduction is the fulfillment of a promise made several years ago.

Dimock pointed out the level of financial improvement largely due to BAI – the meetings are a prime example.

Dimock stated that we have tried to formalize the budgeting procedures for this year. In the past the divisions have received a set amount. This year there is a default amount, \$2K, but we have encouraged the divisions to come forward with additional funding requests. Smith suggested that the divisional requests for funds could come out much earlier. Dimock agreed that this would be run earlier this year.

### ***Motion to approve the budget – unanimously approved***

### **Investment Policy**

Dimock recounted that he and Marvalee worked with BAI to bring forward some types of investment advisors. Dimock stated that there was unanimous approval at the strategic planning meeting to request a formal proposal from Matt Tederick. The document proposed by Tederick describes the philosophical approach and model allocation approaches. Dimock noted that his normal fee is 1.25% and will reduce the fee to 1.075% and will waive the trade costs as well. Dimock stated that we will likely invest approximately \$1.2M.

Smith noted that we need to generate a plan for what to do with the money and what it is to be used for. Wake agreed and pointed out that this is part of the strategic planning process. Dimock noted that a portion of the funds are there as a cushion.

***Motion to approve the investment policy statement and authorize the Treasurer and the Finance Committee to retain Matt Tederick and LPL Financial Services as the financial advisor to execute this modification to the traditional SICB investment policy – Ron Dimock, Wendy Ryan second – approved 10 voting for and 3 opposed***

### **Elections**

Hopkins noted that we are still trying to get these all on the same page.

### **Journal Status**

John Edwards is not able to attend the meeting and John Wingfield will be arriving late. Wake reminded the group that they have approved new consortium members. Wake reported that the change of name for the journal was approved. Wake also reported that the information about electronic manuscript processing has been sent to the Editor.

### **Evaluation of BAI**

Dimock stated that BAI has asked for an evaluation of their work each year. The Executive Committee is requested to fill out the evaluation forms.

### **Responsiveness**

Wake noted that we are all in a time when we are burdened by many things. Wake stated that it is important that we all make a specific effort to respond. Burk offered to have BAI help with internal communication to divisions and officers. Smith and Steven Hand noted the remarkable turnaround time from BAI for such things as divisional emails.

### **International Effort**

Wake stated that the results of the invitations were mixed – 8 countries are represented. Representatives from 35 countries were invited. Wake stated that we need to review whether this should be continued.

# **SICB Executive Committee**

## **6 January 2002**

### **Anaheim, California**

Present: David Borst, Ron Dimock, Martin Feder, John Gellar, Patricia Glas, Kimberly Hammond, Steven Hand, Penny Hopkins, William Kier, Catherine McFadden, Rachel Merz, Michael Moore, Dianna Padilla, John Pearse, Wendy Ryan, Kathleen Smith, Donald Swiderski (representing Miriam Zelditch), Nora Terwilliger, Marvalee Wake, John Wingfield

BAI Staff present: Sue Burk, Brett Burk and Micah Sauntry

#### **Welcome**

Marvalee Wake welcomed the new members Bill Kier and John Gellar.

#### **2001 Minutes**

Wake stated that we had not handed out the minutes from the previous year at the Business Meeting, but that we could approve them here since most of the attendees are in this room.

***Motion to approve the 2001 minutes – John Pearse, Ron Dimock second – unanimously approved***

#### **2002 Meeting Post Mortem**

John Pearse has not heard any complaints or negative comments – the meeting is going quite well. Pearse stated that the planning has improved each year. Pearse also stated that he will help Stacia Sower with the planning for next year in his role as the Past Program Officer.

Catherine McFadden said that the physical layout was great this year and that it should be emulated if possible. Nora Terwilliger also liked the meeting, but was curious about our ability to leave up the posters at all times. Pearse stated that the problem with leaving the posters up is one of available space. David Borst said that having the posters in the evening curtails other items.

Dianna Padilla congratulated Pearse for a job well done.

Sue Burk commented that this has been a very good meeting from her perspective as well. S. Burk stated that we will be in the Sheraton Center Toronto next year. It is right downtown and is connected to the Toronto underground.

S. Burk added that the program meeting that will be held will help with the planning of the meeting.

Michael Moore asked if we will be having late posters next year. In his opinion, they seem to cause some problems with the judging portions at the meeting since people do not take the poster deadline seriously. Martin Feder noted that there used to be an incentive to have people submit on time by having a lower abstract fee – perhaps we should re-establish a fee for those who submit late. The group agreed to a suggestion by Patricia Glas that any late submissions would not be eligible for awards.

Padilla noted that we almost seemed to be soliciting late posters instead of merely accepting them. Pearse would like to encourage submissions that designate either poster or oral since they facilitate planning.

Future meeting venues were discussed with a focus on San Diego for the year after New Orleans. The Town and Country and the Sheraton are the two primary locations being pursued. Terwilliger noted that there are other large meetings in San Diego in 2005 also. Seattle was suggested as another possible location for 2005.

Wake pointed out that there has been some discussion about stabilizing the meeting locations. This could be anything from one location to a more traditional three location (geographically distributed) model. Borst asked what the local committees do now. Wake responded that they are not required to do anything currently. Padilla noted that if we go to set meetings it will mean that some areas will always have to travel to the meeting. Wendy Ryan stated that we have been talking about bringing in undergraduates and that having the meetings rotate near them would be important. Moore stated that we could help keep costs low by signing multiple year contracts.

### **SICB Program Committee Meeting**

Wake stated that there are financial impacts to consider with this meeting. Ron Dimock stated that we are able to afford this given our current finances.

Pearse stated that we need to consider how the affiliated societies are determined and what they are to do. S. Burk stated that it would be helpful to have an Executive Committee contact who can work with us on who we meet with and how this should be structured. Wake stated that the core officers will work Burk & Associates (BAI) and the Program Officer to create a document. John Wingfield will help as a liaison this year to the Division of Animal Behavior which has been less active than in past years.

Wake thanked S. Burk for a great job this year.

The consensus of the Executive Committee was to approve the program meeting at the \$20K rate.

### **Journal**

Wingfield noted that the backlog of manuscripts has just about been cleared. Jenifer Tousley and Claudia de Gruy were formally thanked for their contributions to the production of the Journal.

Wingfield stated that the June 2002 issue should contain the first symposia from this meeting and that all will likely be published this year. The name of the issue will change with the February issue to *Integrative and Comparative Biology*.

Wingfield reported that the Editorial Board will become much more involved now that the backlog has been largely removed. There will be more things published than solely symposia. Wingfield thanked those who have left the Journal Consortium and welcomed the three new ones.

Borst recommended that there be an overt decision about where the authority to determine what is published with regards to symposia should reside. Pearse added that this would facilitate symposium planning also.

McFadden asked if the consortium members are required to be SICB members. Wingfield affirmed that they are. Glas suggested that we advertise the opportunity for people to become reviewers on the dues form in the booth and on the web page. It was also suggested that postdocs are a good audience for generating reviewers.

### **Education Award Proposal**

Ryan stated that the goal is to increase the awareness of the science education at this meeting. The title of the award would be the SICB Award for Excellence and Innovation in Science Education. The Education Council has endorsed this idea. Ryan stated that they would like to see this implemented beginning in Toronto. Ryan stated that they will be looking for funding for 2003 but will ask SICB for the funding just in case.

Feder asked how this is different from the Moore lectureship. Ryan just learned about the latter. Feder noted that McGraw Hill is interested in these types of awards. Feder further applauded the effort to bring forward the funding ideas along with the request as opposed to solely a request for funds. Feder suggested that the spending of seed money is a good way to proceed. Wake also supports this award.

***Motion to approve the award as presented – unanimously approved***

### **AIBS Education Collaboration**

Ryan has contacted AIBS and they recommend that we collaborate with them through Trish Morse – she is the chair of the AIBS Education Committee. Ryan noted that the AIBS effort is largely focused on undergraduates. The unanimous consensus of the group was to participate in the AIBS program.

### **Evolution Town Meeting**

Wake noted that this was fantastic, but under attended relative to last year. Given the low attendance, we need to decide what to do for 2003. The general perception is that last year there were many more announcements of the event. Kathy Hammond suggested serving a box lunch at the event as a draw.

Feder stated that the meeting was held the first year to spark interest in establishing an SICB position of the teaching of evolution. It was not necessarily designed to happen every year, but to begin a process of other activities. Feder rephrased the core question as what are we going to do about the evolution issue and not should we have another town meeting.

Wake stated that we have played a low-level role with the NSF initiative. It is likely that they would welcome much more direct action from us. Feder stated that we need individuals who are willing to be active volunteers to work on this issue.

Wake referred this issue and the concerns of the Executive Committee to the Public Affairs Committee and asked them to report suggestions and ideas back to us. Feder suggested that we should specifically ask for ideas that are in addition to or instead of the town meeting. Pearse suggested that we keep the town meeting whether or not it is a major event.

### **Life Membership**

Padilla stated that the up-front money, if properly invested, will take care of the long term cash interruption.

***Motion to reinstitute the life membership category – unanimously approved***

It was noted that this was a vote on the principle and not on the finances which will go to the Finance Committee.

**Reimbursement Policy**

Wake read the proposed wording for the policy. Padilla stated that you cannot get funding for many of the DEE type symposia. Wake has had some discussions with NSF and there are some who are broadening their support. Feder stated that we would be interested in additional data to amend this policy if necessary. Wake noted that NSF is not the only resource for funding. It was noted that the goal is to cause a good faith effort to be undertaken.

***Motion to approve the policy as: Symposium participants will be reimbursed for their registration fees if organizers explore/apply for outside (non-SICB) support for their symposia. Organizers may make reimbursement contingent on participants' submission of their manuscripts in a timely manner – unanimously approved***

**Procedure Notebooks**

Wake noted that each officer and committee chair will be asked to prepare a procedure notebook.

**Committee Reports**

*Conservation Committee*

John Gellar reported that the committee met this year and would like to continue to exist. Gellar pointed out the similarity between this committee and the evolution issue in that everyone agrees with the basic principles. Gellar stated that the committee is seeking feedback and direction. Gellar noted that the committee views their charge in the light that conservation biology is by definition integrative. They might be interested in sponsoring a symposia for the New Orleans meeting.

Wake noted that AIBS is covering our Washington based need for quick response to potential legislation and that this is extended to state legislation to some degree. This still leaves an important role for us to express our individual SICB opinions.

*Development Committee*

Wake expressed some curiosity as to the need for this committee. Dimock agreed that having a committee in name only is not helpful – it would need to provide constructive input. Wingfield stated that this is worth exploring since many large foundations are showing increasing interest funding activities such as ours. Wingfield noted that this could facilitate bringing in international representation from students. Wingfield will prepare a new charge for this committee.

**International Effort**

Wake reminded the group that we approved a line item for this at \$500 per attendee. Wake invited 35 presidents, but many could not make it due to timing conflicts. Wake reported that representatives were there from Japan, Mexico, Canada, Belgium, Israel and the Netherlands. Some of the representatives were brought in due to the all society symposium – including the IUBS Executive Director from France and the Treasurer from Finland.

Wake stated that there was some discussion about creating an information network between these groups. We could serve as a network of like-minded societies who can help mold issues in our respective countries. Wake asked if there was enough value added from this to propose having it again next year. Hopkins suggested that we ask for feedback from the attendees. Ryan noted that the representative from Finland participated in the Education Council.

### **Secretaries Meeting**

Hopkins will be contacting the three secretaries that were not able to attend the meeting. Hopkins reminded everyone of the March 4<sup>th</sup> Spring Newsletter deadline. Hopkins reported that all of the elections will be in the Spring Newsletter – the ballot will be held afterwards with the results posted in the Fall Newsletter. We will be asking everyone to check their divisional affiliations in advance of the election.

Hopkins stated that this year there was a job board available and that next year there would be an interview room available. We will also try to have some internal links to the jobs on the website.

### **Student Support Proposal**

Borst stated that the groups is appreciative of the increase - \$21K was spent at this meeting which is within the \$24K total budget. Borst brought forward a proposal to create the Graduate Student Traveling Fellowship (GSTF). The amount would be \$2K per award and the first year would be at \$10K total.

***Motion to approve the award – Feder, Terwilliger second – unanimously approved***

***Motion to amend by allowing \$5K total cost and encouraging the committee to come up with matching funds for the rest – Feder, Smith second – approved with one abstention (Ryan)***

Feder suggested that the announcement of this could contain the language that every contributed dollar results in matching dollars. Feder stated that the committee should talk this up quite a bit, but that they are not ultimately responsible for the funding. Moore asked if the word “international” should be added to the title. Borst stated that most of them would be international, but that there is not any reason to be restrictive on this.

### **Congressional Fellow Proposal**

Peter Smallwood proposed the institution of an SICB Congressional Fellow. Glas agreed that it is very important that we get involved in this type of activity. Padilla is also supportive of this effort. Moore agrees that this is important, but stated that it needs to be part of a larger strategic approach. Feder reminded the group of the Bradley Rule. Wake stated that we would sponsor this with other societies. Hopkins stated that we have done this in the past and that it impacts the entire membership and therefore satisfies the Bradley Rule.

Moore suggested pursuing this and establishing a committee of past fellows. Feder would like to see some data on benefits that other societies have received before signing off on a \$60K budget item. Borst agreed with this approach. Wake charged Smallwood to create a proposal for pursuing this that addresses our concerns.

### **Thank You**

Wake thanked the group for their participation and efforts. Pearse was thanked and received a gift of appreciation for his service.

X-Sender: rogrady@aibs.org  
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Version 5.1  
Date: Fri, 20 Dec 2002 17:29:23 -0500  
To: bburk@burkinc.com,mhwake@socrates.berkeley.edu  
From: "Richard O'Grady, Exec. Director, AIBS, 202-628-1500 x 258" <rogrady@aibs.org>  
Subject: AIBS public policy update to the SICB Executive Committee for  
its January 2003 meeting

Dear Brett and Marvalee:

Below and attached please find AIBS's public policy update to the SICB Executive Committee for its meeting next month.

We have two professionally-trained public policy staff at AIBS: Dr. Adrienne Froelich, Director of Public Policy, and, just hired for a 1/20/03 start, Dr. Robert Gropp, Senior Public Policy Representative, who reports to Adrienne. Adrienne's scientific training is in aquatic sciences; Robert's is in botany. Robert was AIBS's Congressional Science Fellow in 1999-2000.

Starting in January 2003, we want to re-engage SICB in the discussions we had last August, where, Marvalee, you wrote that AIBS might work with its members on creating a "more direct 'alarm system' [for public policy matters], societies could respond directly, but, most importantly, the societies would have to take the responsibility for having in place their own contact system in order to respond appropriately to the AIBS request." We agree!

Together, Adrienne and Robert cover the following three areas of public policy:

**Research funding:** Authorization and Appropriations for biological research; this includes the authorization and potential administrative changes for programs such as NSF, Sea Grant, STAR, etc. Also the invasive species research bill falls into this category (which is coming up next year). Anything having to do with the budget or how it's set (i.e., the performance criteria for science programs) falls into this category.

**Education policy:** This includes the teaching of evolution, the math and science partnership program at NSF, the tech talent bill (although it just passed), EPA's environmental education programs and relevant K-12 science ed programs. Any future workforce issues fall into this category. Tracking funding for these programs falls into this category as well.

**Research regulations:** This is where research policy issues fall into place - permits, collections, data quality, human and animal subjects research, etc.

#### **FINANCIAL SUPPORT:**

Our basic proposal to AIBS member societies to contribute ear-marked funds to support public policy activities is as follows. These annual contributions are for a three-year commitment and are above and beyond regular AIBS membership dues. We currently have about \$65,000/yr in contributions coming from the following 16 AIBS member societies:

Soc. Integrative Comp. Biology  
Amer. Soc. Limnology and Oceanography  
Estuarine Research Federation

Biological Sciences Curriculum Study  
Soc. Wetland Scientists  
Soc. Economic Botany  
American Fisheries Society  
Society of Systematic Biologists  
Society for the Study of Evolution  
Organization of Biological Field Stations  
American Society of Mammalogists  
American Society of Ichthyologists and Herpetologists  
Association of Ecosystem Research Centers  
Botanical Society of America  
North American Lake Management Society  
Society of Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry

We are trying to raise at least an additional \$11,000/yr in 2003 (i.e., \$65k + \$11k in total annual contributions) to cover the current costs of the program--and more beyond that to continue growing the program.

**Funding Option A:**

Member societies and organizations pay at the following rates to provide ear-marked funds to help the AIBS Public Policy Office pay its staff and conduct its activities on behalf of the AIBS membership.

- Societies currently paying \$100/yr in dues to AIBS (i.e., < 1,000 members) pay an additional \$1,000/yr
- Societies currently paying \$300/yr in dues to AIBS (i.e., 1,000 - 4,999 members) pay an additional \$3,000/yr -- **SICB IS PARTICIPATING AT THIS LEVEL--THANK YOU FOR YOUR SUPPORT!**
- Societies currently paying \$500/yr in dues to AIBS (i.e., 5,000 or more members) pay an additional \$5,000/yr

(Note: Non-payment of the additional charges in this funding proposal *does not affect AIBS membership status* and all other membership benefits as secured through payment of the regular annual dues (\$100, \$300, & \$500), nor does it affect access to basic AIBS Public Policy Office services.)

**Funding Option B:**

Contributions in excess of the Option A amounts but not the size of Option C amounts...

**Funding Option C:**

A society, or clusters of societies in related disciplines, can collectively fund an entire policy staff position to be hired and administered at AIBS and, in return, a staffer with expertise in those disciplines will be hired to work on the funder(s)' specific public policy issues.

Sincerely,

Richard  
-----

Richard T. O'Grady, Ph.D.  
Executive Director  
American Institute of Biological Sciences  
1444 Eye St. NW, Suite 200  
Washington, DC 20005

V 202-628-1500 x 258

F 202-628-1509

[rogrady@aibs.org](mailto:rogrady@aibs.org)

[www.aibs.org](http://www.aibs.org)



[MSO Board Report Dec 20021.doc](#)

***AIBS Public Policy Office Annual Report***

*Submitted by Adrienne Froelich, AIBS Director of Public Policy  
15 December 2002*

<b><i>Research funding</i></b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>Letter to Congress on funds for NSF BIO signature drive</b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>Launch of the Biological and Ecological Sciences Coalition</b> .....	<b>2</b>
<b>Letters to PCAST regarding federal investment in science</b> .....	<b>2</b>
<b>CNSF Congressional Exhibition and Reception</b> .....	<b>3</b>
<b>Written testimony</b> .....	<b>3</b>
<b>AAAS Annual Report on the federal R&amp;D budget</b> .....	<b>3</b>
<b><i>Research and Education Policy</i></b> .....	<b>3</b>
<b>NSF doubling bill</b> .....	<b>3</b>
<b>NSF long-range planning</b> .....	<b>3</b>
<b>Metrics for measuring research output</b> .....	<b>4</b>
<b>Department of Interior Strategic Planning</b> .....	<b>4</b>
<b>Summary of ethics codes for DOI</b> .....	<b>4</b>
<b>US Ocean Commission</b> .....	<b>4</b>
<b><i>Evolution</i></b> .....	<b>4</b>
<b>AAAS symposium on intelligent design</b> .....	<b>4</b>
<b>Ohio and Georgia</b> .....	<b>4</b>
<b><i>Services to members and member societies</i></b> .....	<b>4</b>
<b>Memo for Oklahoma Medical Research Foundation meeting with House appropriator</b> ....	<b>5</b>
<b>Aquatic Invasive Species Hearing and Research bill</b> .....	<b>5</b>
<b>Public Policy Reports</b> .....	<b>5</b>
<b>BioScience: Editorials and Washington Watch</b> .....	<b>5</b>

The highlights of major activities and accomplishments of the AIBS Public Policy Office since October 2001 are summarized below. **This report is not intended to be comprehensive**, but rather to give you an idea of the types of things we do on behalf of the individual members and member societies of AIBS. In addition to the activities specifically listed below, the AIBS Public Policy Office is frequently contacted by congressional and executive branch staff for assistance on a variety of issues, including research provisions of the Homeland Security Bill and suggested witnesses for hearings. As the AIBS Public Policy Office has garnered standing in Washington, the number of calls from the media and other organizations to our office has increased tremendously, increasing the visibility of biology in Washington, D.C.

### **Research funding**

Funding for biological research continues to be one of our highest priorities. Our three largest efforts this year have been the AIBS sign-on letter to Congress regarding funding for NSF BIO, the launch of the Biological and Ecological Sciences Coalition, and the AIBS Comments to PCAST regarding federal investment in science. We also continue to work with scientific coalitions to accomplish our goals, including the Coalition for National Science Funding (CNSF - dedicated to NSF), the Science-Engineering-Technology Workgroup (which addresses the entire federal scientific research enterprise), and the newly formed Biological and Ecological Sciences Coalition (see below). We also work with the Coalition for Science-based Land Management, which focuses on the biological research activities in the Department of Interior, the USDA, and the EPA. AIBS staff also attended budget briefings and working lunches with DOI agencies, NOAA, and NSF.

#### *Letter to Congress on funds for NSF BIO signature drive*

Immediately following the Senate appropriations subcommittee mark of the NSF funding bill, AIBS began planning strategies to address the lack of additional funding provided to BIO by the Senate. The Senate subcommittee provided an additional \$348 million to NSF's Research and Related Accounts, the equivalent of a 15% increase. While the Senate provided the other directorates with portions of this "extra" money, boosting them to increases from 13-20%, they provided no extra funding to the BIO directorate, leaving BIO with only a 3.4% increase.

One of the activities undertaken by the policy office was to post a letter to Congress regarding funding for biology on the AIBS website and to solicit signatures from the biological sciences community. The reaction was immediate and sustained for the four-week period that AIBS collected signatures online. The AIBS IT department was able to design the website so that individuals could enter their information in a simple webform to sign the letter. The policy office also posted background information such as a list of appropriations members by state, suggested talking points and appropriate legislative history. Nearly 1800 scientists signed the letter, which was delivered to every member of Congress on September 10<sup>th</sup>.

In addition to having the desired effect on the Hill (the House provided BIO with a 15% increase in early October), the letter campaign caught the attention of the scientific community and the media (the effort was reported on in *The Scientist* a few days after the campaign was launched). Once the House subcommittee approved the 15% increase for NSF BIO, Froelich emailed those individuals who had signed the letter with the update, as well as information about next spring's congressional visits day. AIBS received several emails from individuals who wanted to write individual letters and even one who was setting up a meeting with a member of the House Appropriations Committee (see item under Services to Members).

### Launch of the Biological and Ecological Sciences Coalition

One of the largest obstacles we face in Washington, DC is the lack of understanding for the non-biomedical disciplines of biology. The biology studied by AIBS members has been overlooked as a significant portion of the federal R&D budget, and funding for our discipline has been harmed by the continual lumping of all of biology in one vague category of “life sciences”. Over the past six months, we’ve seen evidence of the lack of recognition of the diversity of biological research in a variety of ways including elimination of biology from the “tech talent bill”, smaller increases for BIO than in other directorates, and references to adequate funding for “biology and life sciences” in PCAST’s draft letter to President Bush.

To help increase awareness of the diversity of fields within the biological sciences, AIBS has partnered with the Ecological Society of America (ESA) to launch an informal coalition – the Biological and Ecological Sciences Coalition (BESC). The mission statement is still under revision; however, the sole focus for BESC is funding for biological research. BESC meetings and activities will serve as opportunities for the professional policy staff of biological societies to share information, develop joint strategies and pool resources to most effectively address upcoming issues. Currently there are no dues or officers for BESC, it is purely an informal coalition.

BESC has already had two victories in terms of raising awareness of the biological sciences. BESC members were successful in convincing the Coalition for National Science Funding (CNSF) – which represents all scientific disciplines – to send a letter to the House Appropriations Committee expressing concern about the Senate leaving biology out of the 15% increase for Research & Related Activities at NSF. House Appropriations staffers thanked CNSF for the statement, which provided them with the necessary political cover to provide BIO with an appropriate share of the additional funds. Nadine Lynn of ESA also delivered a statement to the President’s Council of Advisors on Science and Technology at their September 30<sup>th</sup> meeting. Immediately preceding the BESC comments, were comments from Co-FARM, a coalition of societies and organizations with an interest in agricultural issues. Both sets of comments addressed PCAST’s lack of attention to the fields of biology in their draft correspondence to President Bush. Following BESC’s comments, one PCAST member stated his support for their comments and urged the committee to proceed carefully so as not to unintentionally neglect disciplines in need.

### Letters to PCAST regarding federal investment in science

This summer and early fall, AIBS dedicated a lot of time and effort to tracking and commenting on proposed correspondence from the President’s Council of Advisors on Science and Technology (PCAST). A copy of the September AIBS letter to PCAST was sent to the board on September 10<sup>th</sup> and was published in the AIBS news Section of the October issue of BioScience. While preparing comments for PCAST, several other organizations contacted AIBS for assistance or input, including CAST, the Council for Agricultural Science and Technology (CAST). CAST submitted comments that made reference to AIBS’ comments and acknowledged AIBS’s assistance when the comments were mailed to CAST’s board of directors. AIBS also attracted media attention with this effort – a reporter from *The Scientist* interviewed AIBS staff about the AIBS letter and referred to the letter in a story on their website. The reporter also prompted a response from PCAST member Wayne Clough regarding PCAST’s lumping of all of biology into one vague category. The AIBS comments to PCAST also formed the basis of a statement delivered to the council on behalf of BESC (see above) by Nadine Lynn in late September.

The final version of the PCAST correspondence to the White House has not been released yet. Many speculate that the long delay in sending the correspondence is due in part to the large amount of criticism and comments received from the scientific community, including AIBS.

#### *CNSF Congressional Exhibition and Reception*

AIBS co-sponsored and participated in the annual Congressional Exhibit Day organized by the Coalition for National Science Funding (CNSF) on May 15. This year, we displayed two posters – one featuring the proposed National Ecological Observatory Network. The other poster was titled “Solving the mystery of hantavirus: basic biological research funded by NSF pays off.” Terry Yates, provost of the University of New Mexico and a principal investigator for much of the work on hantavirus, presented both posters.

#### *Written testimony*

The AIBS Policy Office submitted written testimony on behalf of AIBS for the Department of Interior and NSF to both the House and Senate Appropriations Committees. One major issue addressed in our testimony this year was the administration’s proposal to transfer several programs from NOAA (Sea Grant), EPA and USGS to NSF. AIBS sent letters to the administration opposing the transfers, and stated opposition to the transfers in written testimony submitted to the appropriations committees. The House and Senate appropriations committees soundly rejected these transfers, referring to the plan to move Sea Grant as “ill conceived”. Additionally, the Administration had cut funding for the EPA Science to Achieve Results (STAR) fellowships on the basis that EPA’s environmental education program “has supported environmental advocacy rather than environmental education”. The proposal received sharp criticism from the House Science Committee and both the House and Senate appropriations committees restored funding for the program. AIBS expressed its support for the STAR fellowships through letters signed by President Gene Likens, as well as written testimony submitted in spring 2002.

#### *AAAS Annual Report on the federal R&D budget*

AIBS co-authored a chapter on biological and ecological science funding with ESA for the AAAS Intersociety Working Group annual report on the federal research and development budget. The report examines the Administration’s budget request in close detail.

### **Research and Education Policy**

#### *NSF doubling bill*

One major effort on the NSF doubling bill (passed by both houses of Congress) was to remove language that would have favored math and physical sciences over other disciplines. This language could have been interpreted, if enacted, as a sign that those were priority areas for Congress. The AIBS Policy Office coordinated a meeting of biology policy professionals with the House Science committee to discuss concerns about the language. The language was subsequently dropped from the bill before the House of Representatives passed it. Similar language appeared in the Senate’s version of the bill. AIBS discussed the issue with both the minority and majority staff of the Senate Commerce committee, which agreed to instead use language provided by AIBS that still fulfilled their desire to mention the need to balance the federal research portfolio, but without saying so in a way that suggests biology is not a priority. This language was included in the final version of the bill.

#### *NSF long-range planning*

AIBS Policy staff attended several meetings at NSF regarding long-range planning activities. Both attended the BIO Advisory Committee meeting in April. The BIO-AC guides and informs

the shape and direction of NSF's funding programs by providing advice, recommendations, and oversight concerning major program emphases, directions, and goals for the research-related activities to the research directorate. A full report of the meeting was published in the May 10 AIBS Public Policy Update. AIBS has also attended briefings on NSF-ERE's new "Agenda for Environmental Research and Education," the NCEAS program review, and the LTER symposium.

#### *Metrics for measuring research output*

At a workshop on 27 February, the Committee on Science, Engineering, and Public Policy (COSEPUP) of the National Academy of Science had a chance to scrutinize and discuss the criteria proposed by the White House Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for the evaluation of all federal basic research programs. The criteria were developed pursuant to the Bush administration's Management Agenda, released last August. That agenda calls for the integration of the budget process and performance reviews, resulting in funding priorities for programs that achieve their objectives. AIBS Public Policy staff attended the COSEPUP meeting and will follow this issue closely. Froelich wrote a Washington Watch column for the May issue of BioScience on this subject.

#### *Department of Interior Strategic Planning*

AIBS public policy staff took part in the second annual U.S. Geological Survey listening session, which gives scientific societies, USGS partners, and others an opportunity to give USGS feedback on USGS' mission, performance, and management.

#### *Summary of ethics codes for DOI*

At the request of the Science Advisor to the Secretary of the Interior, AIBS compiled and summarized the ethics codes of numerous scientific societies.

#### *US Ocean Commission*

The US Commission on Ocean Policy began its work in November of 2001. The Commission is reviewing all aspects of ocean and coastal policy, including research and education, and is of great interest to several AIBS member societies. AIBS has attended several commission meetings and reports on Commission activities to member societies on a regular basis. Froelich wrote a Washington Watch column on the Commission for the March BioScience.

### **Evolution**

#### *AAAS symposium on intelligent design*

AIBS is co-sponsoring an upcoming AAAS symposium on the intelligent design. The symposium is being organized by AAAS's DOSER (Dialog on Science, Ethics and Religion) program and will take place in early fall 2002.

#### *Ohio and Georgia*

AIBS has helped coordinate efforts to prevent the incorporation of intelligent design theory in science curricula in both Ohio and Georgia. AIBS President Gene Likens signed letters to members of both school boards. We continue to keep track of new developments in these and other states via the AIBS Evolution listserv.

### **Services to members and member societies**

#### *Memo for Oklahoma Medical Research Foundation meeting with House appropriator*

As a result of the AIBS campaign to gather signatures for the NSF-BIO letter to Congress, a staff member at the Oklahoma Medical Research Foundation requested AIBS's assistance. The staff member forwarded the AIBS Action Alert to the director of her office, who has a good relationship with Rep. Istook, a member of the House Appropriations Committee. The staff member asked AIBS to prepare a memo and some talking points for the meeting between her boss and Rep. Istook. AIBS mined recent NSF news releases on molecular and cellular biology to create the memo and talking points. Following the meeting with Rep. Istook, the OMRF staff told AIBS that the meeting was very productive and Rep. Istook assured OMRF that he would work to have the BIO directorate included in any increase to NSF's Research Accounts on the House side.

#### *Aquatic Invasive Species Hearing and Research bill*

In June, AIBS was able to arrange for a long-time AIBS member, Dr. David Lodge, to testify at a House Science subcommittee hearing and provided logistical support in preparing the witness. Prior to the hearing, the policy office took care of all logistics (printing and delivering testimony prior to the hearing, etc.). AIBS Policy staff also spent several hours prepping Lodge for the hearing by briefing him on the interests of the subcommittee members and the mechanics of the hearing, as well as asking him mock questions they had prepared.

Subsequently, House Science committee staff have called AIBS for assistance on several other topics, including the "science in the endangered species act" issue. Staff also sent AIBS a draft version of the bill, requesting comments. AIBS provided comments, several of which, including those regarding increased funding for taxonomy, were incorporated into the introduced version of the bill.

#### *Public Policy Reports*

The Public Policy Office is responsible for writing the biweekly public policy reports that are now disseminated on the AIBS website and by e-mail to the president, president-elect, secretary, treasurer, executive director, AIBS Council Representative, journal editor, newsletter editor, public policy committee chair, and public policy representative of the AIBS member societies. We are averaging 5 stories every two weeks in the updates – sometimes stories are cut due to the desire to not overwhelm the reader. We continue to receive positive feedback from the community about the updates and often get follow-up inquiries from recipients. Stories from the updates are frequently forwarded by societies or federal agency labs to various listserves and newsgroups as well. Additionally, material from the AIBS updates are also frequently posted on member society websites or published in their newsletters.

#### *BioScience: Editorials and Washington Watch*

The AIBS Public Policy office is responsible for the Washington Watch column in *BioScience*. The policy staff are responsible for writing the majority of columns for Washington Watch throughout the year. On occasion, an article may be freelanced. In those cases, Froelich is charged with finding and working with writers, developing topics, and fact checking the draft before the column is submitted to the *BioScience* editorial staff. We often alert the AIBS membership to various policy issues via editorials in *BioScience*. Froelich authored the May and October editorials on topics related to the need for distinction between the various subdisciplines of biology.