

* * * Happy Holidays from HFES * * *

CONTENTS

Standards.....	3	JCEDM.....	7
Chapters.....	5	Calls for Papers.....	7
Annual Meeting.....	6	Digital Library.....	8
Reviews of HF/E.....	6	Financial Report.....	9

“Elections Have Consequences . . .”

By the HFES Government Relations Committee

Following the 2008 election, President Obama was quoted as making this comment (followed by “. . . and we won”) in dismissing a Republican proposal with which he disagreed. Now that the Republicans are in control, he’s about to see that the principle cuts both ways. So too are members of the research and development (R&D) community whose activities are directly or indirectly affected by federal funding and regulatory policies.

In view of the significance of these “consequences” for many HFES members, and the frenzied efforts by DC-based representatives of the R&D community to interpret them, we felt that a report on the implications of the election was in order. Given that several informed commentaries appeared shortly after the election, all coming to much the same conclusions, what follows is a summary of perspectives drawn from these sources.

One area in which shifts in party control tend to have a significant impact on HF/E-relevant policy is that of workplace safety and regulations. The National Safety Council reported several key changes in workplace safety and regulations in its November newsletter, *Occupational Safety News* (<http://list.nsc.org/membersonly/index.php/weblog/email>)—notably the likely replacement of Rep. George Miller (D-CA) as chair of the House Education and Labor Committee by Rep. John Kline (R-MN). A more complete analysis of the implications has been promised in the December 2010 *Safety+Health* magazine (http://www.nsc.org/news_resources/nsc_publications/shplus/Pages/S-HPLUS.aspx). At this writing it has not yet appeared, but those interested in workplace safety issues might want to check it out. In general Republicans have opposed regulations, and there is no reason to expect anything different this time.

Another area in which HF/E plays an important role via agencies such as the Federal Aviation Administration and National Highway Traffic Safety Administration is transportation. Leadership of the committee with primary responsibility for policy in this area (the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee) will transition from long-time champion of safety-related research Rep. James Oberstar (D-MN) most likely to a Republican, Rep. John Mica (R-FL).

Not surprisingly, organizations representing the area of broadest interest to HF/E—R&D funding—have been quick to register their perspectives. The most widely cited of these is the American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS), which estimates the impact that the Republican agenda, as laid out in its *Pledge to America* (<http://pledge.gop.gov/>), would have on the budgets of four major funding agencies: the National Institutes of Health (NIH), National Science Foundation (NSF), National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA), and Department of Energy (DOE).

This scenario calls for a rollback in discretionary spending to 2008 levels. By AAAS calculations, such a move would result in cuts of nearly \$3 billion from the NIH budget and \$1 billion each from the other three. Behavioral work typically does not enjoy the highest priority in any of these agencies, so the cuts would likely have a devastating impact on HF/E researchers whose funding comes from one of them.

The frightening prospect of such drastic cuts prompted a November 3 article in *The New York Times* (http://www.nytimes.com/2010/11/04/business/04research.html?_r=2&hpw), followed by one in *Scientific American* (<http://www.nature.com/news/2010/101109/full/468146a.html>), that explored the issue in greater depth through an interview with Allen Schick, a professor of public policy at the University of Maryland. Schick explained that although political realities make such draconian cuts unlikely, the most optimistic forecast is funding at the 2010 level. In view of rising costs, that would constitute a significant real reduction. Asked how he would feel if he were working at one of these agencies, he replied, “I’d be feeling nervous,” but “the people who would be worried the most are the recipients of . . . grants and contracts, like universities or medical centers.”

Another disconcerting point raised by Schick was echoed by Howard Silver, executive director of the Consortium of Social Science Associations (COSSA), in the November 8 COSSA newsletter, *Washington Update*. Basically, the concern is that as R&D funding shrinks, members of Congress will become increasingly inclined toward micromanagement—scanning agency budgets for topics and titles that they consider frivolous. As Silver put it, the new majority is likely “to attack science it doesn’t like from climate change to social and behavioral research.” The article is at <http://archive.constantcontact.com/fs021/1102766514430/archive/1103889439852.html>

Since the days of Senator Proxmire’s “Golden Fleece Awards,” this sort of uninformed micromanagement has been a recurrent threat against which agencies and science organizations (including HFES) have frequently been obliged to fight. Because these attacks have been aimed disproportionately at research involving human behavior, the burden of defending it has fallen largely on organizations representing these fields. Although most of the past threats were successfully defeated, few were as daunting as the ones likely to arise in the context of drastically reduced budgets and a rather doctrinaire political climate.

In view of the fact that R&D funding policy is dependent on several congressional committees along with a few influential members, with current Republican leadership yet to be determined at this writing, all we know for sure is that a number of long-time R&D champions will be missing. These include Arlen Specter (D-PA), Vern Ehlers (R-MI), Brian Baird (D-WA), Bart Gordon (D-TN), and David Obey (D-WI). Rep. Obey chaired the all-important House Appropriations Committee, and although several Republicans are said to be vying to replace him, most observers seem to think that Jerry Lewis (R-CA), who has chaired it on several previous occasions, has the inside track. Rep. Gordon, who chaired the House Science and Technology Committee, will likely be replaced by Ralph Hall (R-TX). Rep. Baird, a psychologist, was particularly valuable in derailing the last serious attempt to micromanage several behavioral projects out of the NSF budget.

In summary, the consensus view of those in the best position to know is that the “consequences” of this election do not bode well for the R&D community or those involved in any regulatory activities. However, regardless of how well informed a person might be, such predictions always involve a lot of speculation. You can rest assured that organizations representing these interests will be working diligently to minimize the damage. By virtue of our relationship with consortia such as the Federation of Associations in Behavioral and Brain Sciences (FABBS, <http://www.fabbs.org/news/making-the-case-for-science/>), and large, influential professional organizations such as the American Psychological Association (APA), HFES will be an active participant in these efforts. Even in the bleakest of times, it is usually possible to identify and cultivate a few influential champions to replace those who have left.

As events unfold, we will keep you informed of significant developments through reports in the *HFES Bulletin* and at hfes.org.

Report on Ergonomics Standardization Activities at ISO

by *Daryle Gardner-Bonneau, Chair, U.S. TAG to ISO TC 159*

This article summarizes discussions and activities at the International Standards Organization Technical Committee 159 (ISO TC 159) Plenary meeting and recent working group meetings.

ISO TC 159

ISO TC 159 held a recent plenary meeting on October 21–22 in Wiesbaden, Germany. Much of the discussion on the first day involved increased collaboration between the International Ergonomics Association (IEA) and ISO TC 159. Ralph Bruder, a representative from IEA, participated in this discussion.

As a point of resolution, ISO subcommittee chairs made a commitment to keeping all IEA technical groups informed about upcoming standardization activities in which they might be interested in participating. Likewise, IEA will provide relevant information to ISO TC 159 about its activities. It was noted that a recent article in the *ISO Focus* magazine (September 2010, http://www.iso.org/iso/iso-focus-plus_index/iso-focusplus_2010/iso-focusplus_2010-08.htm) about IEA and ISO TC 159 increased the visibility of both organizations' activities and should also serve as an appropriate foundation for increasing collaboration. In addition, the next IEA Congress will be held in Recife, Brazil, in February 2012, and ISO TC 159 has been invited to participate and to hold standardization meetings in conjunction with the Congress.

Another topic of discussion was the status of process standards in ISO TC 159 and the need for one or more accessibility-related process standards. In a recent survey conducted by the Federation of European Ergonomics Societies (<http://fees-network.org/>), members who were asked to specify the types of content they wanted to see in future standardization efforts cited process information as number one. An ad hoc TC 159 task force centered on this topic will continue to review the feasibility and requirements of process standards within ISO TC 159.

Accessibility was a prominent topic at this particular plenary, partly because the consumers' group within ISO—COPOLCO—proposed a revision to ISO/IEC Guide 71 – “Guidelines for standards developers to address the needs of older persons and persons with disabilities.” The ISO Technical Management Board (TMB) approved the proposal, and, assuming that the International Electrotechnical Commission (IEC) also approves it, the question remains as to who will do the actual revision. ISO TC 159 would like to have a major role in this process, as some of its working groups have significant experience (both good and bad) using the current version of the guide. The ISO TMB, which will hold the secretariat for the working group that revises this document, has been informed of ISO TC 159's interest.

Also on the agenda was the upcoming ISO workshop on accessibility in Geneva, November 3–5, 2010, with a meeting of standards developers following on November 5. A number of experts from ISO TC 159 were involved in this workshop, including Luke Kowalski and Judy Brewer (United States), Gerhard Fuchs and Klaus-Peter Wegge (Germany), and Ken Sagawa and Kenji Kurakata (Japan). The workshop focused on three topical areas: accessibility of everyday products, building accessibility, and e-accessibility.

Stephen Kennedy noted that TC 159's recommendation to ISO for a change in the New Work Item Proposal (NWIP) form had not been implemented. The change requested was to inquire about the consideration of accessibility in the development of the NWIP. It was recommended that this issue be raised again at the meeting of standards developers following the Geneva workshop.

Finally, with respect to accessibility, there was a discussion of the recent proposal from the U.S. member body of ISO/IEC JTC1 to establish a new working group on accessibility. This proposal was submitted despite a unanimous vote of the JTC1 Special Working Group on Accessibility (SWG-A) *not* to establish such a working group. There is much concern about this proposal, es-

pecially considering that several established working groups within ISO and IEC are already dealing with accessibility issues. However, it will be up to the JTC1 member bodies to consider this proposal, so there were no actions to be taken by ISO TC 159.

Each of the ISO subcommittee chairs gave his or her report with, perhaps, the most notable item coming from Subcommittee 5 – Ergonomics of the physical environment. The U.S. group had submitted a preliminary NWIP on the accessibility of interior and exterior walkways/walking surfaces. Questions arose as to whether or not the item fell within the scope of SC 5 work and if it might overlap with the work of some other ISO technical committees. The U.S. group was advised to move ahead with the development of the NWIP and submit it to ISO TC 159 for consideration. If you are a specialist in this topical area and are interested in working on the proposal, please contact me at JDNBonneau@charter.net.

The topic of expanding the scope of SC 5 work, generally, was discussed and may be addressed at this subcommittee's next plenary meeting.

Christoph Preusse, chair of ISO TC 199 – Safety of Machinery, gave his liaison report. Two ISO guides, on safety and safety of machinery, are being revised. TC 199 has also prepared a bridging Technical Report (TR) that explains the relationship between the Machinery Directive, ISO 12100, and the CEN/TC 122 and ISO TC 159 ergonomics standards. The TR took the process currently laid out in ISO 12100 and “overlaid” the ergonomics process on the basic accepted process for ensuring the safety of machinery.

ISO TC 159/WG 2 and AGAD

ISO TC 159/WG 2 (Ergonomics for People With Special Requirements) and the ISO TC 159 Advisory Group on Accessible Design (AGAD) met in Tel Aviv, Israel, on September 13–16. ISO TC 159/WG 2 continued its revision of ISO/TR 22411 – “Ergonomics Data and Guidelines for the Applications of ISO/IEC Guide 71 to Products and Services to Address the Needs of Older Persons and Persons With Disabilities.” The new revision should be completed and ready for balloting after the working group's next meeting in Paderborn, Germany, March 14–18, 2011.

The AGAD spent much of its meeting discussing various outreach activities, including the ISO accessibility workshop in Geneva (see previous discussion under the TC 159 plenary). Among the recommendations resulting from its meeting were the following:

- ISO TC 159 will ask ISO to consider addressing accessibility issues in the business plans of each Technical Committee.
- AGAD will develop an activity report that compiles information on current accessibility work in ISO TCs, SCs, and WGs.
- The TC 159 convener, Georg Kramer, will report to the ISO TMB about ISO TC 159's willingness to play an active role in the revision of ISO/IEC Guide 71.

ISO TC 159/SC 5/WG 4 and WG 5

Meetings of Working Groups 4 and 5 of ISO TC 159/SC 5 (Ergonomics of the Physical Environment) were held in Mainz, Germany, on October 18–20. Several work items in both groups are undergoing final balloting to become international standards including these:

- ISO 28803 – Accessible Design – Application of International Standards for People with Special Requirements. Comments were resolved at this meeting in preparation for FDIS (final) balloting.
- ISO 28802 – Integrated Environments – Assessment by Means of an Environmental Survey Involving Physical Measurement of the Environment and Subject Responses of People. Comments were resolved at this meeting in preparation for FDIS balloting.
- ISO 24500 – Accessible Design – Auditory Signals for Consumer Products. This has been approved as an International Standard.
- ISO 24501 – Accessible Design – Sound Pressure Levels of Auditory Signals for Consumer Products. This is undergoing its FDIS ballot.
- ISO 24502 – Accessible Design – Guidelines for Specification of Age-Related Luminance Contrast in Visual Signs and Displays. This is also undergoing its FDIS ballot.

In addition to the resolution of comments on the aforementioned documents, SC 5/WG 5 began work on the draft for a New Work Item on sound pressure levels of spoken announcements for products and public address systems.

The U.S. group presented a Preliminary Work Item Proposal on the accessibility of interior and exterior walkways/working surfaces, which was discussed in some detail. The group was advised to continue work on the proposal and to submit it to ISO when completed.

The next formal meetings of these working groups will be in Sapporo, Japan, in conjunction with the TC 159/SC 5 plenary and the 4th International Conference on Human-Environment Systems in October 2011. WG 5 will also hold an ad hoc meeting in Paderborn, Germany, in conjunction with the ISO TC 159/WG 2 meeting there in March 2011, to do additional development of the Work Item on spoken announcements.

CHAPTERS

Human-Centered Automation in Berlin: HFES Europe Chapter Conference

by *P. A. Hancock*

Shortly after the HFES 54th Annual Meeting in San Francisco, I was fortunate enough to attend the HFES Europe Chapter meeting in Berlin from October 13 to 15. The conference was hosted at the Technische Universität at the Harnack House in the southwest section of the German capital. The meeting was superbly organized, thanks to the hard work of organizers Dick de Waard, Dietrich Manzey, Linda Onnasch, Rebecca Wiczorek, Clemens Weikert, Nina Gérard, Ulrike Wiedensohler, and colleagues.

The papers were excellent, including Höger and Wiethof's paper, "Automatic Distance Regulation in Vehicles—How Perceptual Psychology Can Be Applied." The paper deal with efforts to quantify perceptual complexity, a particularly memorable contribution. However, to pick out individual papers is always a subjective exercise; interested readers will eventually be able to find the full spectrum of submissions in the conference proceedings at <http://books.hfes-europe.org>.

The central theme of the meeting was human interaction with automation, and this perspective was epitomized in John Lee's fine keynote address, in which he compared human-automation interaction with marriage. The metaphor, with all its attendant issues, put me in mind of the book by Caroline Hayes and Chris Miller (2010), which has made extensive use of the notion of human-machine etiquette. Lee explored not only the metaphor but also the literature on marriage to examine bi-stable states of such human-human relationships. There is much to exploit here, and the fecundity of the linkage served as a further indication that Lee himself is one of our discipline's most outstanding thinkers.

A bonus at the meeting was the presence of HFES Immediate Past President Kathleen L. Mosier and HFES Executive Director Lynn Strother, who flew the flag for the Central Office. The first day of the meeting concluded with a delightful tour of the Berlin Communications Museum (see photo). The paper and poster sessions presented during the subsequent days provided profound food for thought. Of special note were the 45-second introductions to poster presentations. The sequence featured vignettes ranging from the bizarre to the sublime. This form of "appetizer" replicates our own HFES 2010 Annual Meeting's Early-Morning Madness, a wonderful innovation that deserves much greater support.

I must finally acknowledge an especially insightful paper by Oberheid, Hasselberg, and Söfker entitled, "Know Your Options—Analyzing Human Decision Making in Dynamic Task Environments With State Space Methods." They illustrated the innovation, integration, and inspiration

that characterized the whole meeting. It is a paper that I hope many stateside members of our Society can read in the future.



One of the Berlin Communication Museum's tour guides shows the remarkable decomposition of an early postal carriage. (Photograph by the Author)

The HFES Europe Chapter is a vibrant and cosmopolitan assembly that provides those of us from the United States with fresh perspectives and differing approaches, adding to the spectrum of methodologies and strategies for a fuller HF/E armory.

Reference

Hayes, C.C., & Miller, C.A. (Eds.). (2010). *Human-computer etiquette: Cultural expectations and the design implications they place on computers and technology*. Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press.

ANNUAL MEETING

55th Annual Meeting Call for Proposals Now Open

Members and nonmembers are invited to submit proposals for the 55th Annual Meeting, which will take place September 19–23, 2011, at the Red Rock Hotel in Las Vegas. Case studies, debates, demonstrations, competitive product designs, new methodologies, on-site experiments, and posters are welcome.

For complete formatting and submission information, please be sure to read the Call for Proposals (<http://www.hfes.org/web/HFESMeetings/2011callforproposals-part1.html>) prior to submitting your work.

The deadline for submitting any type of proposal is **February 17, 2011**.

Papers that have been published previously or presented at another professional meeting may not be submitted. All research and analyses described in a proposal must be complete when the proposal is submitted. Program chairs may reject, with or without review, papers that do not present completed work. The sole exception to this policy is for student work submitted for consideration in the Student Forum track, in which case the proposer may report on work in progress.

Note that for all accepted submissions, one of the authors must attend the meeting to present the work. All presenters are required to pay the meeting registration fee.

For questions on the submission process, please contact Lois Smith (lois@hfes.org, 310/394-1811).

REVIEWS OF HF/E

New Reviews Volume Released

Reviews of Human Factors and Ergonomics, Volume 6, contains six chapters that reflect editor Douglas H. Harris's aim "to gain participation from the broadest range of expertise that exists in the Society and the profession. The six chapters in Volume 6 present what we know about specific

areas of human factors/ergonomics—state of knowledge, important current issues, and further research needs.”

Chapters cover transportation accident investigation, supervisory control challenges in network-centric operations, prospective memory in the workplace and in daily life, the human control of technology, human performance in space, and judgment and decision making by individuals and teams.



Raymond S. Nickerson, who has served as *Reviews* series editor for Volumes 1 through 6, notes, “With the publication of Volume 6 of *Reviews of Human Factors and Ergonomics*, the series now constitutes a collection of 41 in-depth reviews of human factors/ergonomics work on topics of concern to HF/E researchers and practitioners and to other users of the findings of HF/E research. The collection is very timely; the individual expositions are not only highly informative regarding recent work in the covered areas but also strongly motivating with respect to opportunities and challenges for future work.”

For more details, including the latest *Reviews* table of contents, go to the Volume 6 Web page, <http://www.hfes.org/Publications/ProductDetail.aspx?ProductID=139>.

CALL FOR PAPERS

Call for Submissions for HEPS 2011

The International Ergonomics Association, Asociación Española de Ergonomía, and Società Italiana di Ergonomia are seeking submissions for the third annual Healthcare Systems Ergonomics and Patient Safety conference, to be held June 22–24, Oviedo, Spain. The conference will feature topical tracks dedicated to the patient-centered design of biomedical devices, intelligent information systems, and clinical pathways for acute and chronic conditions.

Abstracts for presentation, posters, and demonstrations are due *December 15, 2010*; abstracts for workshops and tutorials are due *January 31, 2011*. Editing guidelines are available at the conference Web site, <http://www.heps2011.org>.

JCEDM

JCEDM Special Issue Call for Papers

HFES will be publishing a special issue of the *Journal of Cognitive Engineering and Decision Making* (JCEDM) in 2011 to highlight the wide range of interesting CEDM research presented at recent HFES Annual Meetings: “Innovations in Cognitive Engineering and Decision Making.”

If you presented a paper or poster at the 2009 or 2010 meeting, please consider submitting a paper regarding that research for this special issue. Research that falls within any of the journal’s three topical tracks (Cognition in Context, Studies in Simulation and Synthetic Environments, or Design of Complex and Joint Cognitive Systems) would be appropriate for this special issue.

Papers submitted for inclusion should be revised from proceedings style to the journal style and include more in-depth or broad literature reviews, additional methodological aspects, and additional details regarding results or findings, design features, or implications, as dictated by the type of research or practice presented.

Papers will be reviewed using the usual *JCEDM* review process, and acceptance decisions will be made by the Special Issue Guest Editors Ellen Bass, Jennifer Ockerman, and Ann Bisantz. Acceptance will be based on the quality of the papers submitted, with consideration given to assembling a group of papers that spans the topics presented at recent annual meetings.

If you are planning to submit a paper, please send a short e-mail providing the title and/or topic to bisantz@buffalo.edu by January 3, 2011.

In order to provide a special issue that is timely with respect to research presented at the annual meeting, the schedule for submissions and reviews will be compressed:

- *Deadline for submissions: February 1, 2011*
- *Date for final acceptance: May 15, 2011*

Be sure to indicate, when submitting your paper online (<http://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/jcedm>), that it is for the “Innovations in Cognitive Engineering and Decision Making” special issue.

DIGITAL LIBRARY

HFES Digital Library: 16,000+ Articles at Your Fingertips

The HFES Digital Library continues to grow as additional back volumes of the Society's periodicals are digitized and posted online. Back-volume digitizing is almost complete. Meantime, as of November 16, the Digital Library contained 16,379 articles:

- *Human Factors*: 3,064
- *Ergonomics in Design*: 651
- HFES Annual Meeting Proceedings: 12,545
- *Journal of Cognitive Engineering and Decision Making*: 63
- *Reviews of Human Factors and Ergonomics*: 56

Usage data show that individuals and institutions from around the world are finding human factors/ergonomics content on the Digital Library in great numbers.

Relative to the more than 13,500 titles on IngentaConnect, HFES content often ranks in the top 100 for downloads and abstract and table of contents views.

It's Free for Members; Are You Registered?

If you are an HFES member and haven't yet registered to access free full-text articles in the Digital Library-Archive, please take a few minutes to sign up. Log in at hfes.org (contact Member Services at membership@hfes.org if you need your username and password), click the link, “Register for my Online Subscriptions,” and follow the instructions. HFES will authorize access within 2 business days.

Search the HFES Digital Library

To find articles by key word in title or author name, go to the main Digital Library page (<http://hfes.publisher.ingentaconnect.com/content/hfes>) and enter your search terms. Search within a single title or across all HFES titles. (To search all Ingenta content on IngentaConnect, go to <http://www.ingentaconnect.com>.)

Questions about the Digital Library may be directed to Communications Director Lois Smith (lois@hfes.org, 310/394-1811).

2009 HFES Financial Report

The Human Factors and Ergonomics Society's 2009 audited financial report, received by Secretary-Treasurer Scott A. Shappell in September 2010, was prepared by Castillo & West Accountancy Corporation. The firm audited the following statement of assets and liabilities – cash basis – of the Human Factors and Ergonomics Society, Inc. (a nonprofit organization) at December 31, 2009, and the related statements of revenues and expenses – cash basis, and of changes in fund balance – cash basis, for the 12 months then ended. These financial statements are the responsibility of the Human Factors and Ergonomics Society's management. The firm's responsibility is to express an opinion on these financial statements based on its audit.

In addition to the regular Society funds, the firm reviewed the A. Chapanis Award funds. These funds had a balance of \$20,687 at January 1, 2009; at December 31, 2009 the balance was \$25,399.

The firm conducted its audit in accordance with auditing standards generally accepted in the United States of America. Those standards require that the firm plan and perform the audit to obtain reasonable assurance about whether the financial statements are free of material misstatement. An audit includes examining, on a test basis, evidence supporting the amounts and disclosures in the financial statement. An audit also includes assessing the accounting principles used and significant estimates made by management, as well as evaluating the overall financial statement presentation. The firm believes that its audit provides a reasonable basis for its opinion.

As described in Note 1, these financial statements were prepared on the basis of cash receipts and disbursements, which is a comprehensive basis of accounting other than generally accepted accounting principles.

In the firm's opinion, the financial statements referred to above present fairly, in all material respects, the assets, liabilities, and fund balances of the Human Factors and Ergonomics Society, Inc. as of December 31, 2009, and its revenue, expenses, and the changes in its fund balances for the 12 months then ended, in conformity with the basis of accounting described in Note 1.

**Statement of Assets and Liabilities – Cash Basis
December 31, 2009**

Assets	
Cash on deposit	
Bank of America	<u>\$215,158</u>
Total cash on deposit	\$215,158
Other Current Asset	
Payroll tax overpayment	\$23,000
Investments	
Charles Schwab,	
at market value (Note 7)	\$643,297
Vanguard STAR Fund,	
at market value (Note 7)	<u>\$116,860</u>
Total assets	<u>\$998,315</u>
Liabilities and Fund Balance	
Liabilities	
Reserve for current payable (Note 3)	\$12,000
Due to TG	\$1,217
Payroll liabilities	\$13,145
IEA donations	<u>\$1,369</u>
Total liabilities	\$27,731
Fund balance	<u>\$970,584</u>
Total liabilities and fund balance	<u>\$998,315</u>

**Statement of Changes in Fund Balance – Cash Basis
for the 12 Months Ended December 31, 2009**

Balance - January 1, 2009	\$934,728
Add: Excess of revenues over expenses	\$42,822

Prior year adjustment	<u>(\$6,966)</u>
Balance - December 31, 2009	<u>\$970,584</u>

**Statement of Revenues and Expenses – Cash Basis
for the 12 Months Ended December 31, 2009**

Revenues	
Individual memberships	\$639,709
Sustaining memberships	\$5,200
Publications	\$409,177
HFES Institute	\$40,701
Annual Meeting	\$280,344
Career Center	\$36,633
Net unrealized gain on investments	\$19,889
Miscellaneous	<u>\$12,871</u>
Total revenues	<u>\$1,444,524</u>

Expenses

Publication Expense:	
<i>HFES Bulletin</i>	\$21,548
<i>Human Factors Journal</i>	\$42,520
<i>Directory and Yearbook</i>	\$34,347
<i>Ergonomics in Design</i>	\$55,416
Books	\$18,234
Digital Library	\$37,979
Marketing	\$9,156
Other publication expense	<u>\$30,289</u>
Total publication expense	<u>\$249,489</u>

Member Services:

Mailings expenses	\$17,593
Career Center	\$36,006
Committee and other (Note 4)	\$112,561
Annual Meeting	\$78,019
Member Services	\$13,000
Computer, Web site, and related expenses	\$34,274
Interorganizational	<u>\$40,659</u>
Total Member Services	<u>\$332,112</u>

General and Administrative Expense:

Salaries and related costs	\$670,821
Office expense	\$140,523
Accounting and legal	<u>\$8,757</u>
Total General and Administrative Expense	<u>\$820,101</u>
Total Expenses	<u>\$1,401,702</u>
Excess of revenues over expenses	<u>\$42,822</u>

2009 Technical Groups Financial Report

**Statement of Assets and Liabilities – Cash Basis
December 31, 2009**

Assets	
Cash on deposit	
First Federal Bank Money Market	\$99,082
First Federal Certificates of Deposit	\$70,464
Bank of America	<u>\$45,083</u>
Total cash on deposit	<u>\$214,629</u>
Investments	
Vanguard STAR Fund,	
at market value (Note 7)	<u>\$53,033</u>
Total assets	<u>\$267,662</u>

Liabilities and Fund Balance

Fund balance	<u>\$267,662</u>
Total liabilities and fund balance	<u>\$267,662</u>

**Statement of Changes in Fund Balance – Cash Basis
for the 12 Months Ended December 31, 2009**

Balance - January 1, 2009	\$244,920
---------------------------	-----------

Add: Excess of revenues over expenses	\$22,742
Balance - December 31, 2009	\$267,662

**Statement of Revenues and Expenses – Cash Basis
for the 12 Months Ended December 31, 2009**

Revenues	
Dues	\$38,041
Interest	\$3,303
Dividends	\$1,325
Net unrealized gain on investments	\$9,230
Total revenues	\$51,899
Expenses	
Member Services:	
AM Social	\$11,681
Audiovisual	\$255
Awards	\$7,554
Co-sponsorship	\$750
Door Prizes	\$250
Mock Trial	\$98
Newsletter	\$30
Program Chair	\$2,500
Speakers	\$1,300
Student Lounge Sponsorship	\$3,355
Web site	\$800
Total Member Services	\$28,573
General and Administrative Expense:	
Office expense	\$584
Total General and Administrative Expense	\$584
Total Expenses	\$29,157
Excess of revenues over expenses	\$22,742

Note 1 – Summary of Significant Accounting Policies

This summary of significant accounting policies of Human Factors and Ergonomics Society (the organization) is presented to assist in understanding the organization's financial statements. The financial statements and notes are representations of the organization, which is responsible for their integrity and objectivity.

Activity. The organization is a nonprofit entity. The organization is an interdisciplinary organization of professional workers concerned with the role of humans in complex systems, the design of equipment and facilities for human use, and the development of environments for comfort and safety. The membership is composed of psychologists, engineers, physiologists, and other scientists from the United States and around the world.

Human Factors and Ergonomics Society promotes research and the application of human factors in the design, development, use, and evaluation of machines, systems, environments, and devices.

Basis of accounting. The organization's policy is to prepare its financial statements on the cash basis of accounting; consequently, certain revenues are recognized when received rather than when earned, and certain expenses and purchases of assets are recognized when cash is disbursed rather than when the obligation is incurred.

Note 2 – Property and Equipment

It is the organization's policy to expense all capital assets purchased throughout the year.

Note 3 – Reserve for Current Payable

This represents a segregation of surplus for bills due at December 31, 2009. This represents \$12,000 for miscellaneous payables.

Note 4 – Committee and Other

IEA Representatives	\$9,454
Awards	\$3,000
Diversity	\$1,739
Government Relations	\$5,000
Student Affairs	\$7,494
Miscellaneous	\$8,512

HFES Institute	\$39,293
Executive Council	\$38,069
Total	\$112,561

Note 5 – Concentrations of Credit Risk

The organization maintains its cash balances at several financial institutions located in Santa Monica, California. Accounts at each institution are insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation up to \$250,000. At December 31, 2009, there was an uninsured cash balance of \$0.

Note 6 – Pension Plan

The organization has a tax-deferred annuity plan using Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association—College Retirement Equities Fund (TIAA-CREF) Annuities that meet the requirements of section 403(b)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code.

Benefits are provided by individually insured contracts issued by TIAA-CREF to each participant. The guaranteed rate basis for premiums applied to TIAA Retirement Annuity contracts is in accordance with the terms of the participant's individual annuity contract.

The plan is a defined contribution plan, which covers all full-time employees with two years of service. The plan calls for contributions of 10% of compensation for participants for the first three years in the plan and 12.5% of compensation thereafter.

Note 7 – Investments

The organization has the following funds with the Vanguard Group and Charles Schwab:

HFES Accounts

	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Fair Market Value</u>
6,662,473 shares of Vanguard STAR Fund	\$129,974	\$116,860
Charles Schwab	\$643,748	\$643,297

Technical Group Accounts

	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Fair Market Value</u>
3,023,565 shares of Vanguard STAR Fund	\$60,156	\$53,033

Note 8 – Income Tax Status

The organization is exempt from federal income tax under Section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code. However, income from certain activities not directly related to the organization's tax-exempt purpose is subject to taxation as unrelated business income. For 2009, the organization had no tax on unrelated business income. In addition, the organization qualifies for the charitable contribution deduction under Section 170(b)(1)(A) and has been classified as an organization other than a private foundation under Section 509(a)(2).

Bulletin

Volume 53, Number 12 December 2010

Features Editor: Pamela Savage-Knepshield pam.savageknepshield@us.army.mil
 Communications Director: Lois Smith, lois@hfes.org
 Assistant Managing Editor: Cameron Wile, cameron@hfes.org
 Advertising: R. C. Bublitz & Assoc., 800/485-5029, dickbublitz@sbcglobal.net
 General Information: info@hfes.org

The HFES Bulletin (ISSN 1527-3660) is published 12 times a year by the Human Factors and Ergonomics Society, 1124 Montana Ave., Suite B, Santa Monica, CA 90403 USA. Address inquiries and address changes to HFES, P.O. Box 1369, Santa Monica, CA 90406-1369 USA, 310/394-1811, fax 310/394-2410, <http://hfes.org>.

Opinions expressed in *Bulletin* articles are those of the authors and should not be considered as expressions of official policy by the Human Factors and Ergonomics Society.

Copyright © 2010 by the Human Factors and Ergonomics Society.