



CONTENTS
INSIDE HFES2

JOURNAL6
ANNUAL MEETING7

HFES Web Site Survey

*By Rani Lueder,
Web Content Advisory
Task Force Chair*

The HFES Web Content Advisory Task Force that I chair provides input on the HFES Web site content as it is now and as it might be in the short (1.5 years), medium (3 years), and long (5 years) term. In June, our task force and its invaluable peer reviewers (Tony Andre, Peter Budnick, Nigel Corlett, Hal Hendrick, Valerie Rice, Mark Sanders, Carol Stuart-Buttle, and Pawan Vora) submitted an extensive report to HFES recommending short and long-term changes to the Web site. My thanks to task force members Denny Ankrum, Alan Hedge, Jeff Kelley, and Michele R. Marut.

Our task force also surveyed the HFES membership regarding their familiarity and experience with the current Web site and their interest in new features under consideration. Alan Hedge summarizes the results from data he collected and analyzed (see page 2). My introduction highlights the softer side of that survey – namely, the comments HFES members shared with us.

An important aim of the Web site survey was to serve as a “reality check” of our task force recommendations. Although respondents expressed a range of views and interests (e.g., members outside the United States focused on different issues than did visitors, technical group members, students, members with disabilities, and those seeking employment), we were gratified that HFES member responses closely corresponded with the recommendations of our task force and reviewers.

What the Comments Revealed

The overriding message from members was that they valued the Society and welcomed the opportunity to provide input on a topic that clearly mattered to them. Although some respondents expressed satisfaction with the current Web site, many others communicated that they believed that the site would benefit if it were updated or even revamped. Quite a few of the latter – particularly the HCI specialists – expressed strong views to that effect. Repeatedly, members shared a desire that the HFES Web site reflect the best of what our discipline stands for.

The comments also opened a window to the everyday frustrations some encountered when feedback was delayed, if they could not access parts of the Web site, or when they could not figure out where to get answers to their questions. Others asked for practical features that might streamline tasks (e.g., on-line membership renewals) or enhance the usefulness of areas such as the Placement Service.

Many comments reflected a desire to facilitate communica-

tions with individual members or the various interest and/or work groups that make up the Society (e.g., TGs, local chapters, article submissions) – and even to expand on our notion and experience of the Society as a community with shared values and interests. Some new members

hoped that the site might better familiarize them with both the Society and the discipline and help them understand how they might fit in.

Many comments mirrored the findings described on the following pages in Alan Hedge’s analysis of survey data. The most obvious of these was a consistently strong interest in content that might facilitate members’ own research efforts.

The comments also suggested limitations of the survey. Some expressed frustration that the questions did not accurately reflect their usage patterns, particularly when they had not visited the HFES Web site for over a year and lacked the experience to answer questions “properly.” Objections were particularly strong for the section that asked participants about the ease of using different areas of the site.

A few comments reflected a common pitfall of survey research. These respondents suggested that they felt obliged to give objective “expert opinion,” rather than input on their own experiences that we were aiming for. Some expressed doubts about their ability to fulfill what they believed we asked of them. We were chided for expecting them to “do our homework for us.”

There were unanticipated benefits of the survey as well. Various members commented that prior to participating in the survey, they had been unaware of some features, such as the membership and consultant directories, the Placement Center, the article search engine, and the ability to purchase articles from HFES.

We also appreciated their excellent suggestions, some of which we incorporated into our follow-up report. Some offered to help; their names were forwarded to the associated work groups.

Reading these responses left an overriding sense that our Society functions as an orchestra. The violins may play to a different tempo than the trumpets, but all together, they create a symphony, and I am grateful to be part of it.

Rani Lueder is president of Humanics ErgoSystems, Inc. She has consulted in occupational ergonomics, product design research and (in recent years) Web-based ergonomics training for more than 20 years. She is coediting a book on child ergonomics with Valerie Rice for Taylor & Francis.



HFES Launches Web Site Redesign Effort

By Lois Smith, Communications Director

The Society recently embarked on a plan to evaluate and revise the HFES Web site following Executive Council approval of two task forces. The Web Content Advisory Task Force, chaired by Rani Lueder, conducted a detailed review of the information at the site and submitted a report to the Communications and Publications Subcouncil in early 2003. The Web Design Advisory Task Force, chaired by Anna Wichansky, examined the site's functionality and also prepared a report for the subcouncil's consideration earlier this year.

Questions, comments, and suggestions may be sent to me at lois@hfes.org, fax 310/394-1811.

HFES Web Site Survey Summary Results

By Alan Hedge

From January through April 2003, I led a class of Cornell University graduate students (Dennis Homack, Cheryl MacKenzie, Adriana Petrova, Courtney Sherman, and Jennifer Thom), who worked with the HFES Web Content Advisory Task Force (Rani Lueder, chair) and members of the HFES staff to develop a Web survey designed to gauge opinions about the current HFES site. Survey data collection began in late April, ending in mid-May.

Members were requested to take the on-line survey via an e-mail message. A link was also placed on the HFES home page encouraging any site visitor to participate. A second request was sent to members two weeks prior to the end of data collection. Survey results were logged and then analyzed in a statistics package (SPSS v11.5). This report summarizes the survey results. The summary percentages shown are calculated based on valid responses; for brevity, the detailed results of the statistical analyses have been omitted.

Who Responded?

A total of 818 completed surveys were submitted, of which 810 were identified as coming from HFES members (there were some duplicate submissions). We thank all those who responded to this request. All subsequent tables contain data from these 810 surveys. Over two-thirds of the responses were from Full Members of the Society (Table 1).

Table 1. Membership Status of the Survey Sample

Membership Status	Frequency	%
Associate	121	14.9
Full Member	554	68.4
Life Member	20	2.5
Student Affiliate	113	14.0
Sustaining Member	2	0.2
Total	810	100

Responses were given by experienced HF/E professionals: 79% (637 of 785) said that they belong to at least one professional society besides HFES, and more than 50% (444 of 785) said they belong to two or more associations.

Two-thirds of respondents (524 of 787) said they had been working in the human factors/ergonomics (HF/E) or a related field for seven or more years, and 22% (174 of 787) said one to seven years. Less than 10% of the sample, most of whom were students, were not working in the field.

Regarding work setting, respondents were almost evenly split among academia, consulting, and industry, with a minority working in government and the military (Table 2). The vast majority of responses were from HFES members in the United States (695 of 802), but members in 22 other countries also responded. Some 8% of the respondents were from outside North America (64 of 802).

Table 2. Employment Sector of Respondents

Employment Sector	Frequency	%
Academia	221	28.0
Consulting	165	20.9
Government	98	12.4
Industry	216	27.4
Military	31	3.9
Retired	26	3.3
Other	31	3.9
Total	788	100

The survey logs were analyzed to determine the computer operating systems that respondents used. Almost 90% of them used a Windows operating system, about 9% used Macintosh systems, and 6.5% reported "other."

More than 80% of respondents browsed the Web site using Microsoft Internet Explorer, and around 5% used Netscape Navigator.

Use of the HFES Web Site

Almost one in five respondents said they seldom visited the HFES site, and more than 10% had never visited the site. (A link



Bulletin

Volume 46, Number 9 September 2003

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

Copyright © 2003 by the Human Factors and Ergonomics Society. Printed in the USA. The *HFES Bulletin* is provided to members of the Society (\$10 of annual dues covers member subscriptions); nonmembers may subscribe for \$40/year. Periodicals postage paid at Santa Monica, CA, and additional mailing offices. USPS #018-206.

to the site was provided for those who had not visited it, and respondents were asked to browse the site before continuing with the survey.) Respondents reported visiting the HFES Web site intermittently or at certain times, such as for annual meeting registration (Table 3). Less than 10% said they visit the site on more than a weekly basis.

Table 3. Pattern of Web Use by Respondents

Pattern of Use	Frequency	%
Never visited in past 12 months	86	11.2
Seldom visited in past 12 months	151	19.6
Sporadically visited in past 12 months but only at certain times	313	40.6
Visited most months in past 12 months	160	20.8
Visited most weeks in past 12 months	52	6.8
Visited most days in past 12 months	8	1.0
Total	770	100

Results for the frequency of use and importance of Web site features ordered by percentage of importance are shown in Table 4.

Table 4. Frequency of Use and Importance of Web Site Features

Please rate how often you have used the following site features during the past 12 months and how important these are to you:	% Frequency of Use			% Important
	% Unaware or Aware but			
	Never Used	1-3 Times	4+ Times	
HFES Annual Meeting information and registration	25.9	50.6	23.5	91.8
Search HFES article index	59.1	18.5	22.5	89.5
HFES on-line members' directory	41.2	29.6	29.2	87.5
HFES Technical Group page and links	49.1	32.7	18.2	83.1
HFES Placement Center/Job Bank	52.5	17.7	29.8	80.9
HFES News page	56.3	31	12.6	80.8
Order publications besides the Bulletin (e.g., past proceedings)	71.3	21.7	7	71.9
HFES Bulletin (downloads page)	73.2	19.2	7.6	63.2
HFES on-line consultants' directory	72.6	20.1	7.3	62.6
HF/E Graduate Program Directory	71.1	22.8	6.1	60.8
Background information page about the HFES	62.4	34.1	3.5	56.2
HFES Student Chapters	81.4	14.7	3.8	43.9

For chi-square analysis of the responses to Question 6, frequency responses for "unaware" and "aware but never used" were aggregated into a "Never" category, and the original options 1-3, 4-6, 7-10, and 10+ were aggregated into "≥1" category. For membership level, Life Member was aggregated with the "HFES member" category. Membership level and Question 6 items then were cross tabulated, with the following showing significant differences.

A majority of respondents use the Web site for HFES Annual Meeting information and registration, and almost 92% rated this

as an important feature. There was a significant effect of membership level; more Student Affiliates (89%) use the site for this information than do Associates (74%) or Members (72%).

Fully 90% of respondents agreed that it is important to be able to search an HFES article index on the site, but only a minority had done this, and responses were significantly different by membership level: More Associates (53%) than Members (42%) and Student Affiliates (36%) have used the search feature.

A majority of respondents said the HFES on-line member directory is important. Compared with Student Affiliates (47%), more Associates (69%) and Members (61%) reported that they use this feature.

Regarding the HFES Placement Center/Job Bank, greater use of this section was reported by Student Affiliates (68%) and Affiliates (66%) than by Members (42%).

Less than 30% of respondents reported visiting the Web site for the HFES on-line consultants' directory, but more than 60% rated this as an important feature. More Associates (41%) reported using this feature than Members (29%) or Student Affiliates (24%).

Less than 30% of respondents reported visiting the Web site for graduate program information, yet 60% rated this as an important feature. Not surprisingly, more Student Affiliates (51%) reported using this than did Associates (38%) or Members (25%).

Overall, less than 20% of respondents reported visiting the Web site for student chapter information, and only 44% rated this as an important feature. More Student Affiliates used this information (54%) than did Associates (25%) or Members (13%).

When asked to rate the ease of use of the HFES site to complete a variety of tasks, a majority of respondents indicated that they found the site easy to use (Table 5).

Table 5. Ease of Use of Web Site Features

How easy is it for you to do the following on the HFES site?	% Easy
Find the membership application.	91.4
Find the benefits of becoming a member.	90.9
Find the HFES mission statement.	89.1
Find information on student chapters.	88.6
Find information on technical groups (TG's).	88.3
Navigate the site from the home page.	83.7
Find contact information (e.g., e-mail addresses).	81.7
Navigate from one page to any other page on the site.	75.0
Know where I am on the site.	73.3
Find information on the organizational structure of the HFES.	71.4

Future Web Site Features

When asked to rate the importance of a series of future site features, a majority of respondents indicated that they would like all pages to have a common appearance with a site map, a navigation menu bar, and multiple methods of navigation. There was little enthusiasm for the inclusion of interactive features, animations, or movie modules (Table 6, next page).

continued on page 4

Table 6. Importance of Future Web Site Features

How important to you is it that:	% Important
A navigation or menu bar is included on all pages?	95.0
All pages on the HFES site have a common appearance?	83.9
A site map is available?	81.7
Multiple methods of navigation (scroll bars, menus, text links, etc.) are provided?	80.8
The HFES logo is included on all pages?	64.3
Interactive features such as Flash animations or movie modules are included?	23.4

Table 7 shows the likelihood of using possible new features on the HFES Web site.

Table 7. Likelihood of Using Possible Future Web Site Features

How likely is it that you would use the following features if they were added to the HFES site:	% Would Use
Periodicals available for on-line viewing?	96.0
Publications available as PDF files?	96.0
Books and other publications available for on-line viewing?	95.4
Advanced search options (i.e., keyword, topic, etc.) for HFES publications?	94.3
Human factors and ergonomics tools available for viewing/download?	93.6
An on-line membership renewal form?	88.6
Links to relevant non-HFES annual meetings or conferences?	76.1
Sample pages of HFES books for on-line viewing?	74.1
Regional information on HFES activities?	71.4
Information on local chapter events?	61.4
Message boards for problem solving?	60.9
Bulletin board area for grants and research opportunities?	59.5
Abstracts of the publications available for purchase, but not available on line?	58.7
Ability to communicate directly with members?	58.3
Information on member speaking engagements?	53.0
Peer review forum for research projects?	47.1

Finally, when asked to rate the importance of various possible member directory features, almost a consensus indicated that they would like to have contact information; 90% said it is important to see a member's educational background, credentials, and qualifications; 84% thought the direct e-mail link was important. Over three-quarters would like a link to a member Web site and/or project work, and 60% would like to personalize their own listings.

In addition to the precoded response data summarized here, more than 300 respondents provided insightful comments and suggestions on various issues concerning the HFES Web site.

Overall, the responses to the Web survey have provided useful information to the HFES Web Content Advisory Task Force and the Communications and Publications Subcouncil as the Society considers ways to further improve the site's design and functionality.

Alan Hedge is a professor in the Department of Design and Environmental Analysis, Cornell University, where, since 1987, he has directed the Human Factors and Ergonomics teaching and research programs. His research and teaching activities have focused on issues of design and workplace ergonomics as these affect the health, comfort, and productivity of workers.

HFES Accreditation of Undergraduate Programs

By Kevin B. Bennett, Mica R. Endsley, William C. Howell, John D. Lee, & Lawrence G. Shattuck

There is a great deal of interest in accreditation as a potential vehicle for strengthening the Human Factors and Ergonomics Society (HFES). Procedures for the accreditation of HFES graduate programs were implemented in 1988. A similar mechanism for the accreditation of undergraduate programs is now being considered; HFES President Barry Beith appointed Kevin Bennett (Wright State University) to chair a task force. The members of the task force were Mica Endsley, SA Technologies; William C. Howell, Arizona State University – advisory capacity; John Lee, University of Iowa; and Larry Shattuck, U.S. Military Academy. The deliberations of the task force revealed that this issue is very complex.

The purpose of this article is to outline the pros and cons of undergraduate accreditation and to solicit input from HFES. Five alternative courses of action are outlined. Determine which of those five you believe are reasonable for HFES to pursue. Then, rank the courses of action that you have chosen from most important to pursue to least important to pursue. **Please e-mail your response to kevin.bennett@wright.edu within a week of receiving this issue of the HFES Bulletin.** Also, please help in identifying any undergraduate programs that might consider accreditation if it were available to determine how many programs are relevant.

Option #1. HFES should develop new accreditation procedures for undergraduate programs NOW. HFES should develop criteria that clearly specify the minimum requirements that are necessary for education/training at the undergraduate level for the following reasons:

A. Other professional disciplines accredit programs at the undergraduate level; human factors/ergonomics (HF/E) therefore needs accreditation to be considered a legitimate field of study.

B. There is a need for accreditation: existing HF/E undergraduate programs want accreditation for a variety of reasons. A primary reason is that accreditation could provide additional leverage to allow HF/E programs to compete with other disciplines for organizational resources.

C. The accreditation criteria would provide a measure of quality control, resulting in the provision of a more homogeneous and comprehensive education and training experience for HF/E students at the undergraduate level.

D. Accreditation could serve as a catalyst for the development of additional HF/E graduate programs: An undergraduate program

that begins with limited scope and resources could evolve into a graduate program over time.

E. Accreditation could serve to alert and inform students and academic advisors about HF/E as a potential field of study. This could result in students discovering HF/E earlier, thereby increasing the number and quality of students choosing HF/E as a profession.

F. Accreditation could also increase awareness of HF/E as a discipline to individuals other than students and advisers (administrators, career counseling services, etc.) with similar results.

G. Accreditation could therefore increase the number of students who complete graduate studies in HF/E. Exposing them to HF/E-related activities before they enroll in graduate school, not after, should increase their awareness of what a career in HF/E involves.

Option #2. HFES should NOT develop accreditation procedures for undergraduate programs at this time. An acceptable model for HF/E accreditation at the undergraduate level may be impossible to define. HF/E is inherently interdisciplinary in nature (e.g., engineering, psychology, computer science, and education). This diversity makes accreditation at the undergraduate level extremely difficult, and HFES should not do so.

A. There appear to be two primary options in defining the accreditation model for HFES undergraduate programs, neither of which is satisfactory. One option is to set forth explicit criteria that all accredited programs would be required to meet. Establishing a common set of criteria that would be acceptable across these disciplines would be extremely difficult, if not impossible. The second option is that the criteria would need to be defined with sufficient flexibility so that little, if any, explicit requirements are stated. However, this option runs counter to what one would hope to achieve through the process of accreditation in the first place.

B. Even if it were possible to define a set of agreeable criteria, there could be strong resistance (or perhaps even apathy) from institutions with excellent academic programs. Nothing plays worse in academic circles than pretentiousness or external meddling with curriculum; a professional organization (i.e., HFES) attempting to impose and regulate an undergraduate curriculum could be seen as the height of both. As a result, the development of accreditation criteria might have very little impact in terms of universities' adjusting their curricula or supporting the continuing evaluation process of accreditation.

C. The fact that other disciplines have accreditation at the undergraduate level does not necessarily imply that HF/E needs it as well. Good programs produce good students and have good research programs and good reputations, etc. The converse is true for weak programs. The business and scientific communities can recognize these attributes, distinguish between the two, and respond accordingly.

D. The homogeneity imposed by the accreditation process could actually be viewed as a negative factor. Uniformity rather than creative competition is encouraged. Not all good programs are carbon copies of each other, nor do they teach the same courses, and so on. Accordingly, the strengths and limitations of the students who graduate from these various programs are inherently diverse. This diversity can be viewed as a positive factor for the human factors and ergonomics discipline.

E. Since 1988, fewer than 10 graduate programs (out of 66 on the HFES Web site) have been accredited. Some combination of items #2A through #2D are probably responsible. Is there reason to expect that the outcome at the undergraduate level would be any different, especially considering that the criteria and goals of HF/E education at the graduate level are presumably better defined?

F. Accreditation at the undergraduate level could be detrimental to HF/E (i.e., employers hire a "certified" human factors professional and are disappointed). The real question is whether undergraduate training can provide an individual with the skills necessary to be an HF/E professional.

G. Accreditation could ultimately give credibility to programs that do not deserve it. Accreditation could make weak programs appear closer to good programs than they really are. Finally, accreditation could provide a market edge to some programs over other programs that are equally as good (or better).

Option #3. HFES should NOT accredit undergraduate programs now but should pursue other options. Rather than developing accreditation procedures at this time, HFES might consider alternative measures that share many of the same goals (e.g., improving the quality of HF/E educational programs and informing/attracting students to HF/E as a discipline). These measures could be implemented without the potential downside that accompanies accreditation.

A. HFES could develop, maintain, and update accessible guidelines that institutions could consult and use to develop or upgrade their own courses and programs.

B. HFES could develop outreach materials and dissemination strategies to inform and attract students to HF/E as a career. Materials could be developed and targeted at both high school and undergraduate levels. This material might include a list of important topics in HF/E, a set of representative problems and solutions, and a description of the job opportunities and salary ranges that are available in HF/E. For example, a human factors module developed for use in introductory psychology or engineering courses would reach thousands of students each year. For example, including a chapter from Donald Norman's book *The Design of Everyday Things* or Stephen Casey's *Set Phasers on Stun* in these courses would get a huge number of people thinking of human factors issues.

Option #4. HFES should broaden the current accreditation procedures so that undergraduate programs are not excluded. It appears that a factor driving the need to consider the issue of accrediting undergraduate programs is that a few quality programs want, need, and/or deserve accreditation. This fourth option is to modify the current procedures so that an undergraduate program could receive accreditation as would a graduate program. The accreditation of an undergraduate program would require proof that the faculty are training their students at a level equivalent to that of a graduate master's degree program. The same criteria that are necessary for a graduate program to be accredited at the master's level would be applied to the prospective undergraduate program.

Option #5. HFES should provide an alternative mechanism to formally recognize outstanding undergraduate HF/E

continued on page 6

programs. Instead of accreditation, HFES should develop a formal means to recognize outstanding undergraduate programs. This could be done through a mechanism that designates a particular program as a Program of Excellence, for example. Programs would apply for this designation; it would be rewarded on a limited basis.

NEM: What You Can Do

By Karen R. Young, Ronald G. Shapiro, & Haydee M. Cuevas

So, you're a working HF/E professional and have heard about National Ergonomics Month (NEM), but you don't really know what it means to you. NEM is about making the rest of the world aware of what we do and how it can benefit them. The more we all participate, the more effective we can be at getting people to understand the value of HF/E. There are two major benefits to participating: We make life better for more people, and we increase job security for ourselves. Now that you know *why* you should get involved, you probably want to know *how*.

What Can I Do at the HFES Annual Meeting?

NEM is a time for exchanging information, and there is no better way to do that than at the HFES Annual Meeting. It allows you to exchange information with other HF/E professionals via the sessions and social opportunities where you can network with people. On Monday, October 13 from 4:45 to 6:15 p.m., just before the opening reception, attend the special NEM session to learn more about how to get involved. Several leaders from HFES – including Betty Sanders (HFES President-Elect), V. Grayson Cucklock-Knopp (Diversity Committee chair), Mica Endsley, and Michelle Robertson (Executive Council members) – will share their ideas.

The latter part of the session will include a special presentation of “Games to Explain Human Factors: Come Participate, Have Fun!” led by Ron Shapiro, Jean Fox, and Melissa Weaver. The games presentation includes a series of demonstrations that illustrate HF/E principles in an entertaining way. Take these ideas home with you to share with your community. Three international students who participated in the 2002 games session – Pierre Duez, Angela Garabet, and Yael Yariv – will serve as copresenters this year. Raquel Shapiro, a school psychologist who has partnered in developing the session for elementary and middle school audiences, will also be available to address questions about bringing the session to children.

What if I Don't Attend the Meeting?

In September, you'll find a variety of NEM additions to the HFES Web site to help you spread the word about HF/E. The site will include presentations such as “Games to Explain Human Factors” and guidelines for contacting schools. Members are invited to use this information to organize events and activities, such as a workshop at a local school during career day. Consider giving the games presentation at your office, an entertaining and informative presentation about your work, or a “hands-on” ergonomics presentation.

Members are also encouraged to obtain media coverage of HF/E issues. For example, you could make contact with reporters in your local area to let them know that you are knowledgeable about issues concerning human error and offer to be available for comment when an appropriate situation arises. Or consider performing a high-profile community service project and getting the media to cover it. You could follow the lead of the New England Chapter, which contacted a local public TV station and convinced them to show the HFES video “Human Factors/Ergonomics: The Profession and the Society” during several of their 10-minute breaks free of charge.

Now is your chance to make things better for everyone. So have fun and get involved!

Election Results

The following HFES members were elected to serve beginning in fall 2003:

President-Elect

Wendy A. Rogers, Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, GA

Secretary-Treasurer-Elect

Arthur D. Fisk, Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, GA

Executive Council Members-at-Large

K. Ronald Laughery, Micro Analysis & Design, Inc., Boulder, CO

Valerie J. Rice, AMEDD Center and School, ARM-AMEDD Field Office, Ft. Sam Houston, TX



JOURNAL

Human Factors: Some Good News and Other Good News

By Eduardo Salas, Editor

The good news: On behalf of the Society, I'm pleased to announce that *Human Factors* will be available in electronic form in the first quarter of 2004. We have been looking forward to this transition for many years, which is now possible because of increased subscription income.

We will begin by preparing digital versions of this year's published papers. By the time electronic access is available next year, members and subscribers will have access to the 2003 issues and the first of the 2004 volume. Each year after this, we plan to offer the current volume and one back volume, building an expanding repository that we hope will be of increasing value and usefulness to researchers and practitioners alike. Because of the reference-linking capabilities made possible with on-line journals, we believe access to *Human Factors* will increase well beyond the human factors/ergonomics field. Additional details about the transition will appear in the *HFES Bulletin*.

More good news: We are also happy to announce that the process for submitting and reviewing manuscript submissions to

Human Factors will soon be converted to an on-line system. Following a review of ScholarOne's tool Manuscript Central by me and four of the Associate Editors, HFES signed a contract for this top-rated, Web-based submission and review system to be implemented by the end of this year. Work begins this month to transition the old database to the new system, and a demo is expected to be available for viewing at the 47th Annual Meeting in Denver in October.

Manuscript Central enables authors to upload their submissions and graphics, which are deposited in the on-line database for immediate access by the editor and reviewers. Authors can check the status of their submissions at any time. The system automates and streamlines the entire review process for the editor and reviewers because the site is available for viewing papers, assigning reviewers, uploading review comments, and distributing correspondence around the clock from any platform anywhere in the world.

As we transition from the old database to the new on-line system, we will need to eliminate some old manuscript records to conserve Society resources. If you received a letter anytime in the last year encouraging you to revise and resubmit your paper, I hope you will do so soon. Manuscripts on which no action has occurred since December 2002 will be discarded.

Some more good news: In my view, the journal continues to flourish. We have a good flow of submissions and are accepting the best: We have a 20% acceptance rate on first revisions that we invited authors to submit. We have three special sections in the works (psychophysiology, driver distraction, and aging and human performance) and one more under development (medical errors and patient safety). Our turnaround time is better, but it can improve. We need your help. If you are a reviewer, please do your best to give us timely and thorough reviews. Let me know how we are doing. ☒

ANNUAL MEETING

The Great HFES Conversation, or "Can We Talk?"

Human factors and ergonomics as a field and HFES as a society have been plagued by and engaged in debate over controversial issues for decades. In this year's presidential address on Tuesday, October 14, President Barry H. Beith talks about issues and debates that have persisted over the years in the Society. He will present divergent views and personal opinions on the importance, meaning, and resolution of those debates. Join in the Great HFES Conversation and come away expressing yourself about the future of the discipline, the field, and the Society.



Barry Beith

Terms included in the glossary were primarily scientific terms as used by HF/E professionals. In addition, some problem terms used by lawyers in special ways with special meanings in litigation were included, such as "adequate" and "foreseeable." The glossary will appear in the *Encyclopedia of Forensic Human Factors and Ergonomics*, edited by Waldemar Karwowski, in press with Taylor & Francis.

The committee spent the last several years drafting and debating various definitions that would be appropriate for the glossary. Members included David A. Thompson, H. Harvey Cohen, Donald P. Horst, Daniel A. Johnson, and Richard A. Olsen. They were assisted in some phases of the drafting by Rudolph Mortimer, Richard Pearson, Erik Olsen, Jake Pauls, and others.

David A. Thompson is professor emeritus of industrial engineering at Stanford University. He is a member of the HFES Forensics Professional Group. Questions may be addressed to davidthompson@humanfactors.org.

Session on Glossary of Forensic Terminology

By David A. Thompson

The "Guide to Forensic Human Factors Terminology" has been developed by an ad hoc committee of human factors/ergonomics (HF/E) professionals who have been involved in forensic expert analysis and testimony work. The glossary was felt to be needed to document generally agreed upon terms that are used in testimony and court documents related to personal injury, product design, and facilities design and management litigation. It defines about 810 terms.

The members of the glossary committee (see below) will discuss their efforts at the HFES 47th Annual Meeting in Denver in a session on Tuesday, October 14, at 1:30-3:00 p.m., "Some Useful as Well as Problematic Terms Used by Human Factors Forensic Professionals."

Display Educational Material

Representatives of graduate and undergraduate programs in human factors/ergonomics are invited to display brochures, applications, and other materials at an exhibit booth hosted by the HFES Education Technical Group and the Student Affairs Committee. Program representatives who wish to be present during exhibit hours may do so. HFES will provide a VCR and monitor for those who wish to run videos promoting their programs.

The exhibit will be open on Tuesday, October 14, from 3:00 to 6:00 p.m.; on Wednesday, October 15, 9:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m.; and on Thursday, October 16, 9:00 a.m. to 2:30 p.m. Any leftover materials must be picked up during teardown hours (Thursday, 3:30-8:30 p.m.). For further information, contact Andris Freivalds, Pennsylvania State University, 814/863-2361, axf@psu.edu. ☒

Bulletin

Volume 46, Number 9 September 2003

Communications Director: Lois Smith

Student Views Editor: Melanie Diez

Advertising: R. C. Bublitz & Associates,
800/485-5029; dick-rcb@juno.com

POSTMASTER:

Send address changes to the *HFES Bulletin*,
Human Factors and Ergonomics Society,
P.O. Box 1369, Santa Monica, CA 90406-1369 USA,
310/394-1811, fax 310/394-2410.

General Information: info@hfes.org

Editorial/Advertising: lois@hfes.org

Placement Service: placement@hfes.org

Annual Meeting: lois@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.

FLASH!

Students: Free Special Event!

You are invited to attend a day-long Student Professional Development workshop devoted to issues concerning students on Monday, October 13. The morning session is an APA-sponsored panel on finding a job in academia. Pursue a bag lunch and dine with the speakers from noon to 1:30. Listen to experts in the afternoon discussing publishing, funding, and habits of successful HFES students. There is no limit on attendance, but please RSVP to Kristen Gilbert at gilbertk@montevallo.edu.



**Human
Factors
and
Ergonomics
Society**

P.O. Box 1369
Santa Monica, CA
90406-1369 USA

PERIODICALS
POSTAGE PAID
AT
SANTA MONICA, CA
AND ADDITIONAL
OFFICES