A Message from the President

Nancy Dess

Serving as Division 6’s President is an honor, privilege, and responsibility. I have on occasion pondered whether to stay the course career-wise or veer in another direction. Those moments of reflection have always ended the same way: I am, in my bones, an academic who studies and teaches about basic behavioral processes in a host of species, their biological bases, and their amazing, sometimes troublesome elaboration in Homo sapiens. In self-indulgent moments, doing that is enough. Before too long, though, I remember that I am able to do something I love (and get paid for it) because other people make it possible. And that reminds me of the obligation I have — every day but especially now as Division 6 President — to try to ensure that future generations will find the scholarly pursuits I value worthy of support and that students who have drive and talent will have the chance to succeed at them.

Such thoughts put me in mind of where Division 6 and the constituencies it represents ought to be in the Year 2020 and of what we might do this coming year to move towards those goals. (continued on page 2)
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### Imagining 2020...

Multi-level integrative analyses become commonplace. Remarkable discoveries have been made within behavioral neuroscience and comparative psychology proper and through collaborations and cross-training involving psychologists, molecular biologists, evolutionary biologists, and ecologists. Likewise, translational research has made evidence-based practice and policy the gold standard in many domains. These well-established trends will continue. We now have models for more sweeping kinds of integration that, by 2020, most psychological scientists will be involved in. Social cognitive neuroscience and neuroeconomics will be joined in our lexicon by developmental comparative cognition, experimental cultural epigenetics, and other burgeoning endeavors.

Academic departments and other workplaces will be far more demographically diverse. Division 6, in collaboration with other divisions and the Committee on Animal Research & Ethics (CARE), has taken steps not just to diversify the field but to foster the skills everyone needs to work well in multicultural professional communities. These include the CARE Imprinting Award, which supports graduate student and post-doc travel to the Convention for mentoring, intergroup dialog workshops, and networking, and a strategy session at the upcoming Society for Neuroscience meeting, funded by APA’s Commission on Ethnic Minority Recruitment, Retention & Training. As 2020 approaches,

(continued on page 3)
small steps towards making our community accessible and welcoming to women and people of color will turn into a gallop as talent is identified and nurtured wherever and in whomever it resides. International exchange will continue to grow. In 2020, when you hear that someone is a behavioral neuroscientist or comparative psychologist, you won’t be able to make a very good guess about that person’s demographic attributes.

Our community is widely recognized as a model of ethical responsibility. By virtue of the work many Division 6 members do with nonhuman species, we are acutely aware of the ethical responsibilities that come with that territory and take them very seriously. At a collective level, we can do more to ensure that every new generation has a deep understanding of ethics and doesn’t confuse regulatory compliance for ethical decision making. In 2020, disgruntlement over institutional oversight and overbearing IA-CUCs will be gone. A rich ethical sensibility will pervade conversation in the field, and it compels proactive, collegial participation in educational and regulatory processes, a global perspective on our responsibilities, and effective advocacy.

Ready or Not...

The Year 2020 will arrive regardless of whether we set goals. So let’s set them and figure out how to get there from here. Will we need journals with new scopes and missions? What new kinds of funding programs should we advocate for? Who will our allies be in psychology or other disciplines in those efforts, and how do we forge those alliances? How should undergraduate or graduate curricula and professional development change to meet the future needs of neuroscience and comparative researchers?

Whatever else we do, it must be said: We need to generate a groundswell of involvement in APA. APA has an extremely able professional staff and other resources that can help us, its members, to advance our agenda in a way that no other organization can. APA’s breadth will be a boon as we increasingly emerge from disciplinary silos to engage meaningfully with colleagues in social, developmental, clinical, and other areas of psychology and in other disciplines in the design of curricula, training programs, and research that requires their expertise. The APA Convention is a terribly underutilized resource for our science. It can be whatever we want it to be. Next year in Toronto Division 6, in collaboration with other divisions, will sponsor excellent programming, including celebration of Darwin anniversaries under the theme “Evolution in Mind” and a cutting edge integrative mini-convention on fear. There and in future years, what else do we need to do and talk about? The hottest news on cytokine or symbolic processes research, how to improve IACUC functioning, how to teach about evolution, or...? Propose it, and come with your graduate students (be sure they apply for travel funding available through APA, and student affiliates are eligible for our best-poster award). Do we need a special meeting to plan the next decade of integrative research on stress or memory or to strategize about enhancing ethics education? We can apply for up to $20K to support it through the APA scientific conference program.

Many scientists’ reticence to organize doesn’t change the facts: We are political animals, and there is power in numbers. Our ability to get work done and to have clout in APA, in the world of science, and in Washington DC rises with our membership. I urge every Division 6 member to encourage her/his students and colleagues to join APA. Identities can form early in professional life so focus on junior folk. Student dues are $28. This year, I got a small award that allowed me to offer a “half-price sale” to students; if they joined APA and Division 6 (free to students), I gave them half the dues back as a rebate. Encourage your colleagues to join APA even if they belong to other organizations; none of them duplicates APA, and professional first-time members pay dues of only $78, with eight years of stepping up to full fare.

I am more firmly wed to planning for the future than I am to the specific spattering of ideas above. I hope you will talk or e-talk with me (dessnk@oxy.edu) and each other about what Division 6ers should do in the coming year to plan for that future, so we can get busy doing it together.
Report on APA Council, August 2008

by Bruce Overmier
Council Representative for Division 6

Council met Wednesday 13 and Sunday 17, August.
The big thing at the August meeting is the approval of the budget, which the Council did almost without comment; and that was more than $100,000,000. There were some arguments about items of $5000! The Council also received the final reports from several task-forces. One of these is of special importance to academicians because it focused on Institutional Review Boards (IRBs). The report contained both praise and criticisms and a series of three articles have been submitted to the American Psychologist for peer-review and publication that deal with relations between investigators and IRBs. Another focused on strengthening undergraduate teaching. Yet another focused on improving the attractiveness of the APA Convention for scientists. There were an additional half-dozen such reports (on diversity, evidence based practice, etc., some of which will lead to Council action items eventually.

As I previously reported, APA is in a strategic planning process. It has taken 6 months to get agreement on a one paragraph mission statement. At this rate, the whole process will extend beyond my lifetime. But it is going forward. We must continue to be alert that our values are included throughout.

Council also approves in August the division nominations of persons to initial fellow status. Division 6 had zero nominations, and this was commented upon to me by several Council members. They could not believe that we did not have any qualified rising scholars to recognize. They are of course correct and we need to pay serious attention to identifying and formally nominating such.

Council voted to enter into a contract with the International Union of Psychological Science (IUPsyS, the people who bring you the International Congress of Psychology among other things). This would support a psychologist to work at WHO on the revision of the International Classification of Diseases system. This sounds at first like a “practice issue, but in fact it will influence many agencies as to what kinds of science will be encouraged and supported in the realm of mental health and addiction, including models. Heretofore, this has always been a psychiatrist; having a psychologist there will lend more support to behavioral approaches. This is a special opportunity opened by IUPsyS and supported by APA.

One of the much discussed items at Council was the article in the Chronicle of Higher Education that said APA was going to begin charging authors to publish articles if the work had been funded by NIH and was subject to immediate posting in PUB-MED. This turns out to be not correct. APA is not planning to introduce such charges, although it and dozens of other journal publishers have had discussions about how to deal with the NIH “open Access” requirement, and that was one of the proposals discussed by the publishers. But no such charges are currently being considered, and we can all relax.

By straw ballot, Council agreed to continue the dual dues credit that benefits so many science members. Council also heard from each of the Presidential candidates. One of the candidates, Reizner, seems a one-trick pony focused exclusively on the “torture issue” and bringing ethical charges rather than on any of the broader range of items that face the APA and our areas of interest in particular. You may want to be sure to vote this—perhaps for another candidate who considers the interests of the science community.

Respectfully submitted,

Bruce Overmier
Reflections of a Departing Division Historian/Archivist

Donald A. Dewsbury

I have served as the Division 6 historian since 1998 but I am leaving the post because of the need to devote time to other activities. I have been asked to make a few parting comments. I would like to reflect on the nature of the division and the changes that have occurred over time.

I think that I know the division fairly well. I was first elected a member-at-Large for 1989-1991. Since then, I have been program chair (1990), in the presidential rotation (1992-1994), and served as historian for over 10 years. Thus, I have been involved with the governance of Division 6 for much of the last 20 years or so. During a lot of that time I served on the executive committees of two other divisions (1 and 26). Thus, I can make some comparisons—a comfortable aspect given my history as a comparative psychologist.

As many readers may know, Division 6 was one of the original divisions, founded as the Division of Physiological and Comparative Psychology when the division system was established beginning in 1945 (Dewsbury, 1996). In 1948, Division 6 was merged with Division 3 (Theoretical-Experimental Psychology) probably because many members questioned the distinctions between the two divisions and because of concerns about perceived proliferation of divisions. Division 6 was reconstituted in 1963, probably because of difficulties members experienced in getting sufficient program time in the Division 3 environment. This is the only division with such a history. In 1995 we became the Division of Behavioral Neuroscience and Comparative Psychology.

Characteristics of the Division

The division has always been a small part of the APA. In 1963, the first year for which I have data, the division had 415 members. We reached a peak in 1988 with 821 members. During my years on the executive committee membership dropped to 558, a decline of about one-third. I hope that the correlation between my tenure and this drop does not imply causation! We are not alone. I recently completed a similar analysis of Division 1 membership and found that it too peaked in 1988 but declined to the present by a full 70%. Indeed, some decline during that period characterizes virtually all of the traditionally scientific-academic divisions. What is now the Association for Scientific Psychology was founded in 1988; I doubt that this correlation does not imply any causation. If the membership data are examined as a percentage of APA membership, the decline since 1963 is virtually continuous with no apparent break in 1988 (Dewsbury, 1996 Figure 2). At any rate, membership numbers are a problem for all academic divisions in 2008.

With respect to other demographic data, the percentage of women in the division has almost doubled since 1979, the first year for which I have data, but has risen only from 13% to 23% recently; in 1988 it was still just 17%. Today it is still true that over 80% of the division fellows are male. The number of female presidents has hovered around 20-30% in successive decades from the 1970s to the present (Dewsbury, 2007).

Many interesting recent membership data are available at http://www.apa.org/about/division/profiles.html. We have just seven black members; that is not diversity. Fully one-third of our members are aged 70 or over; just 5% of our members are under 40. We have just one member who is under 30. Division 1 has similar data. The fact is that younger scientific-academic psychologists are not joining APA and are surely not joining academic divisions. This serious disparity in age distribution may be the single most critical problem facing the division. I wish I had a solution for this very serious problem.

Examination of the 2007 shared division memberships provides some clues concerning the interests of division members. Eighteen percent of our members belong only to Division 6; 32% belong to four or more divisions. As might be expected, we share the most memberships with Division 3 (Experimental) (223). This is followed by Division 28 (Psychopharmacology and Substance Abuse)(113), Division 1 (General Psychology)(108), and Division 40 (Clinical Neuropsychology) (102). (continued on page 6)
The numbers for Divisions 2, 25, and 26 are in the 60s. We share at least 5 members with each of the 54 divisions.

What about division leadership? With respect to shared memberships, the 14 PhD members of the 2008 executive committee differ only by degree from the total membership. There was a total of 20 additional memberships or 1.4 additional memberships per person. Four members belong only to Division 6. We share 8 members with Division 3, 5 with Division 1, 3 with Division 25, and one each with Divisions 2, 26, 28, and 52. As might be expected, the Division 1 committee has more shared memberships with other divisions—7 per member (data are skewed by 2 individuals). I thought it might be interesting to compare the recent Division 6 those for the 1989 committee. Twelve members had 26 memberships in other divisions (2.2 per member). Thus there seems to have been only a slight decrease during my time. There were 7 shared memberships with Division 3, 6 shared members with Division 26, and 3 with Division 28. Only Duane Rumbaugh shared a membership with Division 1. Perhaps today’s members belong to fewer other divisions but it is not a strong effect.

Another change that I see is hard to document. In earlier years, Division 6 was dominated by true physiological psychologists. More recently, there have been fewer leading behavioral neuroscientists, the current interim, involved in the division. The shift has been toward animal learning and cognition, as those scientists have become more active in Division 6. One can see this, for example in the presidents and presidential addresses (Dewsbury, 2007). Among the first group of presidents were Clifford Morgan Frank Beach, Hans-Lukas Teuber, Karl Pribram, Mortimer Mishkin, and James Olds. Included among recent presidents have been Bill Timberlake, Karen Hollis, Ed Wasserman, Skip Spear, Herb Roitblat, Dave Riccio, and Mike Domjan. The shift in fields of interest should be apparent. There are some similar trends among other officers. I recently located a 1986 Division program containing abstracts. The program featured papers from Vernon Moutcastle, Mishkin, Mark Rosenzweig, Neal Miller, Larry Squire, Richard Thompson, and other physiological psychologists. Of the 45 or so presentations, I counted just 3 that dealt primarily with animal learning and cognition, more popular topics in recent programs. Two of these papers on object permanence from the laboratory of François Doré.

Reflections on Division Administration

Many division members pay little attention to the machinations of the division executive; many of the results of committee action appear seamless or even invisible. Given current university standards for tenure, promotion, and pay raises, the lack of attention is understandable. However, if these divisions are to function, some people must contribute their time and energies. These divisions can be a bit more complex than they may at first seem. I have been fortunate to work with colleagues most of whom have taken their jobs seriously and worked hard.

In the three divisions with which I have been involved plus the Animal Behavior Society (ABS) I have seen many presidents and other officers, many good but some not so good, come and go. The process begins with nominations. As the call for nominations often yields few suggestions, nominees are sometimes those known to the nominating committee. Ideally, these are people of some standing in the research area and who have a demonstrated track record of working for the division. Sometimes the nominees are strong in just one of the two areas. I have known some distinguished and very capable scientists who did little as officers.

Name recognition is a big part of winning an election. Well-know scientists and individuals who may be less well known but who have made a lot of contact with members while serving in other offices usually are favored. In an analysis of ABS elections (Dewsbury, 1992), I found that alphabetical position and ballot order had only the slightest effect on election (The ABS lists nominees in alphabetical and reverse alphabetical order in alternate years). Although women may be nominated less frequently than men, for whatever reason, they appear to have an advantage in winning elections once nominated.

In the time I have served on these committees in the three divisions there has been a tendency for increases in committee size. Originally, only elected officers and perhaps a few appointees had a vote. The argument then became that those other committee chairs who often did more work (continued on page 7)
than some elected officers, should have a vote as well. More recently, divi-
sions have added a student representative, webmaster, etc. This opens up the process for more division mem-
bers but committees become somewhat unwieldy. The result can be longer and less efficient committee meet-
ings.

One of the biggest problems for divisions is that of institutional memory. Officers are generally elected
or appointed for just 1-3 years. This turnover creates great problems of continuity. Officers do not and cannot
know all that happened before their election—especially if they have not held previous office in the division.
The same issues tend to be debated time and time again with little knowledge of past decisions. To help with
this problem, we have created an operations manual that incorporates the decisions of past meetings. It should
be updated annually after each executive committee meeting. The idea is to have a document of policies and
procedures that is less rigid than the bylaws in that it can be changed by a simple majority vote. However, it at
least can provide a starting point for the committee to decide whether or not the policy in force is worth continu-
ing. I discuss the role of the historian/archivist in institutional memory below.

The Role of the Historian/Archivist

The position of Division 6 historian/archivist was created in 1998 and I have been the only one to hold
that office so far.

The primary duties of the Division 6 Historian are to collect materials related to the Division’s function-
ing and history and to ensure their deposition in a proper archive. Most of the division’s archival materials are
held at the APA archives in Washington, DC. In the early years of my tenure I was able to collect a lot of mate-
rial from past officers of this division and the other groups with which I have worked. This has become more
and more difficult with each passing year. The main reason may be that archivists have generally wanted only
paper, not electronic, materials. As more and more business is done electronically, there is less of a paper re-
cord. It also seems that there is less concern among officers with the organization’s history. This means that the
historian becomes something of a nag—repeatedly asking former officers to send materials for the archive—of-
ten with little success.

There are some indications that archivists are become more receptive to electronic materials. This does,
however, create a big problem for them as the permanency of these media is not well tested and the machines to
read them evolve rapidly.

The historian receives electronic mail as part of the division officer’s Listserv and should print out sig-
ificant messages and annual reports to hedge against this problem—at least until the issues related to preserving
electronic media are solved. It is also important that division newsletters be preserved in both print and elec-
tronic formats. Often they provide the only way to determine aspects of the division’s past.

The historian/archivist can contribute to solving the problem of institutional memory in two additional
ways. First, the historian is the only member of the executive committee who tends to hold office for more than
three years; I held it for 11 years. At meetings, the historian is thus in a position to help provide context from
past meetings for the discussion of issues before the committee. There is a delicate balance between ignorance
of, and reverence for, past decisions.

The second way in which the historian contributes to institutional memory is by maintaining a spread-
sheet of all officers, committee chairs, and award winners. This makes it much easier to make decisions appro-
priate for these categories. It also makes it possible for the historian to answer assorted questions from mem-
bers and other interested parties.

Finally, as a member of the executive committee, the historian participates in the decision making of that
committee both at the annual meeting and via frequent electronic mail communications.
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Perspectives

AS I leave the office in favor of my successor, I believe the division to be basically healthy. The budget appears sound for the present and we have a group of hard-working officers. My concern is for the future of Division 6 and other academic and scientific divisions. The membership decline is a bit of a problem. Far more serious, in my view, is the shift in the ages of members. It is hard to get younger members who can get journals on-line and find bigger audiences at meetings other than the APA conventions to understand the advantages of the APA and the division in maintaining a place for behavioral neuroscience and comparative psychology in the broad field of psychology and for supporting the very active lobbying efforts for intelligent, but not excessive, research regulations for animals and humans alike. With a top-heavy age distribution it is hard to see where the future active members of the division will come from. More broadly, as is the case with the Federal budget, as more and more members reach dues-exempt status those younger members who do join will need to pay more to support those who came before them. One wonders how long this can be sustained.

Even more broadly, I wonder about the future of behavioral neuroscience and comparative psychology. I have long been an optimist with respect to comparative psychology. Today, however, I see the kind of comparative psychology that I practiced, that which lies at the border between psychology and zoology, in serious decline. The shift in the field has been toward behavioral ecology and a comparative psychology with in an animal learning/cognition grounding. We are probably in a cycle and we may expect shifts in the future if we can hang on. Behavioral neuroscience seems to be in much better shape even if today’s behavioral neuroscientists are less prone to be active in the APA than were their predecessors. The shadow hanging over all of those working with nonhuman animals is clear. A combination of legitimate humane concerns and animal extremists has created a vast and expensive web of regulations and rigid procedures. It is sometimes hard to blame departments whose animal researchers retire for replacing them with psychologists who do not require animal laboratories, caretakers, AALAC accreditation, and the like. I also see some animal psychologists leaving the laboratory although it is hard to know if this differs from earlier years (Dewsbury, 1995). Wilson (1975) predicted basically a decline in comparative and physiological psychology with migration to integrative neurophysiology and behavioral ecology. There are indications of moves in the predicted directions. I think that these fields will remain in psychology departments but in a downsized form.

Recently, Walter Mischel (2008) quoted Amos Tversky as saying that for every ten years of scholarly labors, one might earn 10 minutes of pontificating time. Perhaps I have overused mine.

References

Meet the Student Representative

Heidi Marsh

My name is Heidi Marsh and I am pleased to be serving as the Division 6 student representative for 2008-2009. As a relatively new member to APA, I thought I’d take this opportunity to introduce myself as well as to detail my role for the upcoming year. Currently, I’m a Ph.D. candidate in the Department of Psychology at York University in Toronto, Canada, working with Dr. Suzanne MacDonald. My research is focused on information-seeking behavior in orangutans, as it relates to metacognition and cost-benefit analyses. I am hoping to complete my dissertation within the next two years.

As the new student representative for Division 6, I have been learning a great deal from Andrea Gillman (the previous student representative). It looks as though she has done a fantastic job, and I will have big shoes to fill! The mandate of the student representative is to help graduate students to get the most out of their membership in APA and in Division 6. To that end, a large component of my role will involve communication with student members about opportunities available through the organization. This will most often take the form of emails alerting you to potential awards, conferences, and other items that are relevant to student affiliates. If you are not currently on the mailing list and would like to receive these notices, please contact me (hmarsh@yorku.ca). You can also add your name to the Division 6 listserv to stay up-to-date with Division-related information (subscription instructions are available on the website).

One of the biggest opportunities for Division 6 members is, of course, the annual APA convention. I am very happy to inform you that the 2009 APA convention will take place in Toronto, Ontario, Canada, my ‘home town’. A major programming theme for Division 6 will be “Evolution in Mind”, in honor of the 200th anniversary of Charles Darwin’s birth and the 150th anniversary of the publication of The Origin of Species. However, your research submissions need not fall under this umbrella. Note that as a Division 6 student member, your work will be considered for the Division 6 Award for the Best Poster by a Student Affiliate (which includes a $200 prize). The deadline for submissions (December 1, 2008) is fast approaching! As both your student representative and a proud Torontonian, I strongly encourage you to submit your research for next year’s convention. Toronto is a beautiful city, and the convention is a great way to make contacts within the field. More details can be found at http://www.apa.org/convention09

Finally, a continuing goal for Division 6 is to increase student membership. Accordingly, I strongly urge you to speak to your fellow students about the benefits of APA and Division 6 membership. More information on membership can be found at the Division 6 website (http://www.apa.org/divisions/div6/mbrinfo.html). In addition, I would love to hear from student affiliates with ideas to help increase student involvement in the Division.

I look forward to meeting everyone in Toronto next August!
Call for Submissions:  
APA 2009 in Toronto  
Suzanne MacDonald  
Chair, Program Committee, 2008-2009

Next year’s APA convention is in my ‘home town’ of Toronto, Ontario, Canada. Attend, present your work, and enjoy our exciting city! Below is the web address for easy online submission of proposals for symposia, papers, posters, and conversation hours. As you may be aware, 2009 is the 150th anniversary of the publication of Darwin’s “Origin of Species”, so we are celebrating that with our theme, Evolution in Mind. We encourage submissions appropriate to the theme, in addition to any and all interesting work. Papers, symposia, posters, and conversation hours in the areas of behavioral neuroscience and comparative psychology/nonhuman animal behavior are welcome. To submit online, simply go to the link below:

http://apacustomout.apa.org/ConvCall/default.aspx

If you have any questions, don’t hesitate to contact me. Looking forward to seeing you in Toronto!

Suzanne MacDonald, PhD  
suzmac@yorku.ca


Don’t Forget: All U.S. Visitors to Canada Must Present a Passport!
Call for Nominations: Division 6 Awards

Behavioral Neuroscience and Comparative Psychology
(Submission Deadline: January 15, 2009)

Sally Frutiger
Chair, Awards Committee 2008-2009

Division 6 Awards provide the opportunity to publicly recognize colleagues whom you judge to have made substantial contributions to behavioral neuroscience or comparative psychology. Your help is needed in identifying colleagues or former students who merit public recognition for their accomplishments. Award winners are publicly recognized with a plaque at the Business Meeting of Division 6, held at the APA Annual Convention. Please forward the name of the award, your nominee for the award, and a brief statement of support for any/all of the following awards by January 15, 2009 to Sally Frutiger via email (sfrutiger@kumc.edu) or regular mail (Center for Neuropsychology and Cognitive Neuroscience, University of Kansas Hospital, Mail Stop 1059, 3901 Rainbow Boulevard, Kansas City, KS, 66160).

The following Awards require nomination by a member of Division 6.

The D. O. Hebb Distinguished Scientific Contributions Award honors psychologists who have made distinguished theoretical or empirical contributions to basic research in behavioral neuroscience and/or comparative psychology. The candidate does not have to be a member of Division 6, but the recipient will be expected to present the D.O. Hebb Distinguished Scientific Contribution Award Lecture in August, 2010 at the APA Convention. Recipients over the period 2003-2008 have included Steven F. Maier, Duane Rumbaugh, Michael Fanselow, Steven Suomi, and Joseph LeDoux.

The Clifford T. Morgan Distinguished Service to Division 6 Award recognizes members of Division 6 who have made sustained and exceptional contributions to the Division in both scholarly work and service. Recipients over the period 2003-2008 have included Karen Hollis, Nancy Dess, and Sangeeta Panicker.

The Brenda A. Milner Award recognizes the author of an outstanding paper in the field of behavioral neuroscience or comparative psychology, either published or in press, that is written by a member of Division 6 (nonmembers who are nominated may apply for Division 6 membership at the time of nomination) who is within five years of having received the Ph.D. at the time of the deadline for submission. The paper must be in press or have been published within the same five year window. The paper may be co-authored, but must represent the original work of the nominee, who must also be the paper’s first author. Please include a copy of the paper if it is not yet published or readily available. Recipients over the period 2003-2008 have included Jessie Peissig, Michael Beran, and Kimberly Christian.

For the following two Awards, no nominations should be sent as selections are made by editorial boards.

The Frank A. Beach Comparative Psychology Award is given each year to recognize the best paper published in Journal of Comparative Psychology—as selected by the Editor and Consulting Editors of Journal of Comparative Psychology.

The D. G. Marquis Behavioral Neuroscience Award is given each year to recognize the best paper published in Behavioral Neuroscience—as selected by the Editor and Consulting Editors of Behavioral Neuroscience.
Div 6 President-Elect Mark Bouton (U Vermont), Steve Suomi (Chief of the Laboratory of Comparative Ethology, Eunice Kennedy Shriver NICHD) and Suzanne Bennett Johnson (APA Board of Directors) pose for a picture after Suzanne presented Steve with a Presidential Citation from Alan Kazdin in recognition of his lifetime achievements in research.

2007-2008 Div 6 President Bill Timberlake at his Presidential address.

Frances Champagne (right, Columbia) and Tina Williams (program chair for Boston, left, Duke) at the symposium Developmental Plasticity and the Origins of Risk and Resilience.

Don Dewsbury (U Florida) with Bill Timberlake (Indiana U)-- Bill is presenting Don with a rosewood clock, in recognition of his long service as Division Historian (engraved for “Historian Emeritus”).

The Executive Committee in session.
Sangeeta Panicker (APA Director, Research Ethics) receiving the Morgan Distinguished Service Award from Bill Timberlake at the business meeting.

Karen Hollis (Past President Div 6, Mt. Holyoke College) and Pamela Scott-Johnson (CARE, Morgan State U) at the CARE workshop.


John Dovidio (Yale) at the professional-community-building workshop for the CARE/Division 6 Imprinting Award mentees. Pictured with John are mentees Jermaine Jones (American U), and Emily Klein (Georgia State); mentees James Witnauer (SUNY Binghamton) and Caterina Hernández (UT Galveston), are in the facing photo. Mentee Justin Anker (U Minnesota '07) is not pictured.

And the Executive Committee continued in session...!
CALL FOR APPLICATIONS

2009 CARE Imprinting Awards

Opportunity for advanced graduate and post-doctoral students conducting research with nonhuman animals

Aspiring psychological scientists working with nonhuman animals are invited to apply for a terrific professional development opportunity. The APA Committee on Animal Research and Ethics (CARE), is offering a mentoring and networking opportunity for promising new scholars in the fields of behavioral neuroscience, comparative psychology, experimental analyses of behavior, and psychopharmacology and substance abuse.

Up to 10 awardees will be selected by CARE to attend the APA Annual Convention in Toronto, Canada (August 6-9, 2009), where they will participate in activities designed: to enable junior investigators to develop meaningful contacts with senior scientists in their fields and personnel from funding agencies; to help awardees’ navigate a variety of professional settings that they will encounter early in their research career; and to identify with APA as a professional home.

Each award of between $750 and $1,000 is intended to cover participants’ travel, accommodations, and registration costs.

This program also aims to make our research community more inclusive; toward this end, we especially invite participation of scientists from underrepresented groups.

To apply, submit a statement of your research interests, a CV, a letter of recommendation, and a copy of a recent paper (published or in press) by November 20, 2009, to Sangeeta Panicker, Ph.D., Director, Research Ethics Office, Science Directorate: spanicker@apa.org.

Awardees will be notified in late December 2008 or early January, 2009.

Announcements

Do You Teach Undergraduate Neuroscience?

Call for Submissions:
Journal of Undergraduate Neuroscience Education (JUNE)

JUNE is an electronic journal that publishes peer-reviewed reports of innovations in any area of undergraduate neuroscience education related to the mission of advancing undergraduate neuroscience on topics such as novel pedagogy and original laboratory exercises. All articles should be written for an audience of college faculty and include references to relevant literature, supplies, and/or supplemental materials such as animations, websites, etc. Figures and qualitative or quantitative assessment of pedagogical outcomes are also encouraged wherever appropriate. JUNE also invites submissions as letters to the editor and reviews of textbook, curricular, equipment, or media.

JUNE is a publication of Faculty for Undergraduate Neuroscience (FUN) and is free to read and download. Visit JUNE today at [www.funjournal.org/default.asp] or follow the links from the FUN website, [funfaculty.org]. Inquiries regarding submissions should be directed to Gary Dunbar, JUNE Editor-In-Chief at any stage in the writing process. Gary.dunbar@cmich.edu; 989-774-3282 (phone); 989-774-2553 (fax), Department of Psychology, Central Michigan University, Mount Pleasant, MI 48859.