

**Essential Science Conversations:
Your Science Can Affect Policy: How and Why Psychological Scientists
Should Engage in Advocacy
Tuesday, Oct. 25**

Shandol Hoover: Hi, everyone, and welcome. I'm Shandol Hoover, APA Science Programs Officer. Please let us know where you're from by saying hello in the chat. This program is part of a APA series called *Essential Science Conversations* where panelists and audience members can engage in an open dialogue about emerging topics in psychological science.

Before we get started, I want to share a few quick announcements. First, thanks to those of you who submitted questions for today's program when you registered, we'll try to get to as many of those questions as possible.

You can also ask a question as a program is taking place in real-time. There's a Q&A feature on the dashboard, please enter your questions there. We'll be monitoring those throughout the program. Also, this program is being recorded, so once it ends, everyone who registers will receive an email with a link to the recording. You should receive that email in about two weeks' time after the webinar concludes. Without further ado, I'm pleased to introduce Dr. Mitch Prinstein, APA's Chief Science Officer.

Mitch Prinstein: Hello and thank you for joining. Today, we're excited to talk about how our science can affect policy, how our work can provide the essential knowledge that lawmakers need to establish priorities, improve decision-making, resolve policy differences, and how we can make it get more funding for psychological science. I am very excited to introduce our panelists who will talk about how they have engaged in advocacy work and offer ways that you could be getting involved.

I'm pleased to introduce each of these panelists now. First, Katherine McGuire is APA's first Chief Science Advocacy Officer responsible for implementing a unified strategic vision for the association's government relations efforts, and coordinating APA's broader advocacy initiatives in non-governmental sectors. With more than 25 years of senior-level policy experience in Congress, the executive branch, and the private sector, McGuire's most recently assistant Secretary for Congressional and Intergovernmental Affairs at the US Department of Labor.

She has held senior management positions in the House of Representatives and the US Senate and worked as VP for government affairs at the Business Software Alliance, a trade group comprising the world's leading software companies, including Apple and Microsoft. Also, so excited that we have Dr. Reggie Gazes, an Associate Professor of Psychology and Animal Behavior at Bucknell University. Reggie earned her PhD at Emory University, then completed a postdoctoral fellowship in the primate research at Zoo Atlanta.

She currently directs the Bucknell Primate Research facility. Her research primarily focuses on social behavior in the evolution of cognition and non-human primates. She's been engaged in advocacy through APA as a member of the Committee on Animal Research and Ethics and the Comparative Cognition Society's representative to star, which is spreading truth about animal research. Very excited to introduce

Erin Kaseda who is a fifth-year doctoral student in clinical psychology at Rosalind Franklin University in Chicago, Illinois, where she's completing her dual specialization in neuropsych and health psychology.

Erin's clinical and research interests include cognition in the context of pediatric mental illness, neuropsychological and biomarkers of cancer-related cognitive impairment, and medical trauma. She's passionate about translating research into actionable policy change and strongly believes that advocacy is a key professional competency for psychologists. Erin currently serves as the APAGS Advocacy Coordinating Team and previously served as the Chair and Cognitive Science representative to the APA's Science Student Council.

In addition to her advocacy work through APA, Erin is also involved in federal policy advocacy through the National Brain Tumor Society. Last but certainly not least, very excited to introduce Dr. William Stoops, a Professor in the Department of Behavioral Science, Psychiatry, and Psychology at the University of Kentucky. Bill earned his bachelor's in psychology from Davidson College in Davidson, North Carolina, and his master's degree and PhD in psychology from the University of Kentucky.

His research evaluates the behavioral and pharmacological factors that contribute to drug use disorders, focusing primarily on stimulant drugs. He is the immediate past president of the College on Problems of Drug Dependence and his editor of Experimental and Clinical Psycho-Pharmacology. He is also a member of the APA Advocacy Coordinating Committee and is a strong advocate for psychological science providing specific guidance to APA on the role of psychology and psychologists in addressing the addiction epidemic.

He has considerable experience interacting with policymakers locally and nationally to advocate for research and to incorporate research priorities into pending legislation. Welcome to all of our panelists and let's have an essential science conversation. Thank you so much. Your intros are incredibly impressive. Also a little long, I'm afraid we're out of time for today. No, we're not. I wanted to start with Katherine McGuire. You lead our APA Advocacy office, and this is a large team that's focusing every day, all day on science advocacy but what do we mean when we're talking about science advocacy? Could you start us off by defining that term and those activities, please?

Katherine McGuire: Thank you, Mitch. Absolutely, this is one of my favorite topics. Let me start out by just talking about what we call Impactful Science Advocacy. That is science advocacy that requires a multi-pronged approach where we are using a variety of different strategies and tactics at once to advance the value of research to society, as well as applying those findings to everyday challenges.

All of us in the advocacy office lead with the science, and that's a value that comes from the top. The advocacy office, let me talk about them a minute. We have four senior advocates, and they are our team of those four senior advocates are led by Pat Kobor who is the Deputy Chief for Scientific Affairs. They are dedicated leaders on our team of 22 people who are working to ensure that all 22 of our policy experts in the Advocacy office at any given time can advocate for science because it underscores everything psychologists do and value.

Our close partnership with experts in the science directorate under your leadership, Mitch, has allowed us to gain a seat at the table on major policy discussions in government. We not only actively support and lobby for increases in federal research funding, but we also importantly ensure that the research done is applied to policy solutions and scientists in our field contribute to the development of policy.

Just let me give you a few examples to clarify what I mean by multi-pronged science advocacy. First of all, we absolutely are your hired guns or your lobbyists in Congress and we join in coalitions to lobbying and we do it on our own. We focus quite a bit of our lobbying in the science arena to increase the budgets for agencies that fund psychological science, primarily NIH, the Institutes National Science Foundation, Institute of Education Sciences, and the Department of Defense.

I'll let you know that we work year-round to raise the top-line numbers. Also, at the same time, are focusing on getting very special targeted funding for behavioral and social science initiatives. We respond to those same agency strategic plans with input from our expert members. A recent example is the plan for the NIH Center for Scientific Review and the NIH Office of Behavioral and Social Science as research for which we're looking for input now. We respond to requests for information from agencies that support research. We get a lot of questions about why is that important?

Well, this is very important because agencies often gather input from stakeholders before issuing funding announcements so what we're doing is we're taking advantage of every opportunity we can to provide input from psychological science to those federal agencies. The information we recently sent about digital devices or health or climate change in health or even artificial intelligence, that psychological science may indeed shape future funding announcements and one metric we're very proud of, and I'll hold Pat Kobor and her team, raised them up and congratulate them, is that between 2021 and 2022, the science staff has submitted comments on 22 regulatory comments with the help of experts who help shape the responses.

We also, as part of that multi-prong approach, we're looking for every opportunity to put psychologists at the table where important policies are being made by nominating slates of our expert members to key advisory councils to ensure psychology or behavioral sciences in the room where it happens. We also look for opportunities for behavioral scientists to communicate to members of Congress about their research and its significance to society, as well as train them to be more advocates for psychology. Mitch, that's a little bit about how we approach and how we define Impactful Science Advocacy. Turning it back to you.

Mitch: That's more than a little bit. It's an amazing amount of work that the Science Advocacy team does. Thank you so much for summarizing that and making that so clear. I'm amazed at how much they do in a day. Let me follow up on that, I know we have a lot of scientists here that are interested in being a part of these initiatives, and really helping. One of the things that comes up a lot, Katherine is folks saying, "Well, wait a minute, I work at a nonprofit university, or I'm part of a health care agency. I'm not allowed to be involved in anything related to advocacy," but that's not exactly true. Can you help clarify; how can scientists be involved?

Katherine: Absolutely. That is a great question and one that we confront quite a bit, quite routinely. I would counsel that the most direct way to find out if your employer has any type of limits on you going to Congress is to just check with the legislative or policy people at your university, or a nonprofit agency, wherever you are.

We always say just be straight upfront with them and say, here's what you're hoping to talk to members of Congress about, for example, why NSF funding is important, or why animal research is important. Most times, you're going to get a reaction that they're very delighted that you're going to actually take that upon yourself, because it's hard work, and you'll hear a little bit more from the advocates here who've stepped into that breach and helped in that regard.

I think the other thing that is a question that will come back to you, you should be prepared to answer or just be prepared for is that they may want you to stress that you are representing APA or yourself, but not the university, and that's fine. That is absolutely fine. Remember too that limitations on lobbying don't include a lot of the conversations you'd be having anyway. I mean, lobbying means that you are advocating for or against specific legislation. Many conversations with congressional offices deal mostly when we have you along with us as the experts that deal mostly with educating on the various topics or informing the various policies that are being made. It doesn't meet the definition of lobbying.

Mitch: Talking about what you do, talking about what's going on in your lab, talking about what you know as a scientist kosher, talking about a specific piece, a bill may or may not be depending on the situation, that's really helpful. Thank you. Bill, turning to you, you've done such amazing advocacy work, and one of the things that's tricky in today's society is that things are so divisive. I know a lot of scientists think what if I'm meeting with somebody who ideologically be on the other side of the political spectrum or disagree with me on a topic that I care so deeply about? How does that go down? What have your experiences been there?

William Stoops: That is absolutely true. I live in Kentucky and tend to differ politically from my political representatives. What I think is most important to get across when you're visiting them is that you're a constituent and that you are representing concerns as a constituent. To Katherine's point earlier, yes, you need to check with your institution, just as an example, UK, I have to tell them, when I'm going as an advocate, I have to tell them what I'm talking about, but I always make it very clear, I'm here representing myself as a constituent. I'm here representing APA or whatever organization I'm there to advocate for.

Then it's about talking about the issue that you're there to talk about as a constituent. Just as an example, I do addiction research, and I tend to talk to my elected federal officials, really, their staff tend to not talk to them directly about an issue that affects me as a constituent. I'm there talking about addiction, which we know in Kentucky as a major, major issue. I'm talking about addiction treatment or addiction research, and I relate it then back to the district or the state.

That tends to be very, very helpful in getting the point across and setting common ground, rather than coming in and saying I disagree with you about points, X, Y, and Z. Say instead, I'm seeking common ground to talking about something that affects

us, where the people who voted for you and the people who you represent live, and that goes a long, long way in finding common ground.

Mitch: That's terrific. Sticking with you for a second, Bill, I know that you have been doing work on the Advocacy Coordinating Committee. Can you explain a little bit what is that committee? What do they do?

William: Oh, goodness. Sure. The Advocacy Coordinating Committee was formed probably about four or five years ago, as part of a restructuring of how APA and APA Services Inc, operated. It is a group of, I believe, at least 12 individuals closer to 15. It's all psychologist, it's all APA and APASI members and it's brought oddly diverse. It represents people who are interested in science and practice public interest education.

We help to recommend to the Board of Directors each year, the advocacy priorities for APA and APASI. We do some other things, but that's our biggest work product every year. Those 18 priorities that you see, as APA members, APA Advocacy Coordinating Committee develops that draft and recommends it to the board for then further action. That helps Katherine's office then really focus on what those specific priorities are.

Mitch: Terrific, thank you. Reggie, I wanted to ask you, we know that advocacy is especially important for scientists who are working with non-human animal models. Can you tell us what you think is at stake for scientists to do this advocacy for basic research?

Reggie Gazes: Well, animal models, I think, obviously have their own set of unique problems, but basic research in general suffers from this too. Honestly, all of our research probably suffers from this, which is that most of our representatives really don't know what we do. They don't know what we do, they don't know how we do it, they don't know why we do it. The information that they do have about what we do tends to be misinformation. It's either things they're picking up from the media or things they're getting from other groups that are also coming to speak to them.

For those of us who work with animals in psychology, there are many groups out there who lobby and advocate against our work existing. Things like PETA and White Coat Waste, they are meeting with their representatives regularly. For us, if we're not also there to explain the science behind what we do and explain the value and connected as Bill pointed out to the constituents and to the issues that our Congress people care about, then they don't know that this is something that's important, they only have the information that they've been given.

I think, us being there and speaking up and providing them with information, providing them with resources, and connections to us in case they want to reach out at any point with questions, it's just really important to get the information that we need out there.

Mitch: Reggie, a lot of grant funding seems to end up flowing to more of the applied science areas, and we want to see more for the basic science areas itself. What are your thoughts or your guidance about how to make sure that we're getting the relevant attention, the necessary attention towards more funding for basic science?

Reggie: Well, basic science is the basis of all science. I'm just explaining the importance of it can be difficult, but it's really important. I think, advocating for basic science as the basis for other science is a good place to start. We've found it to be particularly effective to provide examples of the path between basic science and more applied or translational work. With animal research, specifically, finding cases that tend to be of interest to people generally things like treating PTSD in veterans or the opioid crisis. These are not things where we can do a lot of research in humans.

At least a lot of the basic research needs to be done in animal models for ethical reasons, and so we can lay out the value of that type of work for the translational things that people really care about. We can also give great examples of starting with really, really basic research and things that go on. One of my favorites is oxytocin, oxytocin, you hear about everywhere now. It's like the miracle drug that everyone wants to use to try to figure out how to solve all sorts of problems. There's research going on into its uses in schizophrenia, and depression, and addiction and autism, all sorts of things.

The reason that we know oxytocin has some value in treating social disorders is because of some neuroscience work done in bulls. The reason that we knew to even look in bulls at oxytocin was because of some really, really basic biology work looking at mating habits of different bull species. We started at this really, truly basic level, and we've come up now to the translation. I think giving those kinds of examples can be helpful.

Mitch: That's terrific. Thank you. Erin is a doctoral student, you don't have a lot of free time, I'm guessing. You have taken your time to do work and advocacy. Why do you get started in that? What inspired you?

Erin Kaseda: That's a great question, and people say that a lot, and I always like to bounce it back that faculty also are not rolling in free time. I think everyone on this call can relate to that feeling. For me, as was mentioned in my introduction, my clinical and my research work really focuses on brain tumor. If any of you have ever worked in oncology and in particular in pediatric oncology, which is where I focus, you really see that there's this moment where every single thing in a person's life changes, and overnight, they're expected to become experts in clinical trial enrollment and drug side effects and educational accommodations and patient advocacy.

Working with that population, there really was a moment for me where I was like if you all can bring this energy in this advocacy to what you are dealing with right now with your child or your family, then I will meet you there. I can bring exactly that much advocacy to now addressing the systems-level issues that are often really at the core of some of the challenges that patients face and that researchers face and not having adequate funding and support to continue to work towards a cure for cancer.

That was really my starting point for why I wanted to get involved. It's very fitting that this is an APA science event because it was through APA science that I actually was able to get involved through my work with the APA Science Student Council and the Advocacy offices work throughout the start of the pandemic to now and creating these virtual hill events where even with limited time, limited financial resources, I'm

not jetting off to DC every weekend, but I'm still able to meet very regularly with the offices of my federal representatives to talk about these issues continuously.

Mitch: That's awesome. Erin, you are an expert on how we should be training students. For all the work that you've done in APAGS and the Science Student Council and your experience in a training program. What should we be training young people starting their careers about advocacy or if anything?

Erin: That's a really great question. I'm actually doing some data collection on this very question right now so stay tuned for the results and recommendations from that research project. What I think it comes down to is, again, as you mentioned, there are very real constraints in terms of time, training programs already really long. Not everybody has the interest in every type of advocacy.

Katherine's talking before about that multi-pronged approach. Not everyone wants to meet with their federal lawmakers and engage in lobbying or policy advocacy. I think that the focus should shift away from what specific experiences should programs provide, but rather really focus on programs need to help foster an identity as advocates in psychologists so that when we do graduate, we go out into the world saying, as a psychologist, I have an understanding of the many intersecting systems that impact my patients and my research.

I understand what's happening at a local and international level, and I view myself as an effective agent of change in those systems. I know that as a scientist, and as a psychologist, I can actually make a difference in those systems, and I'm willing to take the steps to do that. I think that psychologists, again, every single person on this call, we already have so many of those skills and that knowledge base to do this work. I think the missing piece is really that like identity as an advocate. I think, at the end of the day, regardless of the resources and the time that programs have, what they should be doing is helping trainees develop that sense of advocacy, something that's important, and it's something that I can successfully do.

Mitch: Well said. Thank you. I wanted to open it up to the whole panel and ask you, so I think that many scientists might relate to the moment in time when you receive your letter from the editor that your manuscript has been accepted, hooray. You look at those findings that you spent years to get, and you think, now if only these stakeholders knew about this sort, if only the president knew about this, or if only all of Congress knew about this.

I think we have a couple of choices. One is we could wait for the senators to find our article in the journal and read it on their own. I'm guessing that that's not the most effective approach. What would you advise we do instead? You're in the possession of an important finding or body of findings, and you think everyone can really benefit. What do you do next? Who do you contact?

William: I think there's a couple options. I will dive in. If you're working within an institution, you're working within a university or you're working at a non-profit, that group will have some PR arm. I think that's one way especially if it's really impactful and it showcases the institution. That's one thing. If you're also a big fan of tasteful self-promotion, so putting things out on Twitter because things-- Twitter has a lot of

problems, but I find for science knowledge, it's really good people putting pre-prints and new publications out.

If you're talking about important advocacy work that you need to, to get in the hands of the government, couple other options. Of course, as you build confidence as an advocate and you build relationships with your federal offices, you can absolutely share that information with people. Just as an example, Mitch McConnell is one of my senators, and I have a really great relationship with some of his staffers and so if there's something I need them to know, I'm not shy anymore, and I email them and say, Hey, here's this finding, or, hey, we discussed this, here's an option but also, talking with your federal funders as well.

I tend to be funded by NIDA, the National Institute on Drug Abuse or NIAAA and when I have something that is important that NIDA funded, I let them know about it because they may want to publicize that in as well. Maybe we're bashful and maybe we don't want to appear self-congratulatory, but there's a way to get our work out there in a way that is effective, but maybe isn't trying to hog the spotlight or, or any of those things. You've worked really hard, and the taxpayer has paid for this work, so share it. Be thoughtful about it and share it broadly.

Mitch: Terrific.

Katherine: I'll just add to what Bill has said and just share a little, maybe it's a little rule that we always cite with ourselves, and that is right time, right place, right messenger. When that research is coming out, it always serves any of us. I always say, any of us really, it serves us well to pause and really take stock.

Is this the right time to really do what Bill had said, which is to communicate it? Other things that are going on in society or other things where you can't get through the noise so that society can see this new finding or whatever discovery the right messenger is really critical as well because sometimes you might be the right messenger, but other times, it can be, it could be like, Erin, for you. It could be a professor.

It could be someone who's very senior in the university. It could actually even be like a third party who's outside of the university that you're working with. Going back to that right time, right place, the right place is do you know the channel? Bill mentioned Twitter, that's a great channel to get things out there, but it doesn't have the legs, it does not have the staying power. It's a great place to announce things, but know the right place where you've got staying power, where you can anchor your science so that the most people can see it.

Mitch: What if it is the right time? What if everyone's talking about abortion and you study abortion and you're screaming at your TV screen, "You're wrong, I have the science right here?" What's the best way to make that approach? Who, in your office, might be good to contact? What's the best way to start getting involved?

Katherine: What's the way to get involved? I am all about power to the people. We are in a period of time in our country where the power has shifted away from the Federal government to the states. The constituent voice is the strongest voice right

now in your states with your lawmakers from your state. To your point about someone saying, I have this piece of legislation, share it with Mitch, share it with me.

We will figure out together if you need us, we will figure out, and we can walk through that together, how to best get that to the lawmakers, but the other decision makers, because sometimes you're in a district where they're not the decision-makers. Bill's with a decision maker, he's with one of the deciders. He might be a better person to carry something from a different state, from Alaska or something. Absolutely, we're here to engage and always look in your own backyard first about how you can use that research in your community, even to educate people.

Mitch: That's great. To your point, Katherine, as far as contacting the science office, more than welcome to please tell your division presidents, even if you're not a member of APA, go tell your division president. We have a channel with them. We are sending things out at least once a week saying that we need the science on X topic or Y topic, we're constantly doing that, and we need your division president to say, I am just the person for you. That's how we work. The closer you are connected, the more you can make sure that your research is top of radar. What we see there, Katherine sees that right away, Pat sees that right away, and that's going to be really powerful.

Katherine: Mitch, can I also just add on to that, that we in June launched, it's called the Division Advocacy Partner Program. At this point in time, we're at 12 divisions, 12 divisions who have named advocacy partners. It has just been amazing and rewarding to just see that bidirectional communication, the doors have been opened so to speak, doors and windows. We're getting all kinds of good information that we have missed and information, as in research that is really enriching our work here for you.

Mitch: Terrific. Some people might feel a little bit daunted by the idea of contacting a policymaker directly. What do you say? How do you get practice? I know that there's been some training and opportunities to really do that through APA or other kinds of summits. I don't know, Erin, have you had the chance to be at an advocacy day? Can you take a moment to talk a little bit about what that's like and whether that helps you to feel ready to go and talk with a congressional member or staffer?

Erin: Absolutely. Definitely I've seen a couple of Q&A come in that are student focused of like, how does students start getting involved? We'll also drop this in the chat and make sure that it ends up on the recording web-hosted area of resources. Some other alum of the Science Student Council and I have actually put together it's called, Aritable, I don't know if any of you used it before.

It's like a fancy Google sheet, but of different advocacy opportunities to address the specific issue of people saying like, I know that I want to do this, but I have no idea how to do it. What I will say is that getting involved with any professional organization, whether that is EPA or something like the National Brain Tumor Society, the Alzheimer's Association, Research America, AAAS, all of those organizations have folks just like Katherine and Pat who are full-time expert paid staff to help support those advocacy efforts.

Your job coming in as a psychological scientist is not to be an expert on how government works or an expert on every bill that's before Congress, because that's their job. Your job is to say, I'm a constituent and I am an expert on this specific topic, or this is my community, these are people I see in my practice every day, whatever it is, and to really just share your story. Again, speaking to any students who are on this call or early career folks who maybe feel like, I don't know if this time is right for me, again I definitely can relate to that feeling, but just also want to put it out there again, this reminder that if you are writing a dissertation on something, you already know more about that topic than 99% of people in the world.

I think in the context of academia, maybe you don't view yourself as an expert, but meeting with lawmakers, the majority of whom their background is in law or business, to them you are an expert on science, you are an expert on healthcare just by your daily activities. I think those trainings that Mitch mentioned really are a great opportunity to learn how to be more comfortable with that process while really being coached through it again by people like Katherine, like Pat, like the other advocacy staff whose job it is to help you feel comfortable so that you can just do what you do best with just sharing your science and sharing your experiences.

Mitch: Terrific. Thanks. I just want to underscore the experience of talking with folks and the level of scientific knowledge or expertise, it's much lower than you might expect, because, of course, their expertise in a different discipline, so really everyone who's been admitted to a doctoral program has something incredibly valuable and very knowledgeable and useful to say and shouldn't feel like people are going to say like, oh, I know that, I totally read those papers already. No, that's not going to happen. Great. An interesting question's come in from our listeners. One, national advocacy strategies, do you suggest for folks who are residents of Washington DC and do not have elected representation in Congress? Any thoughts?

Katherine: If we haven't connected with you in DC yet, then we need you. I would say that the thought here is that because you are local, we have a lot of opportunities that come before us with like three hours notice. Government is getting back to in-person, and we can always use someone who is willing to step forward and join us in our advocacy efforts in the DC area.

That said, I would tell you that DC does have, at large as they say, representation, and the DC psychologists are some of the most active psychologists that we work with. What we try to do is, we call it the DMV, we will group them with Maryland, or we group them with Virginia sometimes, or we just group them as the DC psychologist and scientists. There is a big footprint there, and I would just say we rely on you and we could help show you the way on how to contribute.

Mitch: Terrific. Question for everybody, we're two weeks away from national elections, of course. Now APA is officially nonpartisan, and the APA staff are not allowed to use APA resources for any electioneering, but most members of Congress are an hour away from Washington, so they're back in their districts campaigning closer to home, you might be able to go to a town hall or to some event and ask a question or meet with somebody, including their staffers to talk about psychology. What are the kinds of things that you would want to say or think we could all be saying to support science, to support psychological science, or the areas of science that you are in? Any thoughts of what you might say?

William: It seems like everybody's shy. Go ahead, Erin.

Erin: I was just going to say, as I think it was Bill, maybe you had mentioned before, most often you're going to be meeting with staff in the offices. There are two main categories of staff that I've met with historically. There's either the DC-based staff or the local district staff. When you're meeting with district staff, so these are people who actually live within your congressional district, so they're local to you, these are folks who are often honestly very excited to have a work field trip. I've had multiple district staff say, can I come take a tour of your lab? If you ever have a presentation happening, I'd love to come see it.

I think just making those human connections, letting people know, hey, I'm somebody who's here physically in the state and I'm interested and I want to be a resource for you is one of the most valuable things that you can do, because it means that regardless of what the lawmaker's priorities are right now, or their stance on particular issues, it means that if Bill does come across their table, or it's about animal research regulations, or it's about addiction, then they'll be like, wait, I met someone at this town hall who actually knows a lot about this, let me dig up their contact information. I think just showing up in and of itself is really, really valuable and informant.

William: I completely agree. I think Erin had made a point about tell stories. Science is important and you've got to have some data and you've got to have some facts, but a story is better., a story with data is the best. I think the point about inviting someone to your lab is a really, really good one, make sure university knows about it because you don't want them to find out that somebody representing your senator, or your congressperson showed up at your lab and they didn't know about it. Just do that paperwork first, but totally worth doing.

I think if you're going to show up at a town hall to talk about issues that are important to you, just my example, I would show up and I tend to talk a lot about NIH and NIH funding. I live in a university town, so it's easy for me to make that point important. Congressman Barr is my congressman, and say, can you talk about your support for NIH and this type of research and relate it back to, I'm in a university in town, it funds a lot of this university, and I think it's important for you to speak to that. It's all about like Erin said, the relationship is about the story, and it's about bringing it back to where you live and where that person lives.

Katherine: I would just add to what Erin and Bill have brought up because they make fantastic points and say that I have always approached engagement at chicken barbecues more or parades as everyday advocacy opportunities. I'm always wearing the advocate hat and so if I have any type of political interaction or someone approaches me to pitch themselves, my time isn't free. I'm not just going to like fold up and say, "Absolutely we love you." I'm going to say, "Well, wait a minute." Bill was saying with Congressman Barr, let me just ask you a few questions.

We've worked with your office in the past, that's another, that's a good lead in. I saw you were recently on the front page of the newspaper talking about supporting a new behavioral science lab, some funding. Can you tell me more about that? Connect yourself with that person, but my advice would be, in those one-on-one interactions

you have, never walk away without extracting some support for psychological science from the individual.

Reggie: Everybody's said all these things already, but it is a great time to go meet with your local folks and to remind them that they have scientists in their district. It takes a while to get comfortable being nice to meet you. I'm a scientist, but it is important to identify yourself that way because a lot of congresspeople really don't interact with scientists that often.

Bill pointed this out, but like connecting it back to the local area. Is this grant money coming in and paying a lot of people's salaries? It has to do with employment, and these are issues that they care a lot about so just reminding them that you're there and thanking them for work that they've done that has been important to science. For supporting scientific funding or supporting bills that were relevant to psychological science can also be just a good way to get in there, let them know who you are, and start making those connections.

Mitch: Speaking of scientific funding, this has a direct impact on the day-to-day job of most academics and scientists, much less whether they get promoted, tenured, we would ideally like to see them funding up to the 99th percentile because they have so much money, they're going to fund every great proposal. Let's start with what is APA doing to increase the amount of money that federal agencies have for psychological science. What's an example of a typical week or month perhaps of the kinds of ways that APA is fighting for that?

Katherine: Well, I'd like to jump in and answer, but I would like to bring Pat Kobor's camera, if you would. Pat is the Deputy Chief of Advocacy for Scientific Affairs. I really don't want to steal your thunder here because you work so hard day in and day out.

Pat Kobor: Thanks, and hi, everyone. One example is we worked with a couple of behavioral and social science organizations to get additional funding for the NIH Office of Behavioral and Social Sciences Research. One of the things that OBSSR does is co-fund grants. OBSSR doesn't fund grants itself, but it will fund a grant proposal from NIMH that's right on the line from Arthritis Institute.

Everything IT funds is behavioral and social science and with my colleague Angela Sharpe, we're very fortunate to get additional funding. We had asked Congress for 20 million additional for the Office of Behavioral and Social Sciences and we got 10 and this is not 20, but we're very happy with it. That's cold hard cash in somebody's pocket and more good research that's being funded.

This was just good old-fashioned shoe leather advocacy. We targeted a member of Congress on the appropriations committee. We brought constituents from that state to talk to her and say why they thought it was important. We talked to the committee and lots of little steps along the way before that was approved. A year goes by and they still haven't passed the bill, and then they pass the bill and it's that money's in the press release. So, we are like this is great. That's an example of going for something specific to behavioral and social sciences research.

Mitch: I know Pat, and the friends of NIMH and NIDA, APA has a very unique and potentially powerful relationship in really supporting and cultivating allegiance to behavioral science. Anything you could say about that?

Pat: Those coalitions are very important. I think, we want to have good relationships with the people in federal agencies, and this is a really nice way to cultivate those relationships. It makes us better advocates. I know more about NIMH now because I'm participating in that coalition and I'm listening to the staff speak to our members about various programs and the work of the different branches.

It's a nice way to work with other organizations that have the same interest. There are lots of organizations interested in mental health research and it's not necessarily the ones that you think of first with the friends of NICHD. Katherine's been on that executive committee. We work with the pediatricians and lots of other organizations, the Obstetricians and gynecologists in support of overall funding for that institute. That rising tide lifts our boats too.

Mitch: Thank you. What are some other ways that scientists themselves can be helpful in the work that's being done to get more funding for psychological science?

Katherine: I'd like to hear Pat as well. Because of our interactions with the agencies on a daily basis, one of the things that we're often pressed for is the five to 10 years from now, which is, is the issue spotting. What are those issues that are coming up that the institute should start thinking about? The federal funding streams that come through Congress and are appropriated, they are funding those here and now and maybe three, maybe five years.

I would never think it's five years. Its appropriations are on an annual cycle. If there was something really valuable, it would be looking across society, looking across in the work that you're doing. I would say getting ahead, getting out in front. Where do we want the institutes, NSF, where do we want them looking? Where are we predicting they should be looking and investing research dollars?

Mitch: That makes good sense. You're reminding me of the kinds of advocacy that sometimes doesn't involve funding agency or the legislative branch at all the ways in which science is being used, let's say, in a surgeon general report or something like that to raise global awareness. Does anyone want to talk a little bit about ways that you see that as being important or powerful? I see a lot of folks nodding their heads. Katherine, you want to take a first stab with that?

Katherine: I have proudly been a part of APA's efforts on both the Surgeon General's guidance on protecting youth mental health, as well as last week's announced effort on workplace mental health and wellbeing. What I want to reiterate about that is that these are policy guidances and efforts that did not happen overnight. We started building those relationships. When I say it's us along with our expert psychologists. We had them in the room, we had them at the table.

This is going back years we were there. We did not. As I said, we never went AWOL. We remained at the table bringing fresh science, fresh points of view. All of that then culminated with having built the trust as a reliable scientific organization that the

surgeon general's office amongst HHS veterans, all these various organizations could rely upon.

Mitch, I'm not sure if that gets to your question, but I think those are some applied examples, yet I could talk about long COVID. We were working with the White House Task Force on COVID, and Health Equity and we had our neuroscience experts. We had them in giving testimony, educating the White House on what long COVID was before. Really, it hit the newspapers as long C'S here and it's not going away. Those are some of those examples of relationship building over time and maybe it's an early bird. We're trying to predict and get there ahead of others to a Good a good job.

Mitch: I just have to say as a scientist myself, to see science that APA has put in front of folks to be cited in the State of the Union address, to see it in these surgeon general reports, to hear that white house task forces have consulted with psychologists. I now see because you all have everyone on this call has put that right in front of folks and used it. It's just incredibly exciting and gratifying to be like wow. All this science really can make a difference, thanks to you all on this call who do much work to really get it there and to really help connect the dots and show people how many answers we have, it's just great. Thank you.

I'd be remiss without answering giving you all a chance to answer a couple of questions that have come up in the chat also that are fantastic. One of them frustratingly says that this pern in their institution, like others are being attacked for evidence-based gender-affirming care. How can APA be a resource in cases where it's beyond a disagreement and it's evolved now to a more threatening situation? Any thoughts about that? I think there was just recently a document that went out from APA on gender on affirming care or gender non-binary.

Katherine: Mitch, can you repeat that? I'm sorry, you broke up from my end.

Mitch: Sure, some folks are being attacked for providing evidence-based gender-affirming care and how can APA use our science to be a resource to really demonstrate the importance of using gender-firming care and moving this from a political debate to back to people being able to gauge in safe practice.

Katherine: One of our new advocacy tools is working with the science directorate and developing, as we call them, resource pages, but it is what they do on whatever the topic is, gender-affirming, care, hate, and violence social media and adolescents. They are very carefully pulling together the freshest and most salient and impactful science into one-pagers. Most recently, to the point about gender-affirming care, in the state of Oklahoma.

I'll use Oklahoma as an example. There was legislation that was going to ban OU Health from receiving any type of state funds if they proceeded to engage in any gender-affirming care. Mitch engaged in a coalition effort with the Trevor Project and from a communications angle, they were able to post an op-ed into the Oklahoma the day that it was being deliberated.

The Oklahoma State OPA Psych Association had their hands full, and this gets to this threatening part of the equation. Oklahoma, unlike many states, are in a situation

of trying to seek a balance and leading with science is what we have been saying is that balance it and when I say it's the balance, it's not being perceived as leaders as picking subjectively picking one side or the other.

Those resource sheets that we have been sharing with the states, instead of the Oklahoma situation, instead of them saying, we don't have a position, because they didn't want to alienate their members on the left or their members on the other side or the right they said, here's what the psychological science says, and that's what they distributed, and we're finding.

That's where the trust has been built in Congress and with their lawmakers is if we're always leading with that bedrock or that the underpinnings of what we do are psychological science, we're able to get in the offices either side and start building the trust with those offices, and that would be my recommendation is rely on the science.

Mitch: That's great. Thank you. Reggie, Erin, and Bill, you all have contacts with undergraduate students, and we have many questions about how do you get undergrads involved in advocacy work.

Reggie: I teach at a primarily undergraduate institution. We have lots of undergrad students, and if you are an undergraduate or you're somebody who's mentoring undergraduates, the answer is the same way you get anybody involved in advocacy work. usually, with our undergraduates, a lot of the advocacy work starts more with communication.

Communicating about science to non-scientists, whether that's their congresspeople which sometimes is the case or whether it's just at the local children's museum talking to young children's or families about the science that they're interested in sharing, but the techniques that you use for communicating science to non-scientists are pretty Universal.

Your audience shifts, but practicing, how do you pick a message and stay on message? How do you make your science understandable and appealing to people who don't have the background or the interest that you have? Those are all skills that are really valuable in advocacy work, and also just educating the public is of course advocacy work on its own right, because the more people we have who understand and support our science, the more advocates we have, for our undergraduates, that's one of the major ways we've gotten them involved.

William: Oh, go, Erin, you go ahead.

Erin: I was just going to say, I think modeling and supporting students' advocacy within your own institution is also really valuable. I think sometimes students can walk away with this feeling if I can't even get my own department chair or my own University president to listen to me, what chance do I have of getting a congressperson to listen to me? I think supporting students through channels you see issues on this very campus, what is the process of engaging in conversation with University administration about policies and things like that can also be a really effective tactic.

William: The only other thing I would say is, maybe start small, it's daunting to be thinking, I'm going to the hill, or I'm going to be meeting on Zoom with, I've got to have this spiel which APA prepares you really, really well by the way, but we get those action alerts. I think it's what voter voice and sending an email especially if the text is crafted for you.

Is really, really a nice way to start whether you're an undergrad or not. That's also something that I always say is APA can link you in and can let you know when there's something you're interested in that they need you to respond for, be a constituent for, and that just a really, really easy way to begin.

Katherine: I would add just one point, and that is a couple years ago, I started working with Rosie Phillips Davis who's at the University of Memphis on curriculum advocacy curriculum that she could use with her doctoral students, and she's now run the class two times, and what we started thinking about, and Erin, this goes to your, some of the reflections that you just shared is number one, how to demystify and how to build confidence in the doctoral or students, and what this training is that we curriculum, we'd happy to share it is that it really based on getting active in your own community.

How do you build coalitions? How do you bring science, the psychological science to two places that are in your own community? You could go and work with a housing Section eight housing administration, there's all things that you could bring psychological science to. I think that's just something that's intentional that we're thinking that might be something others might find attractive, is just intentionally having a curriculum for the doctoral level students.

Mitch: That's great. Well, just a very quick announcement as we say goodbye. Thank you much for participating. We hope you enjoyed this. You're going to get a one-minute survey after this broadcast. It'd be great to get feedback, so we can make more conversations that are useful for you. You can find a copy of this recording and any relevant materials on our essential science conversations page, as well as links to our previous essential science conversations.

Also, any feedback or suggestions you could email us at science@apa.org. If you want to hear about seminars like this, free stats, trainings, money, and awards that we're giving away to top scientists to promote psychological science, you should be subscribing to APA Science Spotlight, and if you are interested in getting the top science articles from APA Journals picked by the editors themselves, then you should be subscribing to the Editor's Choice Newsletter, all for free, not just for APA members, and those links are in the chat.

I'd like to thank Pat, Bill, Erin, Katherine, and Reggie much for participating today, and thanks as always to Shandol Hoover and everyone who helped behind the scenes to make this happen. Have a great day, everybody.