Committee on Behavioral and Social Science Research to Improve Intelligence Analysis for National Security

WORKSHOP AGENDA

Friday, May 15 2009
Lecture Room
National Academy of Sciences Building

9:00 **WORKSHOP CHECK-IN & WORKING BREAKFAST**
Topics: Administrative/logistics issues; Agenda revisions

9:30 **WELCOME & COMMITTEE GENESIS**
• *Baruch Fischhoff, Committee Chair*

♦ UNIVERSITY & INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY CURRICULA

10:00 **UNIVERSITY ANALYTIC TRAINING**
• *Professor Stephen Marrin, Mercyhurst College*

10:20 **DEVELOPING TERRORISM ANALYSTS**
• *Dr. Donald Hanle, National Defense Intelligence College*

10:40 **ODNI ANALYSIS 101**
• *Karl Pieragostini, Office of the Director of National Intelligence*

♦ SCIENTIFIC PERSPECTIVES ON CURRICULA

11:00 **DISCUSSION AND Q&A**

OPEN FLOOR: AUDIENCE REACTION

12:15 **WORKING LUNCH**
Continue Open Floor Discussion

♦ CANADIAN PERSPECTIVES

1:15 **APPLIED BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES IN SUPPORT OF INTELLIGENCE ANALYSIS**
• *Dr. David Mandel, Defence Scientist, Defence Research and Development Canada*
♦ Questions for Dr. Mandel

♦ KEYNOTE SPEAKER

2:00 **THE VALUE OF INTELLIGENCE ANALYSIS**
• *Lt. Gen. Brent Scowcroft, USAF (Ret.), former National Security Advisor to Presidents Gerald Ford and George H.W. Bush*
♦ Questions for Lt. Gen. Scowcroft

2:50 **BREAK – 10 minutes**

♦ MEDICAL DECISION MAKING

3:00 **EVIDENCE-BASED HEALTH CARE**
• *Dr. Kay Dickersin, US Cochrane Center*
♦ Questions for Dr. Dickersin

3:40 **QUALITY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS IN MEDICINE**
• *Dr. Mark Chassin, The Joint Commission*
♦ Questions for Dr. Chassin

♦ COMMUNITY BEST PRACTICES

4:15 **ODNI ANALYTIC INTEGRITY & STANDARDS**
• *Rebecca Strode, Office of the Director of National Intelligence*
♦ Questions for Ms. Strode

5:00 **ADJOURN**

NOTE FOR PUBLIC MEETINGS: This meeting is being held to gather information to help the committee conduct its study. This committee will examine the information and material obtained during this, and other public meetings, in an effort to inform its work. Although opinions may be stated and lively discussion may ensue, no conclusions are being drawn at this time; no recommendations will be made. In fact, the committee will deliberate thoroughly before writing its draft report. Moreover, once the draft report is written, it must go through a rigorous review by experts who are anonymous to the committee, and the committee then must respond to this review with appropriate revisions that adequately satisfy the Academy's Report Review Committee and the chair of the National Research Council before it is considered a National Research Council report. Therefore, observers who draw conclusions about the committee's work based on today's discussions will be doing so prematurely.

Furthermore, individual committee members often engage in discussion and questioning for the specific purpose of probing an issue and sharpening an argument. The comments of any given committee member may not necessarily reflect the position he or she may actually hold on the subject under discussion, to say nothing of that person's future position as it may evolve in the course of the project. Any inferences about an individual's position regarding findings or recommendations in the final report are therefore also premature.