

Consortium of Social Science Associations



Volume 20, Number 6

Celebrating 20 Years of Advocacy

March 23, 2001

FY 2002 BUDGET RESOLUTIONS ON FAST TRACK

It appears that both the House and Senate are moving to pass the FY 2002 budget resolutions before leaving for their Spring recess due to begin on April 7. This would also precede the release of the detailed administration budget, now scheduled for April 9.

On March 21, the House Budget Committee, on a straight party vote, reported out its version of the FY 2002 budget resolution. New Chairman Jim Nussle (R-IA) kept the panel's Republicans in line and his version of the spending and taxing blueprint mirrored that presented by the President in his *Blueprint* (see *Update*, March 12, 2001). The resolution is expected to move to the floor the week of March 26.

On the other side of the Capitol, Budget panel Chairman Pete Domenici (R-NM) has announced that he will take the resolution directly to the Senate floor, bypassing any committee markup. Recognizing the difficulties of the 50-50 split on his committee and satisfying both Democrats and conservative Republicans, such as Phil Gramm (R-TX), Domenici decided that it would be better to go directly to full Senate consideration of the resolution.

The House resolution provides for \$660.6 billion in Budget Authority (BA) for discretionary spending and \$683.8 billion in Outlays. (Budget Authority obligates funds for programs that can be spent in more than one fiscal year; Outlays are what will be obligated in that particular year.) This represents a \$25.1 billion or 3.9 percent boost in BA from FY 2001. The resolution allots \$335.7 billion to non-defense discretionary BA, a 3.5 percent increase over last year, and \$324.9 billion to defense-related discretionary BA.

For Function 250, General Science, Space and Technology, which includes NSF, NASA, and (see *Budget*, page 6)

SENATORS BOND AND MIKULSKI SEEK SUPPORT TO DOUBLE NSF BUDGET

Senators Kit Bond (R-MO) and Barbara Mikulski (D-MD), Chairman and Ranking Democrat on the Senate VA, HUD, Independent Agencies Appropriations Subcommittee, have sent a Dear Colleague letter seeking support on a request to Majority Leader Trent Lott (R-MO) and Minority Leader Tom Daschle (D-SD) to double the budget of the National Science Foundation (NSF) over a five-year period.

The two committee leaders tell their Senate colleagues: "We continue to believe that investing in basic research should be a keystone of our strategy for economic growth, a better-educated workforce, technological leadership, improved public health, prevention of disease, and national security." They further believe that NSF, as the only federal agency whose primary mission is to support fundamental scientific research, "is best positioned to advance this strategy."

The letter to Lott and Daschle cites Harold Varmus and Bernadine Healy, two former directors of the National Institutes of Health, and Ken Shine, President of the Institute of Medicine, as supporters of biomedical research who seek more funding for NSF. Bond and Mikulski also note that "there is a growing consensus that investing in fundamental scientific research is one of the best things we can do to keep our nation economically strong." They hope to double NSF's budget by FY 2005.

Inside *UPDATE* . . .

- **COSSA Calls for Large Increase for NSF**
- **Bush Administration Resumes Appointments**
- **Revisiting the Shelby Amendment**
- **A Brighter Future for Education Research?**
- **Averting Crisis in Child Mental Health**
- **NSF Seeks Proposals for Children's Research Initiative**
- **Announcements**

On the House side, HUD, VA, Independent Agencies Subcommittee Chairman James Walsh (R-NY) is expected to release a letter calling for a significantly higher increase for NSF in FY 2002. It is unclear whether he will call for doubling. A number of Democrats on the House Science Committee, led by Full Committee Ranking Democrat Rep. Ralph Hall (D-TX), Basic Research Subcommittee Ranking Democrat Rep. Eddie Bernice Johnson (D-TX), and Rep. David Wu (D-OR), have circulated a letter to their colleagues calling for doubling NSF's budget.

COSSA CALLS FOR LARGE INCREASE FOR NSF

Calling the administration's proposal for a \$56 million (or 1.3 percent) increase for the National Science Foundation's (NSF) FY 2002 budget "totally inadequate," COSSA Executive Director Howard J. Silver asked the House VA, HUD, Independent Agencies Appropriations Subcommittee for a 15 percent increase. As recommended by the Coalition for National Science Funding (CNSF), this would bring NSF's budget to a total of \$5.1 billion in FY 2002. The nearly \$700 million boost would keep the NSF on a five-year doubling track, once again called for by Senators Kit Bond (R-MO) and Barbara Mikulski (D-MD).

CONSORTIUM OF SOCIAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATIONS

Executive Director:	Howard J. Silver
Government Affairs:	Angela L. Sharpe
Public Affairs:	Chris F. Ryan
Govt. Affairs Ass't:	John A. Wertman
President:	Janet L. Norwood

The Consortium of Social Science Associations (COSSA), an advocacy organization for federal support for the social and behavioral sciences, was founded in 1981 and stands alone in Washington in representing the full range of social and behavioral sciences.

Update is published 22 times per year. Individual subscriptions are available from COSSA for \$80; institutional subscriptions - \$160; overseas mail - \$160. ISSN 0749-4394. Address all inquiries to COSSA: 1522 K Street, NW, Suite 836, Washington, D.C. 20005. Phone: (202) 842-3525, Fax: (202) 842-2788.

www.cossa.org

Silver told the Subcommittee that the substantial increase for NSF would allow fundamental university-based science to continue to deliver the great technological advances that have provided for new methods and products and moved our nation forward. He cited business leaders, who understand that without improvements in education and training and new scientific findings and innovations, economic growth will stall.

In discussing the need for enhanced funding for the Social, Behavioral and Economic Sciences (SBE) Directorate, Silver declared that "the SBE sciences are poised and ready to make significant discoveries in the future." He noted that improvements in computer computation and computer communication and the rapid increase in multidisciplinary endeavors mean that collaboration, "collaboratories," merged databases, functional MRIs, and virtual centers are the future of SBE research. He cited new infrastructure, the Children's Research Initiative, cognitive neuroscience, human origins, and the ethics, legal, and social consequences of information technology as key areas of SBE support in the near future.

Silver included in his testimony many examples of NSF-supported SBE studies that reflect the broad array of subjects where SBE research can make a difference. These include basic economics, the effects of job training, currency crises, entrepreneurship, expert versus non-expert knowledge, environmental hazards, public opinion and voting, women and technology, the impact of biotechnology, education reform, immigration, midlife education, improved statistical measures, and small area estimates.

He concluded by noting that increased funding for NSF will strengthen the SBE Directorate's ability to support research "to meet the needs of this country and the world for evidence-based policies to help work on the complex problems affecting us all."

BUSH ADMINISTRATION RESUMES APPOINTMENTS

According to the Brookings Institution Political Appointees Initiative, (www.appointee.brookings.org), there are 481 Senate-confirmed positions that President George W. Bush needs to fill. After the

initial burst of Cabinet appointments, the pace slowed to a crawl. It is now beginning to pick up again with a slew of announcements in the past two weeks. However, the time between announcing an intention to nominate someone and getting that someone approved by the Senate can be months. As of the third week of March, only 22 appointees had been confirmed.

Among the more recent announcements on intent to nominate are:

- Eugene W. Hickok to be Undersecretary of Education, the number-three post in the Department. Hickok, Pennsylvania Secretary of Education since 1995 under Governor Tom Ridge, is a political scientist who taught for fifteen years at Dickinson College in Carlisle, PA. He also served as Director of the college's Clark Center for the Interdisciplinary Study of Contemporary Issues and served as an adjunct professor at the Dickinson School of Law. He twice won Dickinson's outstanding teacher award. He has written extensively on Federalism and the U.S. Constitution, served as a special assistant in the Office of Legal Counsel at the U.S. Department of Justice, and been an adjunct scholar at the Heritage Foundation. Hickok has a Ph.D. from the University of Virginia.
- Sandra B. Neuman to be Assistant Secretary of Elementary and Secondary Education. Neuman is the Director of the Center for the Improvement of Early Reading and Achievement (CIERA), one of the Office of Educational Research and Improvement's Centers, located at the University of Michigan. Prior to her arrival at CIERA, Neuman was Professor in Curriculum, Instruction, and Technology in Education at Temple University. She has written extensively about teaching children to read and has been co-editor of the *Journal of Literacy Research*, and served on the editorial board of *Reading Research Quarterly*. She is also interested in precocious early readers. She has a Ph.D. from the University of the Pacific.
- Robert Glenn Hubbard as a Member of the President's Council of Economic Advisers. Hubbard is the Russell L. Carson Professor of Economics and Finance and Co-Director of the Entrepreneurship Program at Columbia

University, where he also served as Senior Vice Dean of the Graduate School of Business. He is also a Research Associate with the National Bureau of Economic Research and Director of the program on tax policy at the American Enterprise Institute. From 1991-93 he served as Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Treasury for Tax Analysis. Hubbard has authored a textbook on financial markets and institutions and edited volumes on financial economics and international tax policy. A member of the American Economic Association's liaison committee with COSSA, Hubbard has a Ph.D. from Harvard.

- Deborah J. Daniels as Assistant Attorney General for the Office of Justice Programs (OJP). Currently a partner at an Indianapolis law firm, she has previous experience at the Justice Department as the first Director of the Weed and Seed program in 1992-93. Weed and Seed is a popular program in OJP that helps reduce crime and improve communities. Prior to her Justice Department experience, Daniels served as U.S. Attorney for the Southern District of Indiana. She is a graduate of DePauw University and the Indiana University School of Law.
- Bobby P. Jindal to be Assistant Secretary of Health and Human Services for Planning and Evaluation (APSE). Jindal is currently President of the University of Louisiana system. He was Executive Director of the National Bipartisan Commission on the Future of Medicare from 1998-1999. Previously, he served as Secretary of the Louisiana Department of Health and Hospitals, where he returned the Medicaid program to solvency. His degrees are from Brown and New College at Oxford. It appears that the Administration's priority for ASPE is to figure out what to do about Medicare.
- Kristine Iverson to be Assistant Secretary of Labor for Congressional and Intergovernmental Affairs. A longtime staff member for Senator Orrin Hatch (R-UT), Iverson was instrumental in helping move the National Longitudinal Survey of Labor Market Experiences from the Employment and Training Administration to the Bureau of Labor Statistics in 1984, thus saving it from extinction. She has a B.A. from DePauw University and an M.A. in Economics from George Mason University.

REVISITING THE SHELBY AMENDMENT

On March 12, the Science, Technology, and Law Program (STLP) at the National Academy of Science hosted a session to discuss the implementation of the Shelby Amendment and the controversial rule the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) drafted to put the measure into effect (see *Update*, October 11, 1999 [part 2]).

The Shelby Amendment, which was signed into law as part of the Omnibus Consolidated Appropriations Act for FY 1999, provides that “the Director of OMB amends Section 36 of OMB Circular A-110 to require Federal awarding agencies to ensure that all data produced under an award will be made available to the public through procedures established under the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) . . .” The amendment arose from concerns about scientific fraud and the desire to make public the scientific rationale supporting government regulations.

Following the rule-making period, which included thousands of public comment submissions, OMB issued a rule limiting public access to data that were used to support a government regulation, had already been published, or met other criteria. Senator Richard Shelby (R-AL), the amendment’s sponsor, and three of his colleagues criticized the rule in a letter to then-OMB Director Jack Lew, saying that the guidelines are too narrow and “contrary to . . . Congress’s intent in passing the law.” Nonetheless, the revised A-110 Circular went into effect in November, 1999.

Surprisingly to some, there have been few FOIA requests related to the circular thus far. The low number of inquiries could be due to a lack of public interest in closely examining the scientific data that affects government policy. Alternatively, this may result from the limited types of data that are subject to the OMB guidelines.

Perceptions that the rule shields too much data from scrutiny, according to some of the session’s participants, may prompt court challenges in the near future, possibly by the United States Chamber of Commerce (the Chamber), the world’s largest business federation. In its September, 1999 comments on the OMB’s guidelines, the Chamber stated, “the ‘clarifying changes’ to the proposal to amend Circular A-110 plainly do not satisfy the

requirements of the Shelby Amendment, and certainly will not survive judicial scrutiny.” The business community is a champion of the Shelby Amendment, as it gives their advocates much of the information they need to publicly question the scientific logic behind certain government regulations, which often prove costly to businesses.

Responding later to a question about the prospects of litigation by the Chamber, Co-Chair of the STLP Panel and University of Virginia Law Professor Richard A. Merrill stated that the Chamber has “made several (FOIA) requests that they expect to be denied.” By building up a strong cache of rejected requests for Federally-funded data, the Chamber might challenge the rule in court, pointing to the rejected requests to demonstrate that the rule fails to meet the broad Congressional intent of the Shelby Amendment. Whether a legal challenge might be filed in the near future, according to Merrill, is unclear.

Frederick R. Anderson, a partner at Cadwalader, Wickersham & Taft in Washington, D.C. and member of the STLP Panel, indicated that the Chamber has considered three paths of attack on the OMB rule, but that all three have hit snags. Considering the prospect of an attack on the rule from another direction, Anderson commented that Ralph Nader’s organization, Public Citizen, wrote some of the “most cogent objections to the rule that I have seen” during the comment phase and that the group could be the source of a legal challenge.

If a challenge is made and proves successful, the rule would likely be scrapped, and OMB would probably have to institute a new rule-making process. With a seemingly pro-business administration now in place, this could result in a new rule subjecting more scientific data to FOIA.

A BRIGHTER FUTURE FOR EDUCATION RESEARCH?

As Congress develops an education bill that embraces reform and reauthorizes the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), members of the education research and policy community paused to consider the condition and future of education research.

The two-day Workshop on Science, Evidence, and Inference in Education was convened on March 7 by the Committee on Scientific Principles of Education Research at the National Academy of Sciences. The meeting was part of the committee's larger goal of "explor[ing] the scientific underpinnings of education research, its generation, accumulation, and use." The NRC empanelled the interdisciplinary committee of experts at the request of the National Education Research Policy and Priorities Board.

Several factors make a discussion of research in education particularly timely. First, there is widespread agreement that the nation's education research system is flawed, suffering from an inability to retain good staff, lack of adequate funding, susceptibility to political interference, and lack of research quality and synthesis. Second, ESEA, the authorizing legislation behind the Federal government's involvement in education and education research, is due for reauthorization. Finally, President Bush has made education a top priority, and his blueprint for the federal role in education repeatedly calls for "research-based" programs and practices (available online at www.whitehouse.gov/news/usbudget/blueprint/budtoc.html).

Norman Bradburn, Director of the National Science Foundation's Social, Behavioral, and Economic Sciences Directorate, resisted the idea that science is somehow different in the field of education. The qualities of science in education are the same as in other fields, he said – education is just harder. Bradburn then provided the room of researchers, practitioners, and policymakers with an overview of the logistics of education research, discussing its origination, cultivation, and management.

Several of the speakers' suggestions for improving the state of education research contained similar elements, reflecting shared ideas about what the field currently lacks. Speakers from both within and outside the field identified shortcomings throughout the research process, noting that quality research requires, and the nation's education research program currently lacks: explicit research priorities; a vision; a sustained effort and accumulation of knowledge; shared ideas on how to measure success; adequate peer review; application

of positive research findings; and a sufficient and consistent funding stream.

On the last point, the nation's level of investment in education research is of particular concern to many. William Morill of the consulting firm Caliber Associates pointed out that the federal government's investment in the research component of education is a pathetic two-tenths of one percent, while it should be in the five to ten percent range.

While this problem lies outside the control of researchers, many of the other problems are within the field itself. Kent McGuire, former Assistant Secretary for Educational Research and Improvement, urged more action on the part of researchers, discussing the need for the field to get involved in things like peer review and planning.

Reflecting on the need for the researchers and practitioners within the field to become more active and involved, a member of the audience asked one of the panels a simple but piercing question: If the language of the forthcoming legislation reauthorizing ESEA includes many references to "research-based" strategies and solutions, is the research community up for this? All the panel's members agreed that at this point in time, the answer is "no."

The types of questions the committee is charged with addressing – describing the principles of scientific quality in education research, determining how research-based knowledge in education can accumulate, and envisioning how a federal research agency can promote and protect scientific quality – are demanding and have been on the table for years. Nevertheless, the committee, which began work in October, will continue working throughout the spring and summer. Their final publication is scheduled for release and dissemination between September and December, 2001.

The committee's website is www.nationalacademies.org; project number is CFEX-Q-00-02-A.

AVERTING CRISIS IN CHILD MENTAL HEALTH

There is a public crisis in mental health for children and adolescents, according to the Surgeon General's *National Action Agenda for Children's Mental Health*. The report outlines goals and strategies to improve services for children and adolescents with mental health problems and their families. It "provides a blueprint for change," declares Surgeon General David Satcher, and "presents an overarching vision aimed at fostering social and emotional health in children."

Satcher emphasized that the long-term consequences of untreated childhood disorders are costly, in both human and fiscal terms. The burden of suffering by children with mental health needs and their families has created a health crisis in this country, the report states.

Eight goals are outlined and include promoting public awareness of children's mental health issues, reducing the stigma associated with mental illness, and improving assessment and recognition of mental health needs in children. "Action steps" include encouraging the wide adoption of science-based prevention and treatment services and continuing research. Not only does the report call for bridging the gap between research and practice, but also encourages joining research and practice to policy. Making the policy connection, it states, is a critical step towards ensuring access to quality mental health care for children and their families.

Goal two of the report emphasizes the need to "continue to develop, disseminate, and implement scientifically-proven prevention and treatment services in the field of children's mental health." Action steps to accomplish this goal include:

- Support research on familial, cultural, and ecological contexts to identify opportunities for promoting mental health in children and providing effective prevention, treatment, and services.
- Support research on legal/ethical and confidentiality issues associated with the treatment of children and families.
- Support research to develop and test innovative behavioral, pharmacological, and multimodal interventions.
- Assess the short- and long-term outcomes of prevention and treatment efforts, including the

effect of early intervention on prognosis and the course of mental illness.

- Promote research on factors that facilitate or impede the implementation and dissemination of scientifically-proven interventions.
- Support research evaluating the process and impact of promising policies and programs, including cost-effectiveness research.
- Evaluate the impact of organization and financing of services on access, the use of scientifically-proven prevention and treatment services, and outcomes for children and families.
- Develop and evaluate model programs that can be disseminated and sustained in the community.
- Create a forum for promoting direct communication among researchers, providers, youth, and families to bridge the gap between research and practice.
- Create a standing workgroup for the purpose of identifying research opportunities, discussing potential approaches, monitoring progress in the area of psychopharmacology for young children, and addressing ethical issues concerning research with children.
- Create an oversight system to identify and approve scientifically-based prevention and treatment interventions, promote their use, and monitor their implementation.

The National Action Agenda is the culmination of a series of activities over the past year. For more information, see the Surgeon General's website at www.surgeongeneral.gov/cmh.

(BUDGET, from page 1)

Department of Energy science, the House Budget Committee provided \$22.2 billion in BA for FY 2002, an increase of \$1.1 billion. The assumptions still include the \$56 million or 1.3 percent increase for NSF proposed by the President. An Office of Management and Budget spokesperson has been justifying the proposed small increase by suggesting that NSF has been on a "spending binge" recently. During the markup in the Budget committee, Rep. Rush Holt (D-NJ) proposed an amendment to increase funding for Function 250 by \$1 billion. It was defeated 21-19.

The budget resolution is a non-binding recommendation for funding. Since the budget

resolution allocates by government function and the appropriations subcommittees make spending decisions for programs under their jurisdiction that cut across functions, a lot can happen in getting from the resolution's numbers to the actual appropriations' numbers. However, with the continued assumption of \$1.6 billion or more in tax cuts, discretionary spending will surely be squeezed this year.

NSF SEEKS PROPOSALS FOR CHILDREN'S RESEARCH INITIATIVE

Responding to a Congressional directive in the FY 2001 National Science Foundation (NSF) appropriations bill, the Social, Behavioral and Economic Sciences Directorate (SBE) has announced the program solicitation, *The Children's Research Initiative: Integrated Approaches*. NSF expects to make awards totaling \$5 million. Full proposals are due on **June 4, 2001**.

The announcement references the report, *Investing in Our Future: A National Research Initiative for America's Children in the 21st Century*, issued by the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy (OSTP) in April, 1997. NSF seeks proposals for four types of support: 1) large-scale, center-based research, as called for by Congress; 2) incubation or planning grants, so that research groups can plan proposals that will enable them to conduct collaborative, large-scale, center research projects; 3) workshops and small conferences; and 4) individual investigator-initiated research within the context of the OSTP report.

As required by Congress, "for all four types of activities under this solicitation, highest priority will be given to proposals from human sciences units in institutions of higher education that have an interdisciplinary academic program in human and family development, nutrition and related areas." In addition, a strong emphasis will be placed on theory-driven, applied, policy-related research on children, learning, and the influences of families and communities on children's development.

For further information go to www.nsf.gov (program solicitation NSF 01-85) or contact Dr. Rodney Cocking, Developmental and Learning Sciences Program Director at 703/292-8732 or rcocking@nsf.gov.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

2002-2003 Fulbright Scholar Program

The Fulbright Scholar Program is offering lecturing/research awards in some 140 countries for the 2002-2003 academic year. Opportunities are available for college and university faculty and administrators, as well as professionals from business and government, artists, journalists, scientists, lawyers, independent scholars, and others.

Traditional Fulbright awards are available from two months to an academic year or longer. A new short-term grants program – the Fulbright Senior Specialists Program – offers two-to-six-week grants in a variety of disciplines and fields.

Application deadlines for awards are **May 1, 2001** for Fulbright Distinguished Chair awards in Europe, Canada, and Russia; **August 1, 2001** for Fulbright traditional lecturing and research grants worldwide; **November 1, 2001** for spring/summer seminars in Germany, Korea and Japan for international educators and academic administrators and for the summer German Studies Seminar; rolling deadline for Senior Specialists Program.

For more information, contact the Council for International Exchange of Scholars (CIES) at 202/686-7887; email: apprequest@cies.iie.org; or online at www.cies.org.

University of Maryland WebShop

The University of Maryland's Department of Sociology invites up to 50 graduate students "with a scientific interest in documenting the social impact of the Internet" to their June, 2001 WebShop, featuring presentations by about 40 leading Internet scholars and guidance for students conducting their own analyses of data on the impact of the Internet. Participants will receive a travel/support grant of up to \$750. Application deadline is **April 20, 2001**. See www.webuse.umd.edu for application details.

Conference on the New Economy

The Institute for Operations Research and Management is inaugurating a new conference, "Optimizing the Extended Enterprise in the New Economy." The event will take place May 20-22, 2001 in San Diego, California. See www.informs.org/Conf/Practice2001 for more information.