

### ADMINISTRATION RELEASES PATRIOTIC BUDGET

With the American flag proudly displayed on its cover, President Bush released his proposed Fiscal Year 2003 budget on February 4, the day after the Patriots won Super Bowl XXXVI. The budget reflects the administration's three overriding objectives: protecting the homeland, winning the war on terrorism abroad, and returning to economic vitality. It is a budget that the President describes as "more than a tabulation of numbers." It is "a plan to fight a war we did not seek – but a war we are determined to win."

To accomplish these goals, the administration has prioritized its funding decisions and introduced the notion of "budgeting for results." As one Office of Management and Budget (OMB) official put it: agency budgets will be determined "not just by how much, but how well." Each agency gets rated on the effectiveness of its programs, as determined by General Accounting Office and Inspector General reports, and OMB staff examiners' judgments. In addition, the administration has graded agencies with red, yellow, and green lights for their management effectiveness on five criteria. The National Science Foundation is the only agency in the government to receive a green light, because of its excellent financial management operation.

The administration budget for FY 2003 assumes \$2.128 trillion in outlays and \$2.040 trillion in receipts. Thus, the other big news in the proposed budget is the return to deficits. After four years of surpluses, the combination of the tax cut, the recession, and spending on the war has created an administration-projected deficit of \$106 billion in FY 2002 and \$80 billion in FY 2003. These estimates assume passage of an economic stimulus package, now moribund in the Congress, enactment of additional tax cuts, and an economy anticipated to grow by only 0.7 percent. It also assumes that Congress will accept the President's limits on spending for non-war and homeland security programs.

The next issue of *Update* is our annual budget issue, detailing the proposed budgets for social and behavioral science for FY 2003. It will be sent out the week of March 4.

For discretionary programs, the budget contains an increase of almost seven percent. However, funding for national defense increases by 12 percent, spending for homeland security by 111 percent, and the rest of the government's programs by only two percent. The research and development budget increases to \$111.8 billion, a boost of 8.3 percent. Defense R&D goes up by 8.8 percent, mostly for development. Non-defense R&D rises by 7.8 percent, with the bulk of that increase for the National Institutes of Health.

The **National Science Foundation (NSF)** budget for FY 2003 is \$5.036 billion, an increase of 5 percent. Reflecting another priority to stress competitive research, for which NSF has been cited as an excellent example, the administration has proposed to transfer programs from the U.S. Geological Service, National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Administration, and EPA to the Foundation. These transfers account for about one-third of the proposed NSF increase. Whether Congress accepts these shifts remains questionable. The **Social, Behavioral and Economic Science Directorate (SBE)** has been designated a "priority

#### Inside *UPDATE* . . .

- **Research Protection Committee Acts on Social Science Issues**
- **Council of Economic Advisers Chairman: Economy Resilient**
- **Announcements:** New NSF Division Director Named: Part II
- **Sources of Research Support**

area” for NSF. The budget proposes a \$26.8 million or 16 percent boost for SBE. Of that total, \$5 million reflects the administration’s priority for research on decision-making under uncertainty. Over \$9.5 million is for the redesign of the samples and surveys used to collect data on the scientific and engineering workforce to reflect the results of the decennial census.

President Bush, like many of his predecessors, has also gone after earmarking by Congress. The administration proposes to double the **National Research Initiative Competitive Grants** program at the U.S. Department of Agriculture. At the same time it severely reduces the Special Grants account. This is unlikely to survive the congressional appropriations process.

### Department of Health and Human Services

The President’s FY 2003 budget request of \$27.3 billion for the 27 Institutes and Centers of the **National Institutes of Health** (NIH) seeks to fulfill his promise to complete the five-year doubling of the agency’s budget by FY 2003. This sum provides an increase of \$3.7 billion, or 15.7 percent, over the FY 2002 funding level. It is the largest year-to-year dollar increase ever for NIH. For succeeding years, the request proposes to increase the budget at about the same rate of inflation: two percent for FY 2004, 2.2 percent for FY 2005, and 2.3 percent for both FY

2006 and 2007.

Included in this total is nearly \$1.8 billion to begin implementing NIH’s research initiatives aimed at developing countermeasures to neutralize threats from microorganisms such as smallpox, anthrax, tularemia, and plague. It is more than six times NIH’s bioterrorism spending in FY 2002, and represents 40 percent of the total NIH increase for FY 2003.

An estimated \$5.5 billion is for cancer research throughout NIH, an increase of \$629 million (12.8 percent). For HIV/AIDS research the request is \$2.8 billion, a ten percent increase over FY 2002.

NIH’s sister agency, the **Centers for Disease Control and Prevention** (CDC), did not fare as well. The President’s request for CDC is \$5.8 billion, \$1 billion below the FY 2002 funding level. The administration attributes the reduction primarily to “a major one-time purchase in FY 2002 of vaccines and other pharmaceuticals to combat bioterrorist threats.” The request for bioterrorism is \$1.6 billion, a net decrease of \$661 million that is again associated with a one-time purchase.

The CDC’s budget request includes \$1.5 billion provided through the Public Health and Social Services Emergency Fund (PHSSEF), \$184 million in the Health Facilities and Construction Fund, and \$47 million in Public Health Service evaluation interagency transfer funds for activities related to health statistics.

Despite Secretary of Health and Human Services Tommy Thompson’s declaration that “HHS and its agencies will aggressively take on preventing the onset of diseases such as diabetes,” the budget includes only \$697 million for CDC’s Chronic Disease Prevention and Health promotion. This is \$57 million, or 8 percent, below FY 2002. The net decrease reflects \$14 million in program increases, \$3 million in management savings and \$68 million saved by discontinuing the youth media campaign.

The budget, however, does include \$5 million for a national media campaign to promote physical activity, with an emphasis on families and communities. This effort will be done in conjunction with the Health Resources and Services Administration’s new Healthy Communities Innovation initiative.

#### 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](http://www.cossa.org)

For the **National Center on Health Statistics**, the President requests \$130 million, \$47 million of which will be financed by Public Health Service evaluation funds.

For the **National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health** (NIOSH), the budget request is \$258 million, a decrease of \$28 million.

For the **Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality** (AHRQ), the budget requests a total program level of \$253 million, \$49 million or 16 percent lower than in FY 2002. As with NIOSH, AHRQ's reductions reflect the Department's intent to achieve efficiencies in research activities. The request also proposes that AHRQ be fully funded through inter-agency transfers of evaluation funds in FY 2003.

Priorities for AHRQ include: improving patient safety and reducing medical errors; providing additional information for new national reports on quality and disparities in health care; and encouraging adoption of evidence-based clinical, system, and policy practices.

For patient safety research, the budget provides a \$5 million increase over FY 2002 for a total of \$60 million. A budget of \$53 million (a \$5 million increase) is provided for the Medical Expenditure Panel Surveys (MEPS), a national dataset on how much health care services cost and who pays. The majority of the increase reflects a continuation of FY 2002 efforts to expand the MEPS sample size.

The request for the **Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration** (SAMHSA) is \$3.2 billion, a 1.8 percent increase over FY 2002.

The FY 2003 budget request for the **Administration for Children and Families** is \$47 billion, an increase of \$2.4 billion or 5.3 percent. Of this sum, \$13.1 billion is the discretionary program level and \$33.9 billion is the entitlement authority. The request includes \$6.7 billion for Head Start, an increase of \$130 million.

Finally, the administration requests \$8 million for the **Office of Human Research Protections**.

## Department of Education

The small increase proposed by the President for the Department of Education as a whole would severely slow the trend of the past several years. However, consistent with the President's stated philosophy of employing research-based education programs, **Research and Dissemination** would grow nearly 44 percent, to \$175 million. The funds would support several new initiatives, one of which is to identify the conditions that encourage the use of evidence-based research in decisionmaking by teachers, school administrators, and policymakers.

The **statistics** account would receive \$95 million, a \$10 million increase. The new funds would support the international assessment program, the Schools and Staffing Survey, the Study of Faculty and Students, and the Early Childhood Longitudinal studies.

## Department of Justice

The **National Institute of Justice** (NIJ) would receive a nearly 43 percent increase to \$78.3 million in FY 2003 (excluding transfers). Of the \$23.4 million boost, about \$18 million results from the shifting of counterterrorism research and development from the Office of Justice Programs (in which NIJ resides) to NIJ itself. (The administration proposes to move the counterterrorism activities of OJP's Office for Domestic Preparedness to the Federal Emergency Management Agency in 2003.) The remaining \$5.5 million is a true increase – \$4 million is to expand the Arrestee Drug Abuse Monitoring Program (ADAM) and \$1.5 million is for a comprehensive study on hate crimes.

Including transfers from other accounts, NIJ would actually receive about \$196.7 million. Violence against women programs would get \$5.2 million as in previous years. Most of the remaining funds relate to technology.

The **Bureau of Justice Statistics** would receive slightly more than in 2002 – \$33.8 million, a 4.6 percent increase. The President requested a cut for **Juvenile Justice**, from \$305.9 million in FY 2002 to \$257.8 million in 2003. The budget would reduce Part C discretionary funding from \$58.5 million to \$10 million, "due to the program having been heavily earmarked in recent years, which has limited its ability to provide discretionary funds to the states for juvenile justice innovations."

## Census Bureau

The administration proposes a total of \$737.6 million for the Census Bureau. The Bureau continues to focus on tabulation, dissemination, evaluation, and archiving of Census 2000 data. Litigation surrounding sampling (see *Update*, October 22, 2001) and other issues is still pending.

However, the Bureau is already planning the next decennial census; replacement of the long form with the annual **American Community Survey** (ACS) is underway, with full implementation expected in 2003. Funding for the 2010 census is proposed at \$219 million. Of this, \$121 million is for the ACS, according to sources close to the Bureau. A yearly sample size of three million households will begin to yield detailed demographic data for every community by 2008.

Other key census initiatives include conducting the 2002 Economic Census, improving measures of the economy's service sector, increasing the quality and timeliness of foreign trade statistics, enhancing the measurement of electronic business, and re-engineering the 2010 census for efficiency and cost-effectiveness.

As usual, this is only the beginning of what promises to be a long budget debate that is always exacerbated in an election year. As the two parties battle over priorities, former Congressman Bill Frenzel (R-MN) told a Brookings Institution seminar audience: "It will be a real catfight; we'll know who won with the outcome of the November elections." Stay tuned, and look for COSSA's widely anticipated, detailed budget issue of *Update* next month.

## RESEARCH PROTECTION COMMITTEE ACTS ON SOCIAL SCIENCE ISSUES

The National Human Research Protection Advisory Committee (NHRPAC) took significant action on issues important to the social sciences at its meeting last month. It also heard from social scientists and humanists who presented their views on the human research protection system, as well as the administration's chief scientist.

The panel examined a number of recommendations from its Social Science Working Group (SSWG), co-chaired by American

Sociological Association Executive Officer Felice Levine. One issue that NHRPAC appeared to settle was how to treat Public Use Data Files. It approved guidelines that make clear to Institutional Review Boards (IRBs) that public use data files should be subject to review, and certified as such, before they are made publicly available. However, once they are certified, IRBs should not require other investigators to seek review when using them.

NHRPAC also agreed to recommendations regarding Third Parties – persons referenced by human subjects in the course of their interaction with investigators. Are these persons human subjects and thus subject to the rules of protection? The agreed-to statement says that IRBs should determine that third parties are human subjects if they can be identified, and if the IRB concludes that the focus of the research is really on the third party and not only on the originally designated human subject. Such a determination would require the investigator to provide the third party with consent options.

Both of these NHRPAC recommendations are made to the Secretary of Health and Human Services and the Director of the Office of Human Protections for their consideration and implementation.

NHRPAC also discussed two other issues that emanated from the SSWG.

The committee accepted the notion that in defining "minimal risk," the *probability* of harm and the *magnitude* of harm should be treated as separate concepts. It also will clarify the "daily life" standard used to define risk in the Common Rule currently governing human subjects protection. NHRPAC will now seek final language on this issue for review and approval at its next meeting.

Finally, NHRPAC accepted, in principle, a report and recommendations from the SSWG regarding confidentiality. One recommendation is that IRBs should recognize that when identifiable data are shared between investigators, the original confidentiality protections are transferred with the data.

For more information about the recommendations on all four of these issues, go to <http://ohrp.osophs.dhhs.gov/nhrpac/nhrpac.htm> and [www.asanet.org/public/humanresearch](http://www.asanet.org/public/humanresearch).

## History, Journalism, Ethnography as Special Cases

The advisory committee also heard from Linda Shopes of the Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission, Margaret Blanchard, Professor of Journalism and Mass Communication at the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, and Jonathan Church, Chair of Sociology and Anthropology at Arcadia University in Pennsylvania.

Shopes presented the case for oral historians who believe IRBs do not understand their research methods. Some IRBs, Shopes reported, have asked oral historians to provide advanced questionnaires, to destroy interview tapes, and to protect anonymity of respondents. She declared that these are constraints on historical inquiry, and argued that oral historians should be exempt from the human subjects protection system because their research is of minimal risk and does not produce “generalizable knowledge.”

Blanchard confronted the issue of whether subjecting journalism research to IRB review is not an example of prior restraint and thus a violation of the free press clause of the First Amendment. She also argued for an exclusion from the human subjects protection system as practiced by IRBs.

Church declared that IRBs are having a “chilling effect” on the ability of ethnographers to conduct research. He claimed that IRBs do not understand that requiring prior “informed consent” is “inherently problematic” for ethnographic research techniques where consent occurs as part of the constant activities of doing the research.

He argued that social/behavioral scientists should become more involved in the IRB process, especially at small schools where biological problems dominate the human subjects protection system.

The reaction of NHRPAC members to these presentations varied. The greatest support came for the notion that the First Amendment did offer protections for journalism professors; however, they envisioned situations where oral historians and ethnographers could place their research subjects at risk, and therefore suggested that some sort of review is necessary.

## The President’s Science Adviser

John Marburger, Director of the White House Office of Science and Technology, addressed the panel, emphasizing the President’s commitment to taking ethical responsibilities seriously and his “strong moral positions.”

“Science tells us what we can do, not what we should do,” Marburger asserted. Thus, despite extraordinary scientific advances leading to the rapid evolution of new knowledge, he urged, the moral and ethical implications of these advances must be considered.

The goal of human subjects protection, he concluded, is to achieve uniformity and effectiveness without inhibiting research. The system should be flexible, with “responsible regulations” at both extremes of risk. He also stressed the importance of confidentiality for social surveys and psychological issues.

Finally, NHRPAC also heard from Alan Milstein, an attorney representing a number of clients in lawsuits against universities. In their remarks to the committee, both Milstein and one of his clients, Paul Gelsinger, father of Jesse Gelsinger, who died in a University of Pennsylvania clinical trial, seemed most concerned about financial conflict of interest issues. Karen Rothenberg, Dean of the University of Maryland Law School, responded to Milstein’s assertions about the applicability of Tort Law to these situations.

## COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS CHAIRMAN: ECONOMY RESILIENT

On January 31, R. Glenn Hubbard, Chairman of the President’s Council of Economic Advisers, saluted “the amazing resilience of the American economy” to a standing-room-only crowd at the launching of the National Science Foundation’s Social, Behavioral and Economic Sciences’ Directorate’s new lecture series. Buoyed by the previous day’s news of an upturn in the Gross Domestic Product, Hubbard, a professor of economics and finance at the Columbia School of Business, spoke about the state of the economy, the role of research in economic assessments, and the Bush administration’s new policy initiatives.

Acknowledging the economic impact of the events of September 11, Hubbard noted the consumption shock and investment shock precipitated by the terrorist attacks. At the same time, he argued that the “seeds of recovery are there,” and predicted moderate growth beginning this quarter that would be sustained for the rest of 2002. He also said that investor confidence would turn around by the middle of this year, while the buoyant consumer spending will continue.

The Chairman did suggest that the policy issues have changed since the attacks. Before 9/11, the focus was on the tax plan, the “lock box” for social security, energy markets – particularly the California energy crisis – faith-based initiatives, and “how to spend surpluses.” Following the tragedy, other items are now on the agenda, such as avoiding commercial aviation disruption, terrorism risk insurance, “growth insurance” through a stimulus package, and conducting the right kind of cost/benefit analysis so that the right policy choices can be made in a deficit environment.

As a former NSF grantee, graduate fellow, and member of the Economics Program peer review panel, Hubbard stressed the importance of research for policy decisions. Discussing trade, he referred to studies that revealed the large economic gains of multilateral trade agreements and the value of providing the President with trade promotion authority. In response to a question, he also argued for untying environmental and labor concerns from trade.

Hubbard noted that the President’s proposed budget would request increased funding for NSF, and in particular SBE, for research on decisionmaking under uncertainty as part of the administration’s climate change research program. He also made the case for new research on incentives for quality health care, on how markets work under deregulation, and on the demand for broadband technology.

Acknowledging that forecasting economic trends and conditions – particularly turning points – remains difficult, the Chairman related that the President keeps a scorecard of his predictions. Hubbard hopes that enhancements of social science tools will enable more research into real-time policymaking.

Hubbard also responded to a number of questions about the Enron collapse, warning against over-reaction. He did concede that pension reform and better financial disclosure information are necessary and would be part of the President’s agenda.

## ANNOUNCEMENTS

### New NSF Division Director Named: Part II

Richard Lempert has been named the new head of the Social and Economic Science Division of the National Science Foundation’s Social, Behavioral, and Economic Sciences Directorate (SBE). Lempert, who is the Eric Stein Distinguished Professor of Law and Sociology at the University of Michigan, will replace William Butz, who left NSF last summer. In December, Kenneth MacCrimmon of the University of British Columbia had accepted the job, but decided for professional and personal reasons to return to Vancouver before officially starting in the position (see *Update*, December 10, 2001).

Lempert is currently directing the University of Michigan’s Life Sciences, Values, and Society Program, an interdisciplinary effort to examine how developments in the life sciences are affecting thinking and activities in all spheres of human life. For most of his career, Lempert has focused his research and teaching on applying social science research to legal issues. He has done work on juries, capital punishment, and the use of statistical and social science evidence by courts. He was instrumental in the founding of NSF’s program in Law and Social Science and served on its original review panel. He has also chaired the National Research Council’s Committee on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice. He is the co-author (with Joseph Sanders) of *An Invitation to Law and Social Science*.

The new division director has edited the *Law and Society Review* and is the recipient of the Harry Kalven Jr. Prize for outstanding socio-legal scholarship. He has held visiting fellowships at the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences and the Russell Sage Foundation. In 1993, he was elected a fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences.

In addition, Lempert teaches evidence, is the co-author of *A Modern Approach to Evidence*, and has written a number of articles on evidence law, including a series on statistical and other issues posed by DNA evidence. He has also presented talks on legal education throughout Japan.

Lempert received his B.A. from Oberlin College and he holds a Ph.D. in sociology and a J.D., both from the University of Michigan.

## SOURCES OF RESEARCH SUPPORT

COSSA provides this information as a service and encourages readers to contact the sponsoring agency for further information. Additional application guidelines and restrictions may apply.

### NSF Solicits Math and Science Partnership Proposals

The National Science Foundation (NSF) seeks proposals to implement the Math Science Partnership program (MSP), a key component of President Bush's program to reform elementary and secondary education. NSF has \$160 million to spend on this program and intends to make 25 to 30 comprehensive awards and 60 targeted awards. Letters of intent (optional) are due **March 15, 2002**. Full proposals are due **April 30, 2002**.

Proposals must be submitted on behalf of a partnership by a lead organization that is one of the following: 1) a pre-K-12 local, tribal, regional, or state educational system; 2) an institution of higher education; 3) a higher education system or consortium; or 4) an educational consortium, private foundation, or other public or non-profit private school or organization focused on pre-K-12 education. Each partnership must include one or more institutions of higher education and one or more school district partners and can include other partners that bring needed human and institutional resources to the collaboration.

The MSP seeks to improve student outcomes in high-quality math and science by all students, at all pre-K-12 levels. The MSP program will support the development, implementation, and sustainability of exemplary partnerships addressing the following goals: 1) to enhance the capacity of schools to provide a challenging curriculum in math and science and to encourage students to participate in

and succeed in advanced math and science courses; 2) to increase and sustain the number, quality, and diversity of pre-K-12 teachers of math and science through continuing professional growth; 3) to contribute to the national capacity to engage in large-scale reform through participation in a network of researchers and practitioners who study and evaluate educational reform and experimental approaches to the improvement of teacher preparation and professional development; and 4) to engage the learning community in the knowledge base being developed in current and future NSF Science of Learning Centers and Centers for Learning and Teaching.

Comprehensive partnerships will be characterized by fundamental, inclusive, and coordinated changes in educational practices, with strict accountability measures at both the college and university level and the local school district level. Targeted efforts will focus on improving one or a limited set of elements of the math and/or science educational endeavor. For more information and a list of cognizant program officers go to [www.nsf.gov/cgi-bin/getpub?nsf02061](http://www.nsf.gov/cgi-bin/getpub?nsf02061).

### Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education – Comprehensive Program

The Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE) is inviting applications for new awards in its comprehensive program that provides grants or cooperative agreements to improve postsecondary education opportunities. Preapplications (non-optional) are due **March 13, 2002**. Final Applications are due **May 24, 2002**. The program expects to spend almost \$10 million to make 60-65 awards ranging from \$50,000 to \$275,000 per year.

The Secretary has determined invitational priorities: 1) improving the preparation of K-12 teachers; 2) promoting reform of curriculum and instruction, especially student-centered and technology-mediated reforms; 3) designing cost-effective ways of improving instruction; 4) supporting new ways to ensure equal access; and 5) improving student retention and program completion. Other projects relating to improving postsecondary education may also be proposed.

For further information contact FIPSE at 202/502-7500.