

Note: If you wish to continue receiving COSSA Washington Update, please add [newsletter@cosssa.org](mailto:newsletter@cosssa.org) to your address book (or "buddy", "safe", "approved" or "trusted sender" lists). If you are receiving a forwarded copy of Update and would like to receive it directly, please email us at [newsletter@cosssa.org](mailto:newsletter@cosssa.org) or visit us on the web at [www.cosssa.org](http://www.cosssa.org).



# COSSA Washington Update

---

## IN THIS ISSUE:

- [Enhancing Diversity in Science Report Available](#)
- [NSF's HSD Program Makes Final Awards](#)
- [NIMH Council Workgroup Makes Recommendations for Strengthening Research Training; Professional Associations Discouraged](#)
- [OHRP Seeks Comments on Draft Guidance Document](#)
- [Linda S. Birnbaum Named New Director of NIEHS](#)
- [Former Census Official John H. Thompson Named President of NORC](#)
- [Brookings' Report Reiterates Need for More Resources for Prisoner Reentry Programs](#)
- [Center on Reinventing Public Education Claims School Finance Systems Still Deficient](#)
- [SRCD Celebrates Thirty Years of Fellows](#)
- [Grants for Scholarly Works in Biomedicine and Health Available](#)
- [CDC Funding Opportunities](#)
- [Editors Note: Farewell to 2008](#)

Volume 27, Issue 22

December 8, 2008

## ENHANCING DIVERSITY IN SCIENCE REPORT AVAILABLE

On February 28, 2008, nine multidisciplinary organizations sponsored a disciplinary-wide retreat of the leaders of professional associations and scientific societies to discuss the role of these organizations in "*Enhancing Diversity in Science*." Led by COSSA, the organizations responsible for conceptualizing and implementing the groundbreaking meeting include: AAAS Center for Careers in Science and Technology, the American Educational Research Association (AERA), the American Sociological Association (ASA), the American Psychological Association (APA), the Association of American Medical Colleges (AAMC), the Federation of American Societies for Experimental Biology (FASEB), the Institute for the Advancement of Social Work Research (IASWR) and the Society for Research in Child Development (SRCD). The National Institutes of Health provided the funding with additional funding provided by the National Science Foundation.

The retreat, in part, was a response to recent reports that have documented increasingly fewer underrepresented minorities are pursuing careers in science, and that the leakages in the science pipeline for minority students and professionals happen at various stages - but especially within higher education. The goal of the retreat was to generate *collaboration* among associations, societies, federal agencies, and private foundations.

The consensus that emerged from the day-long retreat of the leadership of professional associations and scientific societies is that enhancing the diversity of the scientific workforce is a shared aspiration. It cannot be accomplished, however, through a single or simple step divorced from institutions' and organizations' overall work and missions. We will achieve success when the commitment is infused into all aspects of an organization and at all levels of leadership. Most importantly, diversity must be understood as involving not merely a certain number of students, faculty members

or workers, but as an essential element of science and of growing a field or discipline. This commitment must be demonstrated by specific actions by organizations, working both individually and in concert. Using their influence, resources, and expertise, America's professional associations and scientific societies can move the issue forward on many fronts.

Recommendations from the retreat participants included those specifically urging that professional associations and scientific societies:

- Incorporate diversity goals into their strategic plans. They should espouse inclusion principles in their policies, strategies, program designs, and leadership.
- Work to improve the collection and evaluation of empirical data on underrepresented minorities, as well as research on program outcomes. Likewise, they should work with their members to emphasize the importance of good data collection and evaluation at their home institutions.
- Identify, highlight, and reward model programs and best practices for enhancing diversity.
- Communicate with universities about the status of underrepresented minorities in science to raise awareness and demonstrate commitment and leadership in setting expectations and norms for behavior.
- Provide tools, resources, and incentives to improve member mentoring and provide support to underrepresented minorities during transition periods when there may be gaps in mentoring.
- Provide or identify financial support for professional development workshops.
- Advocate for policies and funding to support diversity initiatives

The summary report, *Enhancing Diversity in Science: A Leadership Retreat on the Role of Professional Associations and Scientific Societies*, of the day's proceedings with the accompanying recommendations can be downloaded at [http://www.cossa.org/communication/diversity\\_workshop/diversity.html](http://www.cossa.org/communication/diversity_workshop/diversity.html). In addition, a limited number of copies are available via request to [diversity@cosso.org](mailto:diversity@cosso.org).

## NSF'S HSD PROGRAM MAKES FINAL AWARDS

The National Science Foundation's Human and Social Dynamics (HSD) priority area has made its last awards. The cross-directorate, multi-disciplinary program ends its five year existence having made more than 400 awards totaling about \$166 million. The last awards include 37 new grants amounting to \$28.3 million.

HSD grew out of former NSF Director Rita Colwell's commitment made at the Social, Behavioral and Economic Sciences (SBE) directorate's advisory committee meeting on November 7, 2000. She predicted that "with new tools and a new infusion of research funding, these sciences will become newly invigorated." She further maintained that "seeking to understand how and why people behave will become a greater focus of research as we move through this new millennium." At that same meeting, Norman Bradburn, then Assistant Director for SBE, called the initiative the "grand adventure" that he hoped would double the directorate's budget.

After workshops, including one hosted by COSSA, some false starts and delays, in its FY 2003 proposed budget, NSF designated SBE as a "priority area" and included \$10 million in "seed" funding for the priority, including money for the new Administration's interest in decision making under uncertainty.

The first major solicitation for the new priority occurred in 2004. The response from the science community was overwhelming. According to then-program directors Rochelle Hollander and Keith Crank, reporting at the November 2004 SBE Advisory Committee, there were 1061 Letters of Intent that led to 800 eligible proposals representing 694 projects. A total of \$570 million was requested with a budget for funding totaling only about \$20 million. Twenty-three panels consisting of 259 reviewers evaluated the proposals. All reviews were completed within three months of proposal submission. Of the 694 projects, 113 costing about \$80 million received highly recommended reviews. Because of limited funds, only 37 projects were awarded grants. Of these, 30 percent involved international research counterparts or sub-awards. The success rate was minimal.

The following year SBE decided it would try to reduce the number of submissions to the program. It set up priority areas around the notion of "change" and restricted applications to an extent. This made the program manageable. However, the vision of significant budget enhancements never occurred as NSF funding did not grow as rapidly as the doubling the 2002 NSF reauthorization act promised and new NSF priorities took precedence. This became especially true since the release of the *Rising Above the Gathering Storm* report by the National Academies in 2006, which stressed the importance of the physical sciences and math and science education.

HSD's themes and framework, according to NSF, focused on improving understanding of the complexities of change and the dynamics of human and social behavior at all levels, including that of the human mind. The research focused on increasing knowledge about cognitive and social structures that create, define and result from change. Additionally, HSD research sought ways to manage profound or rapid change, and make decisions in the face of changing risks and uncertainty.

Despite the funding limitations, current NSF assistant director for social, behavioral, and economic sciences, David Lightfoot has concluded that "NSF's HSD program has been relentlessly interdisciplinary in funding transformative work on change in human systems," and "has funded much innovative work on human factors in environmental change, both in causes and consequences, and in complex systems very broadly, where complexity arises from the interaction of simpler systems and is often manifested by dramatic phase transitions, many phenomena changing at the same time."

At the most recent SBE Advisory Committee held last month, Lightfoot reported that the funds for HSD would now be redistributed to the core scientific programs of the directorate. At the same time, key research areas from the priority would continue to remain in favor.

The HSD priority area has been supported by NSF's Directorates for Biological Sciences; Computer and Information Science and Engineering; Geosciences; Mathematical and Physical Sciences; and Engineering; and by NSF's Offices for Polar Programs and International Research and Engineering.

## NIMH COUNCIL WORKGROUP MAKES RECOMMENDATIONS FOR STRENGTHENING RESEARCH TRAINING; PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATIONS DISCOURAGED

On November 1, a National Advisory Mental Health Council (NAMHC) workgroup issued its report, *Investing in the Future*, in which they make recommendations designed to strengthen the National Institute of Mental Health's (NIMH) program in research training. The Workgroup was asked by NIMH Director Tom Insel to advise the NAMHC on NIMH's investment in research training and to provide strategic recommendations about how the Institute could "better achieve its goals of recruiting, training, and retaining a workforce capable of integrating novel technologies and approaches across multiple levels of analysis in its NIMH-relevant research."

The Workgroup recommended that "NIMH improve the way in which its university-based institutional training programs are internally reviewed, monitored, and administered. . . . To increase the likelihood of interdisciplinary training," it also encouraged NIMH to "shift the management of training programs away from professional societies to academic institutions with structured research training environments and broad and deep research expertise." The Workgroup also advised the Institute to "establish and enforce clear expectations for T32 (a grant mechanism) diversity recruitment and retention plans, efforts, and outcomes. The Institute had begun to implement this recommendation prior to the convening of the NAMHC Workgroup. Several professional associations, including the American Psychological Association, the American Sociological Association, the Council for Social Work Education, and the Society for Neuroscience are currently positioned to lose their Minority Fellowship Programs, which are funded through the T32 mechanism.

The Workgroup expressed frustration with the limited data available on the Institute's research training and career development programs and their outcomes. It is a frustration that is shared from those seeking the data associated with the programs that are being phased out. The Workgroup, thus, "strongly encouraged the NIMH to improve programmatic monitoring and assessment of the Institute's research training and career development portfolio." The workgroup further recommended that the NIMH "make a comprehensive data collection effort concerning its research training and career development portfolio. Development of longitudinal data sets would allow for improved monitoring, assessment, and data-driven policy modifications." The group also recommended that "prospective data collection and evaluation plans be required for any new programs initiated as a result of the Workgroup's recommendations." NIMH is further urged to implement a "rigorous monitoring and evaluation system . . . in a timely manner to gauge the impact of each new program implemented on its target population."

Finally, the Workgroup noted that the Institute had made “substantial reductions in its training portfolio in the past five years,” due to “flattening budgets to balance the NIMH commitment to the pipeline with the Institute’s need to protect the R01 [investigator-initiated] payline.” Acknowledging the need for these “financial decisions,” the Workgroup encouraged NIMH to “look strategically at the management of its training portfolio.” Specifically, the Workgroup suggested that the Institute focus on “(a) who will be the future scientists making the breakthroughs for NIMH research, (b) how many trainees will be needed at each stage of the pipeline, and (c) what existing programs have been the most likely to yield NIMH-supported scientists.”

A copy of the Workgroup’s report is available at <http://www.nimh.nih.gov/about/advisory-boards-and-groups/namhc/reports/investing-in-the-future.pdf>.

## OHRP SEEKS COMMENTS ON DRAFT GUIDANCE DOCUMENT

The Office for Human Research (OHRP) is seeking comments on a draft guidance document entitled "OHRP Guidance on Important Considerations for When Participation of Human Subjects in Research is Discontinued." When finalized, the draft guidance document would provide OHRP’s first formal guidance on this topic. The draft document is intended primarily for institutional review boards, investigators, and funding agencies that may be responsible for the review or oversight of human subject research conducted or supported by the Department of Health and Human Services.

According to OHRP, the proposed guidance document would provide guidance on important considerations for when participation of human subjects in research is discontinued, either because a subject voluntarily chooses to discontinue participation during the course of the research, or because an investigator terminates a subject’s participation in the research without regard to the subject’s consent. OHRP will consider comments received before issuing the final guidance document.

Written comments on the draft guidance document are due by January 30, 2009. Comments may be submitted by any of the following methods: (1) E-mail to [discontinueparticipation@hhs.gov](mailto:discontinueparticipation@hhs.gov) and include “Guidance on Discontinuation of Subject Participation” in the subject line; (2) Fax: 301-402-2071; (3) Mail/Hand delivery/Courier [For paper, disk, or CD-ROM submissions]: Michael A. Carome, M.D., Captain, U.S. Public Health Service, OHRP, 1101 Wootton Parkway, Suite 200, Rockville, MD 20852.

The draft guidance is available at: <http://www.hhs.gov/ohrp/requests/200811guidance.html> or <http://www.hhs.gov/ohrp/requests/200811guidance.pdf>.

A copy of the Federal Register notice announcing the availability of the draft guidance for comment is available at: <http://edocket.access.gpo.gov/2008/E8-28369.htm> or <http://edocket.access.gpo.gov/2008/pdf/E8-28369.pdf>.

## LINDA S. BIRNBAUM NAMED NEW DIRECTOR OF NIEHS

On December 3, Acting NIH Director Raynard Kington announced the appointment of Linda S. Birnbaum as director of the National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences (NIEHS). Kington pointed out her “long and distinguished career conducting research into the health effects of environmental pollutants, and the cause and effects relationships at pollutant concentrations which mimic those occurring in the environment.”

Birnbaum comes to the job from the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) where she has served for 16 years as the director of Experimental Toxicology Division. She received her M.S. and Ph.D. in microbiology from the University of Illinois, Urbana. A board certified toxicologist, Birnbaum has served as a federal scientist for nearly 29 years, the first ten of those at NIEHS. She expressed her excitement regarding “serving as the director of NIEHS at a time when integration across disciplines is essential, from molecular biology to pharmacology and physiology to epidemiology. Complex environmental issues require individual and team efforts to address the interactions between the environment and human health,” said Birnbaum. “Chronic exposures and chronic diseases can have multiple causative factors. A broad array of scientific expertise is needed to understand such problems in order to prevent disease. I am eager to translate the work of the basic scientist and epidemiologist into improvements for the health of our citizens and communities.” Birnbaum will begin her appointment in January 2009.

## FORMER CENSUS OFFICIAL JOHN H. THOMPSON NAMED PRESIDENT OF NORC

The National Opinion Research Center (NORC) at the University of Chicago, a member of COSSA, has announced that John H. Thompson will be its next President. Thompson has served as interim President since February 2008 and as NORC's Executive Vice President for Survey Operations since he joined the organization in 2002.

NORC, founded in 1941, conducts social science research in the public interest. NORC's clients include government agencies, educational institutions, foundations, other nonprofit organizations, and private corporations. Although NORC's national studies are its most well-known, its projects range from local to regional and international. It has conducted the General Social Survey for 36 years.

Thompson came to NORC after 27 years at the U.S. Census Bureau. An acknowledged expert in conducting large and complex surveys, he was responsible for helping run all aspects of the 2000 Decennial Census - including management, operations and methodology. He has also been project director for the National Immunization Survey, which NORC conducts on behalf of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

He has a B.S. and a M.S. in Mathematics from Virginia Tech University

## BROOKINGS REPORT REITERATES NEED FOR MORE RESOURCES FOR PRISONER REENTRY PROGRAMS

On December 5, Brookings' Hamilton Project hosted a roundtable discussion on their new report by Bruce Western, "From Prison to Work: A Proposal for a National Prisoner Reentry Program."

Earlier this year, based on research by social scientists, Congress passed and the President signed the Second Chance Act designed to improve outcomes for people returning to the community from prisons and jails. The statute authorizes federal grants to government agencies and community and faith-based organizations to provide employment assistance, substance abuse treatment, housing, family programming, mentoring, victims support, and other services that can help reduce re-offending and violations of probation and parole. However, so far no funds have been appropriated for this program, since the FY 2009 Continuing Resolution allows no funding for new programs.

Currently, there are 2.5 million people in the U.S. prison system. America locks up more of its citizens than any other first world industrialized country, 700 per 100,000. While the U.S only has five percent of the world's population, we have 25 percent of the world's prison population. In addition, while blacks make up only 13 percent of the population, they make up half of the prison population. According to Western, a black male non-college graduate has a 30 percent chance of going to prison at some point in his life, a high school dropout has an almost 60 percent chance.

Speaking at the session, Sen. Jim Webb (D-VA) declared: "We all want to see violent criminals brought to justice, but there is something else that is going on when we lock up such a large number of our people."

Each year, State and Federal prisons currently return more than 700,000 prisoners back to their communities. Most are ill prepared for their reentry back into society. One-third to three quarters of released prisoners are out of work in their first months after their release. Studies show that incarceration is associated with reduced earnings and higher unemployment rates over an ex-prisoners lifetime, as well as increased rates of separation and divorce.

According to data cited in Western's report, roughly two-thirds of those released will return to prison within three years of their reentry into society. About half of all ex-prisoners who are returned to jail are returned for non-violent, technical violations of their parole. Western argued that returning ex-prisoners to prison for technical violations disrupts their ability to develop work skills and acquire the social behavior necessary for successful reentry into the community.

Western proposed a prisoner reentry program that would be comprised of four elements: 1) parole reform; 2) expansion of in-prison education and vocational training programs; 3) transitional employment in the form of community service for prisoners upon their release; and 4) the elimination of federal benefits' bans for those with criminal records.

He also called for setting a national standard for prisoner education in State prisons. Prisoners who do not possess a high school diploma would have to enroll in 240 hours of education programs. This would be modeled after the current Federal prison education program.



Western acknowledged the cost of this program would be high, \$8.5 billion per year, but he argued, it would end up saving Federal and State governments even more. Western asserted that the program costs would be offset by: 1) a net reduction in crime from successful reintegration programs; 2) higher earnings for ex-offenders over their lifetime; 3) a reduction in the prison population; and 4) improved public works.

Considering States have increased their prison spending by 40 percent over the last 20 years, Sen. Webb agreed with Western that his recommended program could provide significant financial savings. And ultimately the savings to our society, community and families could prove immeasurable.

For more information on this event and to view the full report please go to [http://www.brookings.edu/events/2008/1205\\_prison\\_to\\_work.aspx](http://www.brookings.edu/events/2008/1205_prison_to_work.aspx)

## CENTER ON REINVENTING PUBLIC EDUCATION CLAIMS SCHOOL FINANCE SYSTEMS STILL DEFICIENT

On December 1, Brookings' Metropolitan Policy Program and its Brown Center on Education Policy co-hosted a discussion on the release of a new report, "Facing the Future: Financing Productive Schools," by the Center on Reinventing Public Education (CRPE) at the University of Washington. The discussion was led by Grover 'Russ' Whitehurst, former Administrator of the U.S. Department of Education's Institute for Education Sciences and the incoming director of the Brown Center.

The report is the culmination of a six year study on school finance, by the CRPE's School Finance Redesign Project (SFRP). The report sought to answer the question: "How can states and localities spend money more effectively to promote high achievement for all students?"

The report's authors, Paul Hill, Director of CPRE, Marguerite Roza, Professor of Education at the University of Washington, and James Harvey, a Seattle, Washington, based education writer and former U.S. Department of Education official, found that school financial systems are contradictory, opaque, inefficient and driven more by politics than students. The result is a financial system that de-links spending from outcomes.

The SFRP report made four recommendations for revamping our current system: 1) have school funds tied to student counts; 2) create a longitudinal data system that would link funds and results; 3) encourage innovation and experimentation at the school and district level; and 4) hold schools and districts accountable for student performance.

The report cites previous studies that show total expenditures on K-12 public education came to \$499 billion dollars in 2004-05, or 4 percent of GDP. This hefty price tag supports a system of over 14,000 school districts, 97,000 schools, 54 million students, and 3.1 million administrative and support staff and teachers. Some cities are spending an astounding amount per pupil, like Washington, DC which spends \$13,000, but whose students continually rank low on standardized tests. This led Whitehurst to suggest "we're spending a lot and getting mediocre results."

While the federal government provides extra funding to high poverty schools under the Title I program, schools in high income areas tend to have greater access to State and local resources that tend to offset these extra Federal funds. The report also indicates that schools often spend much less money per pupil on core courses like English and Math than they do on electives.

Schools are operated by districts and funded by a combination of different revenue streams; locally raised property taxes, State taxes, and Federal dollars. By the time these funds reach the school they already have been assigned for into specific resource units. This prevents school administrators from making decisions that best fit the needs of their schools.

Districts also have a great deal of difficulty knowing where their money is or how it is spent. Salaries, benefits, facilities, technology, and private contracts are often kept in separate data systems making it difficult to know the cost of any given resource or activity. Whitehurst contended "we cannot get there [being effective and efficient] unless we know what we're spending on what."

Every level of government has methods of funding schools that make it difficult to see how funding is used and how those funds are linked to student achievement. Our current system is focused more on maintaining programs and compliance, than effectively educating students. The authors of the report argue that "States cannot continue current funding and regulations and know the right amount to spend." They call on governors and state legislatures to make

meaningful reform to the school finance system. "We need to be effective and efficient and we are neither at this time," said Whitehurst.

To for more information on the discussion and to read the full report please go to [http://www.brookings.edu/events/2008/1201\\_public\\_schools.aspx](http://www.brookings.edu/events/2008/1201_public_schools.aspx)

## SRCD CELEBRATES THIRTY YEARS OF FELLOWS

On December 5, the Society for Research in Child Development (SRCD) celebrated thirty years of providing scientists to serve as Fellows in the Congress and Executive Branch agencies. Established in 1978 with support from the Foundation for Child Development (FCD) and the W.T. Grant Foundation, the program, according to former SRCD Executive Director John Hagen, "has become one of the most successful and important endeavors to bridge the gap between the research and policy communities...that the Society has undertaken."

As part of the commemoration, SRCD presented a seminar on Capitol Hill: "Investing in America's Children: Linking Developmental Research and Policy." Aletha Huston, Professor of Child Development, Human Development, and Family Sciences at the University of Texas at Austin, introduced the session stressing the importance of evidence-based policy making. The former SRCD President and the incoming President of COSSA also noted how evidence from child development studies has impacted Federal and state policies on early childhood programs, Head Start, children and the media, juvenile justice, and many others. SRCD has produced a booklet discussing these impacts.

Ruby Takanishi, President of FCD and a former Fellow, moderated the session, and declared that the SRCD program "was an extraordinary investment that has paid off." She introduced the speakers, all former SRCD Fellows: Valora Washington, President of the CAYL Institute, an organization that helps empower people to create change on behalf of children; Deborah Stipek, Dean of the School of Education at Stanford University; and William Foster, Dean of the Edmund Muskie School of Public Service at the University of Southern Maine.

Washington focused on early childhood education and suggested that a lot has been accomplished. The evidence, she declared, clearly demonstrates that "early experience matters," and that "interventions help shift the odds to favorable outcomes." Yet, she said that the research still needs to provide better evidence of causality in evaluating interventions. In concluding, Washington suggested there are two problems that require further investment and investigation. First, she argued that we must close the "persistent disparities" in early childhood success that occur among our ever-more diverse population. Second, she asserted that we have to examine more closely the "going to scale" problem, where interventions that work in one small community can have applications in larger communities and nationwide.

Stipek examined investments in America's children from pre-school to high school. She chose two "leverage points" for improving education: teaching and tests used for accountability. She did admit that these two were illustrative and not a prioritization among many areas. Citing evidence of the impact of "effective teachers" on achievement in reading and math even in poverty areas, Stipek argued for increased resources for teacher preparation and ongoing professional development as well as higher salaries and differential pay for math and science teachers. She also wants "better tests" for accountability, since "tests dramatically affect what and how teachers teach." These tests, she contended, should assess critical/analytic thinking, conceptual understanding and the ability to solve novel problems, and the ability to learn. Commenting on a key policy in this arena, Stipek suggested that an opportunity is coming in the new Administration and Congress to reverse the negative effects of No Child Left Behind to "make it smarter."

Foster turned his attention to children's health and its impact on learning. He started with the premise that "each child will cross the threshold of their first classroom healthy and ready to learn." In order to accomplish this, Foster suggested there were six things that mattered: "start clean," no toxic substances in a child's environment; "move around," make sure the child gets plenty of physical exercise reducing the probability of obesity; "learn lots of stuff," make sure the child is ready to and gets exposed to many learning opportunities so that pre-literacy gaps of vocabulary words are overcome; give parents help even "if it takes a village," since Ron Mincy, Professor of Social Policy and Social Work Practice at Columbia University, has demonstrated the impact of "fragile families" on a child's development; and provide access to health care by expanding the SCHIP (State Children Health Insurance Program).

SRCD Fellows have had many distinguished careers following their service on Capitol Hill or in the Executive Branch. Two have served with distinction on COSSA's staff. Helen Rauch-Elnekave, who was a Fellow in the late Rep. Ted Weiss' (D-NY) office and is now a pediatric psychologist in private practice, was on the COSSA staff in 1982-83 as an Executive Associate advocating for the social/behavioral sciences on Capitol Hill (She was succeeded by current COSSA Executive

Director Howard Silver in late 1983). Judith Auerbach came to the COSSA staff to focus on health policy following her service with former Rep. Patricia Schroeder (D-CO). She is now the Deputy Executive Director for Science and Public Policy at the San Francisco AIDS Foundation.

For more information about the SRCF Fellowships go to

[http://www.srcf.org/index.php?option=com\\_content&task=view&id=181&Itemid=300](http://www.srcf.org/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=181&Itemid=300).

## GRANTS FOR SCHOLARLY WORKS IN BIOMEDICINE AND HEALTH AVAILABLE

The National Library of Medicine (NLM) awards Grants for Scholarly Works in Biomedicine and Health for the preparation of book-length manuscripts and other scholarly works of value to U.S. health professionals, public health officials, biomedical researchers, and historians of the health sciences. Grants are awarded for major critical reviews, state-of-the-art summaries, historical studies, and other useful organizations of knowledge in clinical medicine, public health, biomedical research, and the informatics/information sciences relating to them. The scholarly work may be prepared for publication in print or non-print media, or both.

Scholars in biomedical fields face competing demands for their time, including requirements for clinical care services, grant-related research and administrative duties. Scholarly work draws upon original sources that may reside in archives, databases, libraries or human experts around the world, in many different languages and formats. The work of scholarship - discovery, thoughtful analysis, synthesis and lucid presentation of findings from such materials - requires protected time and support for incidental costs, including materials, staff assistance, and travel. The NLM Grant for Scholarly Works in Biomedicine and Health is intended to help defray such expenses.

NLM Grants for Scholarly Works can be used to support several types of scholarly projects, including but not limited to:

- Scholarly works in the history or philosophy of medicine, public health and the life sciences, the development of medical research and health services, bioethics, and studies on the interrelationship of medicine and society
- Scholarly works in the history or philosophy of biomedical informatics, computational biology, health information sciences, health communications or health sciences librarianship
- Analytical and comprehensive critical reviews which identify the present status of research and practice in various health-related fields, addressing advances which have been made, problems requiring examination, and emerging trends

The Grants are designed to support scholarly work on a manuscript, video or electronic resource that will, ultimately, be published by a commercial or academic press or similar print or electronic dissemination service that assures quality and availability of the product. Self-publishing by the author will not normally be considered an appropriate dissemination vehicle.

Applicants should include a topic or chapter outline of the book or work to be produced as part of the appendix. This topic or chapter outline should be limited to 20 pages. All applicants are required to provide NLM with one copy of the final published work, once it has been issued. The Project Director/Principal Investigator (PD/PI) will be solely responsible for planning, directing, and executing the proposed project. For more information see <http://grants.nih.gov/grants/guide/pa-files/PA-09-030.html>.

## CDC FUNDING OPPORTUNITIES

### Preventing Sexual Violence Perpetration: Targeting Modifiable Risk Factors

The National Center for Injury Prevention and Control (NCIPC) of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) is committed to achieving the health promotion and disease prevention objectives of "Healthy People 2010." Accordingly NCIPC has issued an RFA that addresses "Healthy People 2010" priority area(s) of injury and violence prevention and is in alignment with NCIPC performance goal(s) to conduct a targeted program of research to reduce injury-related disability.

The purpose of this program of research is to conduct a rigorous evaluation of primary prevention strategies designed to reduce risk for perpetration of sexual violence. The strategies should target modifiable contextual factors either alone



or in combination with individual risk factors that have strong empirical support for their relevance to sexual violence. Given high rates of this crime, the conceptualization, implementation, and rigorous evaluation of evidence-based primary prevention approaches is fundamental to the field and to the prevention of sexual violence.

Awards issued under this announcement are contingent upon the availability of funds and the submission of a sufficient number of meritorious applications. CDC anticipates that there will be up to two awards funded at \$400,000 each including direct and indirect costs per award/per year.

For complete program details, please see the full announcement on the CDC website at <http://www07.grants.gov/search/search.do?&mode=VIEW&flag2006=false&oppld=43446>.

### **Adaptations of Evidence-Based Parenting Programs to Engage Fathers in Child Maltreatment Prevention**

This Funding Opportunity Announcement (FOA) solicits research applications that will help advance the knowledge of effective strategies for engaging the participation of fathers and male caregivers in evidence-based parenting programs that may prevent child maltreatment.

CDC seeks specific proposals to take an evidence-based parenting program (that is, a program that has been evaluated using a randomized- or quasi-experimental design with evidence of positive effects on parenting and/or child behavior outcomes) and develop systematic adaptations to the delivery structure, content, and/or materials to target father or male caregiver involvement and engagement in the program. In addition, applications should seek to conduct pilot evaluations of the effects of the adapted programs on participant involvement and engagement in the program; parenting behaviors and male caregiver-child relationships; and child behavior outcomes.

CDC anticipates that there will be up to two awards funded at \$200,000 each including direct and indirect costs per award/per year.

For complete program details including eligible organizations, please see the full announcement on the CDC website at <http://www.cdc.gov/od/pgo/funding/CE09-002.htm>.

## **EDITOR'S NOTE: FAREWELL TO 2008**

This is the final issue of Update for 2008. It has been an extraordinary year in American history. We wish everyone a Happy and Joyous Holiday Season and a Healthy and Peaceful New Year! We will resume publication on January 12, 2009.

## **CONSORTIUM OF SOCIAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATIONS**

# **COSSA**

**Executive Director:** Howard J. Silver  
**Deputy Director for Health Policy:** Angela L. Sharpe  
**Associate Director for Public Affairs:** Pamela L. Pressley  
**Assistant Director for Government Affairs:** La Tosha C. Lewis  
**President:** Susan Cutter

The Consortium of Social Science Associations (COSSA) is an advocacy organization promoting attention to and federal support for the social and behavioral sciences.

UPDATE is published 22 times per year. ISSN 0749-4394. Address all inquiries to COSSA at [newsletters@cosssa.org](mailto:newsletters@cosssa.org)

---

#### **NEW ADDRESS**

**1701 K Street, NW, Suite 1150  
Washington, D.C. 20006  
Phone: (202) 842-3525; Fax: (202) 842-2788**

## **GOVERNING MEMBERS**

American Association for Public Opinion Research  
American Economic Association  
American Educational Research Association  
American Historical Association  
American Political Science Association  
American Psychological Association  
American Society of Criminology  
American Sociological Association  
American Statistical Association

Association of American Geographers  
Association of American Law Schools  
Law and Society Association  
Linguistic Society of America  
Midwest Political Science Association  
National Communication Association  
Rural Sociological Society  
Society for Research in Child Development

## **MEMBERSHIP ORGANIZATIONS**

American Agricultural Economics Association  
American Association for Agricultural Education  
Association for Asian Studies  
Association for Public Policy Analysis and Management  
Association of Research Libraries  
Council on Social Work Education  
Eastern Sociological Society  
International Communication Association  
Justice Research and Statistics Association  
Midwest Sociological Society  
National Association of Social Workers  
National Council on Family Relations

North American Regional Science Council  
North Central Sociological Association  
Population Association of America  
Social Science History Association  
Society for Behavioral Medicine  
Society for Research on Adolescence  
Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues  
Society for the Scientific Study of Sexuality  
Sociologists for Women in Society  
Southern Political Science Association  
Southern Sociological Society  
Southwestern Social Science Association

## **COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES**

Arizona State University  
Brown University  
University of California, Berkeley  
University of California, Davis  
University of California, Irvine  
University of California, Los Angeles  
University of California, San Diego  
University of California, Santa Barbara  
Carnegie-Mellon University  
University of Chicago  
Clark University  
Columbia University  
Cornell University  
Duke University  
Georgetown University  
George Mason University  
George Washington University  
University of Georgia  
Harvard University  
Howard University  
University of Illinois  
Indiana University  
University of Iowa  
Iowa State University  
Johns Hopkins University  
John Jay College of Criminal Justice, CUNY  
Kansas State University  
University of Kentucky  
University of Maryland  
Massachusetts Institute of Technology  
Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs, Syracuse

University of Michigan  
Michigan State University  
University of Minnesota  
Mississippi State University  
University of Nebraska, Lincoln  
New York University  
University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill  
North Carolina State University  
Northwestern University  
Ohio State University  
University of Oklahoma  
University of Pennsylvania  
Pennsylvania State University  
Princeton University  
Purdue University  
Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey  
University of South Carolina  
Stanford University  
University of Tennessee  
State University of New York, Stony Brook  
University of Texas, Austin  
Texas A & M University  
Tulane University  
Vanderbilt University  
University of Virginia  
University of Washington  
Washington University in St. Louis  
West Virginia University  
University of Wisconsin, Madison  
University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee  
Yale University

## **CENTERS AND INSTITUTES**

American Academy of Political and Social Sciences  
American Council of Learned Societies  
American Institutes for Research  
Brookings Institution  
Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences  
Cornell Institute for Social and Economic Research  
Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan

Institute for the Advancement of Social Work Research  
Institute for Women's Policy Research  
National Bureau of Economic Research  
National Opinion Research Center  
Population Reference Bureau  
Social Science Research Council