

Note: If you wish to continue receiving COSSA Washington Update, please add 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 or visit us on the web at www.cosssa.org.



COSSA Washington Update

IN THIS ISSUE:

- [FY 2008 War Supplemental: Census in Both Bills; Science in Senate Committee Bill; Administration Threatens Veto](#)
- [Nanotechnology Act Renewal Emerges from House Panel](#)
- [Marburger Reflects on Science Policy At AAAS Forum](#)
- [House Science Panel Looks to Legislation to Overcome Gender Bias in Higher Education](#)
- [Administration Issues Memo on Controlled Unclassified Information](#)
- [A Change Is Gonna Come](#)
- [Still Seeking Research and Dissemination Tactics to Improve Education](#)
- [American Academy Awards First Moynihan Prize To Alice Rivlin](#)
- [Howard University Celebrates E. Franklin Frazier](#)
- [NIDA Announces Conference on Blending Science and Treatment](#)
- [Future RFA To Support Research on Women in the Biomedical and Behavioral Sciences](#)

Volume 27, Issue 9

May 19, 2008

FY 2008 WAR SUPPLEMENTAL: CENSUS IN BOTH BILLS; SCIENCE IN SENATE COMMITTEE BILL; ADMINISTRATION THREATENS VETO

Mired in procedural and political messes, the Congress' attempt to enact a FY 2008 Supplemental Appropriations bill to provide continued funding for the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan and to add funding for certain domestic activities took some steps forward on May 15. Bypassing the committee process, the full House considered its version on that day. Passionately defending his Chairman's prerogative, Senate Appropriations Committee head Sen. Robert Byrd (D-WV) insisted on a mark up in his panel. Both bills were structured as three separate amendments to the unfinished fiscal 2008 military construction appropriations bill ([HR 2642](#)): one for war money, one for war policy provisions, and one for domestic spending

The House adopted a package that includes policy restrictions including a withdrawal date from Iraq of December 31, 2009 and a requirement that Iraq contribute much more to its own reconstruction. The bill also expands Veterans' education benefits, extends unemployment benefits, and includes funds for some domestic agencies. The Census Bureau would receive \$210 million to help it overcome problems caused by the switch from a Non-response Follow Up strategy using handheld computers to one conducted by paper (see Update, [April 21, 2008](#)). House Appropriations Committee Chairman Rep. David Obey (D-WI) defended inclusion of the Census Bureau's funds by noting: "They had a huge technical screw-up." When it came to voting on the actual funding for the wars, all House Republicans abstained from the vote and the Democrats split 141-149, thus rejecting the money.

The Senate Appropriations Committee's bill includes \$168.9 billion to fund the wars in FY 2008 and FY 2009. It also includes much more domestic spending than either the House bill has or the Administration wants. The Census Bureau would also get \$210 million from the Senate. Science agencies would receive \$1.2 billion. The National Institutes of Health would get \$400 million, the National Science Foundation would receive \$200 million (\$150M for Research and Related Activities and \$50 million for Education and Human Resources); NASA, and the Department of Energy Office would also receive part of this bounty. The Senate's domestic spending provision additionally includes: \$490 million for Byrne grants to assist state and local law enforcement agencies; \$275 million for the Food and Drug Administration; \$451 million for the Federal Highway Administration's emergency relief program; and \$400 million to help rural counties where federal timber royalties have declined. At the markup, Senators were successful in passing amendments that further increased the domestic spending portion of the bill.

The Administration has threatened to veto either current version of the bill. It doesn't like the lack of war funding and the policy restrictions in the House bill and it is aghast at the additional domestic spending in the Senate bill.

During the week of May 19, the Senate hopes to consider the bill on the floor. Majority Leader Sen. Harry Reid (D-NV) expects to offer the House version as an amendment, with the funding for the wars restored. What happens to the science funding is unclear, although there are reports that the Administration might accept these provisions, since some are part of its American Competitiveness Initiative.

At this point, the goal of getting this bill enacted by the Memorial Day recess appears unobtainable. How the Administration reacts to whatever final product emerges will also determine when the funds might start actually flowing to the agencies. We are already in the eighth month of fiscal year 2008.

NANOTECHNOLOGY ACT RENEWAL EMERGES FROM HOUSE PANEL

The promise of nanoscience and engineering continues to excite scientists, companies, and lawmakers. As Julia Moore from the Woodrow Wilson Center and Pew Charitable Trust's Project on Emerging Technologies told the COSSA Annual Meeting last November (see Update [December 10, 2007](#)), there are about \$60 billion worth of products that utilize nanotechnology currently on the market. During the past two years, Moore noted, "nanotechnology has moved dramatically from the lab to the marketplace."

In 2003 Congress enacted the 21st Century Nanotechnology Research and Development Act, the law that authorized the Federal interagency National Nanotechnology Initiative (NNI). Since that launch, the NNI budget has grown to almost \$1.5 billion in FY 2008. The Department of Defense gets almost one-third of those funds. The National Science Foundation (NSF) receives about \$400 million to support major research facilities and instrumentation as well as research on fundamental nanoscale phenomena and processes, nanomaterials, nanoscale devices and systems, instrumentation, nanomanufacturing, and societal dimensions. During deliberations on the 2003 legislation COSSA played a significant role in ensuring the inclusion of this last activity. Other key players in the NNI are the Department of Energy, the National Institutes of Health, NASA and EPA. Small amounts are spent by the National Institute of Occupational Safety and Health (the key oversight agency protecting nanotechnology workers), the U.S. Department of Agriculture, the Department of Justice, and the Department of Transportation.

On May 7, the House Science and Technology Committee, chaired by Rep. Bart Gordon (D-TN) reported out the reauthorization of the NNI (H.R. 5940). As Chairman Gordon noted, most of the NNI's major features are left unchanged, since "the program has many strengths, and for the most part, is working well." However, he admitted, that "risk reduction" needed addressing, since it is important for nanotech's successful development "that potential downsides of the technology be addressed from the beginning in a straightforward and open way."

That is why one of the key considerations in the new bill is enhanced attention to the environmental, health, and safety (EHS) aspects of the new technology. Both the legislative and executive branches of government involved in nanotechnology have held numerous hearings into this issue. In February 2008, the NNI released a report: *Strategy for Nanotechnology-Related Environmental, Health, and Safety Research* (www.nano.gov/NNI_EHS_Research_Strategy.pdf). A month later, the Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report: *Nanotechnology: Better Guidance is Needed to Ensure Accurate Reporting of Federal Research Focused on Environmental, Health, and Safety Risks* (GAO 08-042). The GAO found that instead of focusing on EHS risks about 20 percent of the funds were actually spent on how to use nanotech to remediate environmental damage or to detect a variety of hazards.

The new legislation assigns responsibility to an Associate Director of the White House Office of Science and Technology to fulfill the role of Coordinator for the societal dimensions of the NNI. The Coordinator's main function will be to oversee the development of a strategic plan for EHS, the acceptance and implementation of that plan by the agencies,

and encouragement to the agencies to form public-private partnerships for support of EHS research. The NNI EHS component of the President's FY 2009 budget request is \$76.4 million, almost double from the FY 2007 level.

The second part of the societal dimensions component: Education and Societal Dimensions is also addressed in the Committee's legislation. The bill establishes Nanotechnology Partnerships as part of the NSF Math and Science Partnership (MSP) program to recruit and help prepare secondary schools students to pursue postsecondary education in nanotechnology. They must include business partners who are engaged in nanotechnology. The bill also provides authorization for greater education activities at the undergraduate level, including support for course development, faculty professional development, and acquisition of equipment and instrumentation. The legislation also includes the formation of an Education Working Group to coordinate, prioritize, and plan the education activities funded under the NNI. The President's proposed FY 2009 budget for the Education and Societal Dimensions component is \$40.7 million, a \$1.7 million increase over FY 2008.

Aside from EHS and Education issues, the NNI's societal component also includes Ethical, Legal and other Social Issues (ELSI) research. NSF spent over \$6 million on ELSI studies in FY 2006, with slight reductions in more recent years. This has included support for two Centers for Nanotechnology and Society. One is at the University of California, Santa Barbara (<http://www.cns.ucsb.edu>) and the other at Arizona State University (<http://cns.asu.edu>). In addition, Davis Baird of the University of South Carolina has a large grant to focus on "Imaging, Scientific Change, and Public Understanding of Emerging Nanotechnologies." Public understanding remains a difficult issue, as Moore noted in her COSSA speech. It also raises the specter of the European protests against Genetically Modified Organisms.

The NNI renewal legislation will now move to the full House and then the Senate. For more information on the NNI go to: www.nano.gov.

MARBURGER REFLECTS ON SCIENCE POLICY AT AAAS FORUM

Presidential Science Adviser John Marburger made his seventh and final appearance in his current position at the recent American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS) Policy Forum on May 8. Marburger, who is also the director of the White House Office of Science and Technology (OSTP), used the occasion to reflect on his tenure and discuss the "policy context" for science policy during the Bush Administration.

He referenced a 2002 National Academy of Sciences report: *The Drama of the Commons*, one of whose co-authors was Elinor Ostrom (see other story), as well as an article by biologist Garrett Harden in SCIENCE magazine from 1968 called "The Tragedy of the Commons." Marburger also noted that 'the commons' is now part of the policy vocabulary, "and common resources scholarship has become an important area of social science research." He explained that "the tragedy of the commons is the tendency of an unregulated resource to become depleted as the result of rational choices made by individual users of the 'commons'."

Applying the concept to science policy, especially funding, he indicated that funds are relatively stable and predictable from year to year. (He cited the research of Arizona State University's Daniel Sarewitz demonstrating that Federal research and development funding takes up relatively the same percentage of the Federal budget from year to year.) "These funds," Marburger continued, "are exploited through the actions of multiple stakeholders including Executive agencies, members of Congress and their staffs, lobbyists, individual and organized science activists, think tank advocates, and many others who seize on science symbols to make their own case for a piece of the common resource pie." He suggested OSTP and OMB attempt to "regulate the exploitation of this resource," but Congress mucks things up by earmarking funds, which "closely resembles the unregulated use of a common resource." He concluded that most social scientists who study 'the commons' agree that "it must be managed under a consensual framework that regulates the behavior of the actors to avoid degradation of the resource."

Further discussing Sarewitz' findings, Marburger also said that he expected the funding pattern "will likely persist in future Administrations." On the other hand, he also exclaimed that "it will actually be difficult to match the increases in research funding that have occurred during the Bush years." Using charts to compare the Bush years with the Clinton era, he noted "overall there is a much greater amount of research money on the table today than there was at the beginning of the Administration." Maybe not as much as some in the audience would like, he admitted, and not distributed as some would hope, but more dollars nonetheless.

The Science Adviser also bemoaned the unwillingness of Congress to fund both the Administration's American Competitiveness Initiative and its own America COMPETES Act in the FY 2008 Consolidated Appropriations Act. He seemed to dismiss attempts to include science funding in the FY 2008 Supplemental Appropriations bill that Congress will

soon consider, suggesting by the time the funds started flowing it would be too late in the fiscal year to do any good. Marburger also suggested that the recent flat funding for the National Institutes of Health after the five-year doubling effort ended in 2003 could not continue, indicating that it will "need to increase in a predictable, sustainable way in the future if we are to reap the value of our very substantial investment in biomedical research."

Marburger also made a plea for scientists and engineers to enter public service. "Despite what seem to be enormous down-sides to this and other senior positions in the Executive Branch...our government needs men and women who understand the science and engineering machinery in our society, and are prepared to make it work for the nation," he declared. They also need to understand that "policies significant for science get shaped over a long period of time, very rarely overnight." However, he also argued, it is important to be there at the beginning of any new Administration, not nine months into it, which is when Marburger assumed his position.

Furthermore, the scientist must recognize, Marburger citing Sarewitz again, that the process of policy implementation in American government is shared over so many uncoordinated actors that the policy behavior of the governmental science machinery is not only different from what policy makers intended, but sometimes difficult to trace at all. Understanding what the policy is "on the ground" as opposed to some theory of it embedded in law or a strategic planning document is the key, Marburger contended, to evaluating the effectiveness of that policy.

Responding to a question, Marburger praised the National Science Foundation's initiative on the Science of Science and Innovation Policy, a program in the Social, Behavioral and Economic Sciences directorate that grew out of his admonition to the science policy community in speeches at AAAS and the COSSA Annual Meeting a number of years ago.

As he gets set to end his tenure as the longest serving Presidential Science Adviser in American history, Marburger continues, as the speech indicated, to utilize social science concepts and research. In another interview, he told science writer Dan Greenberg for his Chronicle Review blog that "the social sciences...have not yet fully exploited the opportunities that are now available in information technology and applications," even though a field such as geography has been transformed by technology. Meanwhile, OSTP continues to review a document developed by an inter-agency working group that presents the "Grand Challenges for the Social and Behavioral Sciences." Many hope that the document will become public before the end of this Administration.

ADMINISTRATION ISSUES MEMO ON CONTROLLED UNCLASSIFIED INFORMATION

One of the more vexing problems identified in the National Academies' report *Science and Security in the Post-9/11 World* was the increasing use by Federal agencies of the category Sensitive But Unclassified Information (SBU). Agencies used this designation "for documents and information that are sufficiently sensitive to warrant some level of protection from disclosure but that do not warrant classification"

Researchers told the Academies that SBU use was limiting "the scientific community's right to publish the results of basic research" and restricting the participation of non-U.S. researchers in their projects. This particularly affected the Department of Homeland Security's Centers of Excellence. Another problem was agency promulgation of disparate definitions of SBU.

In an attempt at clarification, the Bush Administration issued a memorandum on May 9 to heads of departments and agencies on this subject. The first thing it did was change the nomenclature. No longer Sensitive But Unclassified (SBU); now Controlled Unclassified Information (CUI). This will be, according to the memo, "the single categorical designation throughout the government" referring to unclassified information "pertinent to the national interests of the United States or to the important interests or entities outside the Federal Government, and under law or policy requires protection from unauthorized disclosure, special handling safeguards of prescribed limits on exchange or dissemination."

All CUI shall be categorized into one of three combinations of safeguarding procedures and dissemination controls:

- 1) Controlled with Standard Dissemination - the information requires standard safeguarding measures that reduce the risks of unauthorized or inadvertent disclosure. Dissemination is permitted to the extent that it is reasonable to believe that it would further the execution of a lawful or official purpose.
- 2) Controlled with Specified Dissemination - the information requires safeguarding measures that reduce the risks of unauthorized or inadvertent disclosure. Material contains additional instructions on what dissemination is permitted.

3) Controlled Enhanced with Specified Dissemination - the information requires safeguarding measures more stringent than those normally required since the inadvertent or unauthorized disclosure would create risk of substantial harm. Material contains additional instruction on what dissemination is permitted.

The head of a Department or agency still maintains significant discretion to determine if information is CUI. Since such designation can occur "based on mission requirements, business prudence, legal privilege, the protection of personal or commercial rights, safety, or security."

The Administration memo also created a CUI Council to ensure coordination among the department agencies and serve as a dispute resolution entity. The plan will give agencies five years to implement the full CUI framework.

For the full Memorandum go to: www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2008/05/print/20080509-6.html

A CHANGE IS GONNA COME

On April 7, Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Director Jim Nussle informed Federal agencies that the FY 2010 budget will be submitted by the next President. In a memorandum, he told the agencies that they will not have to submit their formal budget requests to the OMB in September. In addition, there will no Director's review and no passbacks in November.

OMB will prepare a budget database with a current services baseline that will help the new Administration construct the FY 2010 budget. Agencies will not have to submit the supportive policy materials that usually accompany their budget requests in September. They will not be necessary, Nussle writes, until the new Administration or Transition team is in place. However, OMB will still require agencies to submit their 2010 performance plan components consistent with the Program Assessment Rating Tools (PART).

Agencies are probably delighted to hear all this since it appears highly unlikely that they will know their FY 2009 budgets until after the next Administration takes office in 2009.

HOUSE SCIENCE PANEL LOOKS TO LEGISLATION TO OVERCOME GENDER BIAS IN HIGHER EDUCATION

According to the National Science Foundation (NSF), in 2005 women earned more than half of all science and engineering bachelor degrees, and 20 percent of degrees in the fields of engineering, computer science, and physics. And while there are still differences across the fields, women are receiving Ph.D.'s in science and engineering fields in increasing numbers. However, even though women receive more than 50 percent of Ph.D.s in the in the life sciences, they hold only 30 percent of all associate and full professor faculty positions. In October 2007, the Subcommittee on Science and Research Education, chaired by Rep. Brian Baird (D-WA), held a hearing on "Women in Academic Science and Engineering" to discuss the findings and recommendations of a National Academies' report *Beyond Bias and Barriers: Fulfilling the Potential of Women in Science and Engineering*, which examined the reasons behind the high attrition rate for women in the academic science and engineering fields (see Update, [October 22, 2007](#)). On May 8, the Subcommittee convened a follow-up to that hearing.

The National Academies' panel had found that most of the barriers women faced are not intentionally discriminatory. The panel also found that even those policies that are gender-neutral in theory might not be so in practice. The panel recommended that Federal science agencies sponsor workshops on gender bias, and highlighted the need for better data collection. Both of these changes would allow academic fields to understand the extent of gender inequity and to have a basis for evaluating policies to address the gap.

To implement these suggestions, Rep. Eddie Bernice Johnson (D-TX) has drafted a bill, *Fulfilling the Potential of Women in Academic Science and Engineering Act of 2008*, which would enable the creation of workshops to raise awareness of gender bias, and help provide strategies for combating it. The bill would also require Federal science agencies to collect detailed demographic data on the grant making process, and encourage universities to collect better data.

Donna Ginther from the Center for Economic and Business Analysis at the University of Kansas testified that the underrepresentation of women in academic science is a result of more than just bias. "My research suggests that the difficulties women face in balancing work and family and in the postdoctoral years cause too many women to leave science," she said.

She recommended on-campus childcare for both students and faculty. She suggested providing grant support to caregivers through direct and indirect costs, and that the Federal government should allow universities to count facilities for daycare provided on campus toward indirect costs. This would provide a subsidy for the expansion of daycare centers on campus, Ginther contended, which would free up the time of caregivers. Another of her recommendations would provide financial support for improved data collection and research analyses.

Holding workshops on gender bias is a recommendation of the National Academies' panel and part of the proposed legislation. Currently, the scientific community is initiating workshops themselves. Linda Blevins from the Office of Science at the U.S. Department of Energy testified that since each science field has a unique culture, the model for these workshops continues to evolve.

The Division of Science Resources Statistics (SRS) at NSF currently collects information on demographics, field, award type and budget request, and reviews scores and funding outcomes for NSF proposals and awards, Lynda Carlson, SRS Director testified. However, she also noted, that due to the Privacy Act principal investigators (PIs) are not required to provide any demographic information. Most notably for those attempting to study gender bias in science, she said, in the past ten years the number of new PIs who disclose their gender has been declining. Given the complexity of the process for collecting review scores across programs and directorates within NSF, and including the variety of review processes and scoring systems used by Federal agencies, it would be almost impossible for SRS to provide Congress a report with review scores that would be comparable across agencies, Carlson declared.

Yet, all the panelists agreed that better data collection and greater access to that data, along with rigorous evaluation of interventions would create a more complete picture of the gender bias problem and help lead to viable solutions.

STILL SEEKING RESEARCH AND DISSEMINATION TACTICS TO IMPROVE EDUCATION

The No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) with its heavy emphasis placed on scientifically-based research, has increased the need and desire for research-based evidence on how to improve teaching and learning. Scientific evidence and research-based knowledge can and should help shape education policy and practice in the classroom. The Institute for Education Sciences (IES) and other Federal agencies have provided continued support for this vital research area.

In 2002, the National Research Council released a report *Scientific Research in Education*, edited by Richard Shavelson and Lisa Towne (www.nap.edu/catalog.php?record_id=10236). The report stated that we could not expect "reform efforts in education to have significant effects without research-based knowledge to guide them." In that year a group of education stakeholders: the National Education Knowledge Industry Association (now known as Knowledge Alliance), the Education Quality Institute, and the Progressive Policy Institute, convened a policy forum titled "Research in Education: On the Leading Edge of School Improvement?" Now six years later education researchers are still trying to find ways to disseminate their research data and evidence to educators and give them practical and effective information that will have an impact on students.

On May 13, to continue the discussion started six years ago, the Academy for Educational Development, American Institutes for Research, Education Sector, and Knowledge Alliance held a policy forum *Towards 2014: Education Research on the Leading Edge of School Improvement?* Participants included current IES Director Grover 'Russ' Whitehurst, former Assistant Secretary for Educational Research and Improvement (IES' predecessor) Chester 'Checker' Finn, and former Education Department Undersecretary Marshall 'Mike' Smith, now at the Hewlett Foundation. The second panel consisted of Towne, Gina Burkhardt, Learning Point Associates; Frederick Hess, American Enterprise Institute; and Jason Snipes, Council of Great City Schools.

An audio podcast of the forum can be found at: Knowledge Alliance Website at <http://www.knowledgeall.com/>; AED at <http://www.aed.org/>; the Education Sector at <http://www.educationsector.org/>; or AIR at <http://www.air.org/>.

AMERICAN ACADEMY AWARDS FIRST MOYNIHAN PRIZE TO ALICE RIVLIN

The American Academy of Political and Social Science awarded its first Daniel Patrick Moynihan prize to Alice Rivlin, Senior Fellow at the Brookings Institution, at its annual award dinner held May 8 in Philadelphia. The Academy created the prize in 2007 "to recognize public officials and social scientists who champion the use of informed judgment to advance the public good."

Rivlin's career, which includes service as vice-chair of the Federal Reserve Board, director of the Office of Management and Budget, the first director of the Congressional Budget Office, and the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation at the old Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, reflects the goal of the Moynihan prize, Penn President Amy Gutmann told the audience. The goal of the prize is to "honor those, who like the late Senator, have promoted the use of sound analysis in the public arena, while contributing to civil discourse in ways that respect the opinions of others."

Former NBC and ABC television correspondent Sander Vanocur and former Ambassador Peter Galbraith regaled the dinner audience with tales of Senator Moynihan's inquisitive mind, his need to be where the action was, and his willingness to work for and with a wide array of policy makers to improve society. Rivlin's acceptance talk also discussed her dealings with Moynihan, including an unsuccessful attempt to sell the Clinton administration's welfare reform proposal.

The Academy also bestowed Fellow Medals on a half-dozen distinguished social scientists. Elinor Ostrom, Professor of Political Science at Indiana University, was named the Robert A. Dahl Fellow for "her groundbreaking work on natural resource governance." Samuel Preston, Professor of Demography at the University of Pennsylvania received the Samuel A. Stouffer Fellow award for his breakthrough developments on how demographers examine populations. Ernst Fehr, the Director of the Institute for Empirical Research in Economics at the University of Zurich, was designated the John Kenneth Galbraith Fellow for his work in experimental economics and human altruism.

Terrie Moffitt, Professor of Psychology and Neuroscience at Duke and Professor of Social Behavior and Development at King's College London, received the Thorsten Sellin Fellow for her work on antisocial behavior and violence. Sara Lawrence-Lightfoot, Professor of Education at Harvard University, was named that Margaret Mead Fellow for "her work on links between adult developmental themes and teachers' work and the dynamic between culture and learning styles." Geoffrey Cowan, Professor at the Annenberg School of Communications at the University of Southern California and Dean of that school for over ten years, was named Walter Lippmann Fellow for his career as "an important force in the communication world as an academic leader, government official, author, television producer, and playwright."

The American Academy of Political and Social Science seeks to promote the progress of the social sciences and the use of social science knowledge in the enrichment of public understanding and in the development of public policy. It publishes *The Annals*, its current President is Princeton University Sociology Professor Douglas Massey, and its Executive Director is Phyllis Kaniss. For more info go to: www.aapss.org

HOWARD UNIVERSITY CELEBRATES E. FRANKLIN FRAZIER

As part of the observance of the 50th anniversary of its Graduate School, Howard University recently sponsored a lecture by UCLA Professor Walter Allen remembering the contributions of sociologist E. Franklin Frazier. Allen, the Allen E. Murray Professor of Higher Education and director of the Center for Higher Education and Organizational Change, discussed the career of one of the nation's most influential scholars whose work focused on the role of institutions and practices in American life on the demands by African Americans for economic, political and social equality.

Frazier, born in Baltimore, lived from 1894 to 1962 and taught in and chaired Howard's department of sociology for many years. He had graduated from the school in 1916, taught high school math, English, history, and French before going to Clark University for his M.A. After a stint as a Russell Sage Fellow in New York City and teaching at Morehouse College and directing the Atlanta University School of Social Work, where he was forced to resign after writing that racial prejudice was akin to insanity, Frazier received his Ph.D. from the University of Chicago in 1931.

He published *The Negro Family in Chicago* in 1931 and *The Negro Family in the United States* in 1939, analyzing the cultural and historical forces that influenced African American families and raising some of the same issues that Daniel Patrick Moynihan would discuss in his famous report almost 25 years later. Frazier also surveyed housing conditions for the Commission on Conditions in Harlem appointed by New York Mayor Fiorello LaGuardia following riots there in 1935. In 1941, supported by the Guggenheim Foundation, he spent a year in Brazil studying family life there. He also worked for UNESCO over a period of years and in 1950 helped draft the organization's statement, *The Race Question*.

In 1957, Frazier's book *The Black Bourgeoisie* appeared in America (it had originally been published in France). Criticizing middle class Blacks for adopting white culture and mores, the book caused Frazier difficulty in the Howard community and other areas of Black affluence. Frazier's left wing politics and anti-capitalist writings and speeches also caused him difficulty in the 1950s during Senator Joseph McCarthy's anti-communist investigations. Frazier also had many debates with Melville J. Herkovits, a noted cultural anthropologist, who maintained the importance of African cultural influences on American blacks.

Frazier, in 1948, became the first African American to serve as President of a major American social science association, when he was elected to head the American Sociological Association. Earlier he had been President of the Eastern Sociological Society and a founding member and President of the D.C. Sociological Society.

Former COSSA President Orlando Taylor, Howard's Vice Provost for Research, Dean of the Graduate School, has organized the 50th anniversary celebration. He bemoaned the lack of recognition that Frazier receives from many young African Americans, although judging from the audience at Allen's lecture that may be changing.

NIDA ANNOUNCES CONFERENCE ON BLENDING SCIENCE AND TREATMENT

On May 14th the National Advisory Council on Drug Abuse held its 99th Meeting. At the session, the Council announced that on June 2-3 in Cincinnati, the National Institute on Drug Abuse (NIDA) will convene a conference on "Blending Science and Treatment: The Impact of Evidence-Based Practices on Individuals, Families and Communities." The Universities of Cincinnati and Pittsburgh will co-sponsor.

The conference will bring leading researchers and practitioners to present their most current drug abuse and addiction findings and their application to clinical practice. NIDA Director Nora Volkow will join fellow plenary speakers Dennis Daley of University of the Pittsburgh Medical Center, Kathleen Brady of the Medical University of South Carolina, and A. Thomas McLellan and Deni Carise, both of the Treatment Research Institute of Philadelphia.

Designed to fill in the gap that exists in the drug abuse treatment field between clinical practice and scientific research, the conference will present an important opportunity for clinicians and providers to interact with the developers of empirically supported treatments in awareness raising workshops focused on treatment implementation.

One important response to the gap in the drug abuse treatment field between clinical practice and research has been NIDA's National Drug Abuse Clinical Trials Network (CTN), a research infrastructure currently consisting of 16 research "nodes" designed to test the effectiveness and usefulness of new and improved interventions in community-based treatment settings with diverse populations.

Research conducted within NIDA's Clinical Trials Network (CTN) as well as other NIDA supported research studies are disseminated through the NIDA/SAMHSA Blending Initiative. The Blending Initiative is NIDA's most recent and innovative effort to translate research into practice and help make the best drug addiction treatments available to those who need them. The upcoming NIDA Blending Conference represents one component of this initiative.

For more information on this conference visit: www.nida.nih.gov.

FUTURE RFA TO SUPPORT RESEARCH ON WOMEN IN THE BIOMEDICAL AND BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES

In an effort to give investigators sufficient lead time to prepare responsive applications, on behalf of the National Institutes of Health's (NIH) institutes and centers, the National Institute of General Medical Sciences (NIGMS) has released a notice of the agency's plans to issue a Request for Applications (RFA) to research and analyze causal factors and interventions that promote and support the careers of women in biomedical and behavioral research, defined broadly to include science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) fields. The RFA is expected to be published in July 2008 with a receipt date in October, 2008.

The RFA will support research on:

- The causal factors such as individual characteristics, institutional/departmental environment, organizational structure, and disciplinary culture or practices explaining the current patterns observed in the careers of women in science and variation across different subgroups such as underrepresented minority women and socio-economically disadvantaged women, and
- The efficacy of programs designed to support the careers of women in science.

Investigators will be strongly encouraged to collaborate with colleagues in the natural, behavioral and social sciences, as well as with other fields, as needed.

The RFA is part of the efforts of the NIH Women in Biomedical Careers Working Group, chaired by Vivian Pinn (Office of Research on Women's Health) and NIH Director Elias Zerhouni, which was designated to address the challenges outlined in the 2007 National Academies report, *Beyond Bias and Barriers: Fulfilling the Potential of Women in Academic Science and Engineering* (see earlier story). The RFA comes out of the deliberations of Subcommittee 6 of the Working Group, "Research on the Efficacy of Programs to Reduce Gender Bias," led by NIH Deputy Director Raynard Kington. The Subcommittee is focusing on developing the evidence base on the effectiveness of programs to advance the careers of women in science and engineering and on promoting improved understanding of the factors that might explain the current patterns of careers of men and women in these fields.

Please note that applications are not being solicited at this time. For additional information contact: Juliana M. Blome, NIGMS, (301) 594-2762; blomeju@mail.nih.gov.

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

1522 K Street, NW, Suite 836
Washington, D.C. 20005
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