

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:

- Senate Confirms Holdren and Lubchenco
- Commerce Nominee Promises Census Will Get Done
- House Panel Examines Prisoner Reentry Research
- NSF Issues Statement on Recovery Act Funding
- SBE Interested in Proposals to Investigate Recovery Act Implementation
- NIH Announces Availability of Administrative Supplements
- HHS Announces Federal Coordinating Council for Comparative Effectiveness Research
- 'Building a Diverse Scientific Workforce' Subject of Congressional Briefing
- International Education Programs Celebrated
- New Solicitation for Decision Making Under Uncertainty Research
- NSF and Foundations Offer Opportunities for Cyber-Enabled Data on Innovations in Organizations
- Wanted: Proposals for Exploratory Grants for Behavioral Research in Cancer Control
- CNSTAT Issues New Edition of Principles and Practices for a Federal Statistical Agency

Volume 28, Issue 6

March 23, 2009

## SENATE CONFIRMS HOLDREN AND LUBCHENCO

On March 19, after weeks of delay, the Senate finally confirmed John Holdren to become the Director of the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy (OSTP) and Jane Lubchenco to become the Administrator of the National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA). For an earlier article on their confirmation hearing see Update, [February 23, 2009](#).

On the same day, the Senate confirmed Elena Kagan, Dean of Harvard Law School, as the nation's new Solicitor General.

## COMMERCE NOMINEE PROMISES CENSUS WILL GET DONE

Gary Locke, former Governor of the state of Washington, faced the Senate Commerce, Science and Transportation Committee, chaired by Sen. Jay Rockefeller (D-WV), in a confirmation hearing on March 18. As the Obama Administration's third announced nominee to be Secretary of Commerce, Locke found himself closely questioned about the 2010 Census.

Chairman Rockefeller noted the \$1 billion in the Recovery Act to help the 2010 count. He also pointed out the "seriously underfunded paid advertising" effort. He said getting the Census done on time will be "a real challenge" and worried that "it won't happen." Sen. Kay Bailey Hutchison (R-TX), Ranking Republican on the Committee, wanted assurances that the 2010 count will be handled on a "professional basis" without undue influence from the Administration that would "politicize" the effort.

Locke told the Committee that he was a “stickler for accuracy.” We need to get the decennial “right - no exceptions, no excuses,” he testified. He reassured the panel that the 2010 Census “will be run out of the Department of Commerce and by a Director who will work with the Congress, the Administration and our state and local leaders to make sure you and they are involved every step of the way in making this a successful count.” “The Director will report to me,” he pronounced.

The nominee acknowledged the General Accountability Office’s (GAO) charge that the Census has many difficulties and is “starting behind” and “time is running out.” It will take “extraordinary efforts” and the “right people” who “work with absolute vigor” to meet the management challenges of taking the count. He promised “creative efforts” to get the word out to the American people about the importance of the Census.

Hutchison raised the issue of statistical sampling to correct the expected differential between the undercount and overcount. Locke cited the Supreme Court ruling that prohibits using sampling to correct Census numbers for reapportioning congressional districts. He also told Hutchison that sampling would not be used for redistricting state legislative seats. He concluded: There is “no plan within the Department of Commerce for statistical sampling with respect to the population count.”

Locke was praised by all the Senators who attended the hearing and it looks like after three tries the new Administration will get a new Commerce Secretary. Now it is time to find a Census Director!

## HOUSE PANEL EXAMINES PRISONER REENTRY RESEARCH

During the week of March 9 the House Commerce, Justice, Science Appropriations Subcommittee, chaired by Rep. Alan Mollohan (D-WV), turned its attention to the nation’s prison system in a series of hearings. A significant part of the members’ interest focused on the issue of prisoner reentry. In two hearings on March 11 and 12, the Subcommittee heard testimony regarding research into effective programs to reintroduce former offenders back into society.

As Pamela Lattimore of RTI International and Christy Visher of the University of Delaware and the Urban Institute and a former COSSA Board member, told the panel, the number of people in the U.S. under criminal justice system supervision doubled from 1988 to 7.3 million in 2007. The number of people in state and Federal prisons grew from about 600,000 to nearly 1.6 million. Consequently, these increases have had a growing price tag. In 2006, governments spent \$69 billion on corrections and total criminal justice costs grew to \$215 billion.

Jeremy Travis, former director of the National Institute of Justice (NIJ) and now President of the John Jay College of Criminal Justice, testified that according to the Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS), more than 700,000 people leave our state and Federal prisons each year. In addition, another estimated 13 million individuals leave our nation’s jails. Travis further noted that approximately 70 percent of those released from prison are placed on supervision by the criminal justice system. In addition, there are many what Travis called “invisible punishments” facing former offenders. These include barring those with felony convictions from many jobs, benefits, and other forms of civic participation.

These numbers and their consequences led Rep. Danny Davis (D-IL) to tell the Subcommittee that prisoner reentry is the “most serious problem facing urban America.” It also led him to sponsor and shepherd through Congress the Second Chance Act. With its variety of reentry initiatives this law, Travis said, “marks a turning point in our nation’s history” of dealing with released prisoners. The goal of all these efforts is to reduce a much too high recidivism rate for former offenders.

Lattimore and Visher have been examining an earlier effort called the Serious and Violent Offender Reentry Initiative (SVORI) promulgated during the George W. Bush Administration. SVORI was a \$110 million federal investment that provided corrections and juvenile justice agencies with grants. These were used to implement prisoner reentry programs that began in prison and continued following release. For the past six years, with funding from the NIJ, they have been evaluating SVORI and they related their findings to the Subcommittee.

According to Lattimore and Visher, SVORI had four objectives for released prisoners: Improve employment, housing, and family and community involvement; Improve health by addressing substance use, and physical and mental health problems; Reduce criminality; and Promote systems change through collaboration and management strategies.

Although the evaluation, which surveyed SVORI program directors, interviewed nearly 2,500 men, women and boys between July 2004 and April 2007 who were program participants in SVORI and other adult and juvenile reentry programs, is not complete, Lattimore and Visher offered the Subcommittee some of the important conclusions so far:

- (1) Since many prisoners had employment, drug, mental health and other problems before they were incarcerated, the successful reintegration of individuals exiting prison is a complex issue that requires a comprehensive approach;
- (2) SVORI funding was significant in the development and continuation of reentry programming;
- (3) SVORI funds increased collaboration among state and local agencies and organizations, including community- and faith-based groups;
- (4) SVORI funds resulted in an increase in services for participants, such as reentry planning, assistance obtaining documents, mentoring, substance abuse and mental health treatment, and educational and employment services;
- (5) More services, especially substance abuse treatment, were delivered prior to release than after release; and
- (6) The impact of SVORI on outcomes suggests that in most cases SVORI participants fared better than comparison subjects.

In reviewing many other studies, Travis testified that “the literature has produced a set of guidelines for effective programs.” These include: focus on behavioral outcomes, use positive reinforcements; target high risk offenders; use risk assessment instruments; begin treatment in prison and provide continuity in the community; and provide intensive interventions for at least six months.

James Byrne of the University of Massachusetts, Lowell related to the panel his use of the Campbell Collaboration’s systematic review process, an emphasis on meta-analysis of studies using randomized controlled experiments, to evaluate what works. He concluded that most of these reviews indicated that “the necessary quality research has not been conducted.” One area where research has demonstrated effectiveness, Byrne noted, is that in-prison treatment programs have a small, but statistically significant effect, on reducing recidivism upon reentry.

### **New Promising Approaches to Reentry**

The Subcommittee appeared interested in some of the new alternative approaches to reentry. Ranking Republican Rep. Frank Wolf (R-VA) chastised Travis and Byrne for neglecting faith-based approaches that from Wolf’s experience offer significant success in helping with reentry problems. Travis embraced the idea of moving from individual-based approaches to an ecological model “that focuses simultaneously on the community context in which individuals are struggling to thrive after prison.” Some of these new approaches include: Offender Notification Forums, now part of Project Safe Neighborhood efforts in Chicago; Comprehensive Interagency Initiatives, best exemplified by the Boston Reentry Initiative, which has demonstrated recidivism reduction rates of thirty percent; Reentry Courts, an idea in the Second Chance Act, which help coordinate available services with a judge as reentry manager; and Community Based Interventions, using coalitions of community organizations to change the climates in neighborhoods where many ex-offenders return.

Chairman Mollohan asked how the Second Chance Act was working and was told it was still too early to evaluate and since so far, there has been very little funding (\$25 million in FY 2009; \$75 million proposed for FY 2010). The Chairman also asked if there was a role for the National Science Foundation (NSF) is carrying out research on this topic. Byrne indicated that this type of evaluation research was generally not part of NSF’s portfolio. Instead, Travis, Byrne, Lattimore and Visser all suggested that more funding for NIJ and BJS was imperative and reminded the Subcommittee of the forthcoming National Academies’ reviews of these two agencies.

## **NSF ISSUES STATEMENT ON RECOVERY ACT SPENDING**

In response to the enactment of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA), also known as the stimulus package, the National Science Foundation (NSF) has developed policies, procedures, and Frequently Asked Questions regarding the implementation of the law. These documents are available at [www.nsf.gov/recovery](http://www.nsf.gov/recovery).

NSF’s implementation plans are noted below.

The Recovery Act supplements NSF fiscal year 2009 funding by \$3.0 billion. NSF currently has many highly rated proposals that it has not been able to fund. For this reason, NSF is planning to use the majority of the \$2 billion available in Research and Related Activities for proposals that are already in house and will be reviewed and/or awarded prior to September 30, 2009.

The Foundation also expects to expeditiously award funds as specified in the Recovery Act for: the Math and Science Partnership program (funded at \$25 million); the Robert Noyce Teacher Scholarship Program (funded at \$60 million); the Major Research Equipment and Facilities Construction Account (funded at \$400 million); the Academic Research

Infrastructure (ARI) program (funded at \$200 million); and the Science Masters program, (funded at \$15 million). Solicitations for these latter two programs will be posted this spring.

NSF will also post a solicitation this spring for the Major Research Instrumentation Program (MRI) in order to make a sufficient number of awards to utilize the \$300 million provided in the legislation. The Foundation currently anticipates that no other solicitations will be posted that are solely in response to the Recovery Act.

NSF will ensure that Recovery Act funds are awarded in a timely manner while maintaining its commitment to its established merit review processes.

In keeping with this, NSF's overall framework for Recovery Act investments emphasizes the following:

- All grants issued with Recovery Act funds will be standard grants with durations of up to 5 years. This approach will allow NSF to structure a sustainable portfolio.
- Funding of new Principal Investigators and high-risk, high-return research will be top priorities.

With the exception of the MRI, ARI and Science Masters programs, the majority of proposals eligible for Recovery Act funding include those that are already in house and will be reviewed and/or awarded prior to September 30, 2009.

NSF also will consider proposals declined on or after October 1, 2008. The reversal of the decision to decline must be based on both the high quality of the reviews received on the initial submission and the lack of available funding at the time the original decision was made. The cognizant program officer will contact the institution when a reversal is being considered by NSF. Specific procedural information regarding this new process is available on the NSF Recovery website.

#### Transparency and Accountability Guidance

The Recovery Act mandates a significant level of transparency and accountability. The law and implementing guidance identify specific award conditions for awards made with Recovery Act funding. Therefore, award notices will include special award conditions identifying the funding as coming from the Recovery Act, and indicate the specific awardee reporting responsibilities mandated by Section 1512 of the Recovery Act.

Given the goals of the Recovery Act, awardees will be informed that they are expected to expend funds in a timely manner on allowable award costs and that NSF will be monitoring awards for expenditures. If, after 12 months, no allowable expenditures have taken place, NSF may consider reducing or terminating the award and reallocating the funds.

## SBE INTERESTED IN PROPOSALS TO INVESTIGATE RECOVERY ACT IMPLEMENTATION

The National Science Foundation's (NSF) Social, Behavioral, and Economic Sciences (SBE) directorate has sponsored the Science of Science Innovation and Policy (SCiSIP) initiative for a few years now. The purpose of the initiative is to support research designed to advance the scientific basis of science and innovation policy with one its components the development of analytical tools, data and metrics that can be applied in the science policy decision making process.

SBE believes that the implementation of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act offers a natural experimental situation for studying SCiSIP activities. Thus, it is willing to consider proposals under NSF's RAPID (Grants for Rapid Response Research) award system.

According to NSF, the RAPID funding mechanism is used for proposals having a severe urgency with regard to availability of, or access to data, facilities or specialized equipment, including quick-response research on natural or anthropogenic disasters and similar unanticipated events. Proposals for the SCiSIP grants must be discussed with the program officer Julia Lane, [jlane@nsf.gov](mailto:jlane@nsf.gov) or 703/292-5145.

The Project Description is expected to be brief (two to five pages) and include clear statements as to why the proposed research is of an urgent nature and why a RAPID award would be the most appropriate mechanism for supporting the proposed work.

Only internal merit review is required for RAPID proposals. Under rare circumstances, program officers may elect to obtain external reviews to inform their decision. If external review is to be obtained, then the PI will be so informed in the interest of maintaining the transparency of the review and recommendation process. The two standard NSB-approved merit review criteria will apply.

Requests may be for up to \$200K and of one year duration. The award size, however, will be consistent with the project scope and of a size comparable to grants in similar areas. No-cost extensions, and requests for supplemental funding, will be processed in accordance with standard NSF policies and procedures.

Renewed funding of RAPID awards may be requested only through submission of a proposal that will be subject to full external merit review. Such proposals would be designated as "RAPID renewals."

## NIH ANNOUNCES AVAILABILITY OF ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPLEMENTS

On March 18, the National Institutes of Health (NIH) announced the availability of three administrative supplements providing approximately \$1 billion in funding through the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA). The NIH encourages applications in all scientific and programmatic areas funded by the agency.

### Summer Research Experiences for Students and Science Educators Available

The announcement included one for administrative supplements for summer research experiences for students and science educators. The supplements (<http://grants.nih.gov/grants/guide/notice-files/NOT-OD-09-060.html>) are for investigators and institutions and organizations in the U.S. with active NIH research grants and are designed to promote job creation, economic development, and accelerating the pace and achievement of scientific research. The supplements are also an effort by NIH to encourage students to "seriously pursue research careers in health related sciences, as well as provide elementary, middle school, and high school teachers, community college faculty, and faculty from non-research intensive institutions with short term research experiences in NIH-funded laboratories." The agency encourages the participation of individuals from racial and ethnic groups underrepresented in biomedical and behavioral research, individuals with disabilities and individuals from disadvantaged backgrounds.

The agency is prepared to make awards with ARRA funding under other existing programs that provide administrative supplements, such as PA-08-190, Research Supplements to Promote Diversity in Health-Related Research (<http://grants1.nih.gov/grants/guide/pa-files/PA-08-190.html>), and PA-08-091, Research Supplements to Promote Re-entry into Biomedical and Behavioral Research Careers (<http://grants1.nih.gov/grants/guide/pa-files/PA-08-191.html>).

ARRA funds allocated to NIH specifically for comparative effectiveness research (CER) may also be available to support supplements. Projects will need to meet the following definition of CER: "a rigorous evaluation of the impact of different options that are available for treating a given medical condition for a particular set of patients. Such a study may compare similar treatments, such as competing drugs, or it may analyze very different approaches, such as surgery and drug therapy." The research may also include the development and use of clinical registries, clinical data networks, and other forms of electronic health data that can be used to generate or obtain outcomes data as they apply to CER.

### Administrative Supplements to Accelerate Tempo of Research on Active Grants

Supplements (<http://grants.nih.gov/grants/guide/notice-files/NOT-OD-09-056.html>) are also available for investigators and institutions and organizations in the U.S. with active NIH research grants for the purpose of accelerating the tempo of scientific research on active grants, including research program and center grants (Ps), Career Development Awards (Ks), Institutional Training Grants (Ts), Cooperative Agreements (Us) and Educational Development Awards. More detailed eligibility information is available on the web sites of the individual institutes and centers (ICs). Some ICs will consider administrative supplements only in target areas identified on their web sites.

To be eligible, the parent grant must be active and the research/scientific activities proposed in the supplement must be accomplished within the current competitive segment. In addition, the proposed supplement "MUST" be within the general scope of the peer-reviewed activities and aims approved in the parent grant, including projects on no-cost extension. Again, ARRA funds allocated to NIH specifically for CER may be available to support supplements that meet the definition of CER noted above. There are no limits to the number of administrative supplement requests that may be submitted by an institution or Project Director/Principal Investigator (PD/PI) although individual ICs may limit eligibility.



NIH's funding method to support the administrative supplement program can be used to cover cost increases that are associated with increasing the tempo of scientific research funded under the parent grant and/or achieving certain new research objectives as long as they are within the scope of the parent project. Examples of the types of supplements that could be appropriate include, but are not limited to, hiring additional personnel or funding investments in equipment and technology to leverage the goals of the project or enhance energy efficiency of the conduct of the project. NIH will not consider requests which are solely to restore previously applied budget adjustments to a project nor to supplant institutional commitments supporting individuals and other costs previously committed to projects.

### Competitive Revision Applications

The NIH also announced the opportunity for investigators and institutions and organizations in the U.S. with active NIH research grants (including SBIR and STTR) to submit revision applications to support a significant expansion of the scope or research protocol of approved and funded projects (<http://grants.nih.gov/grants/guide/notice-files/NOT-OD-09-058.html>). (These were formerly known as competitive supplements.) Support for these revision applications will also come from ARRA funds. CER funds allocated to NIH for this research may again be available to support supplements. Funding decisions and awards associated with this application will be issued on or prior to September 30, 2009, and on or prior to September 30, 2010 for any applications submitted in response to any reissuance of the notice. **The deadline for receipt of these revision applications is April 21, 2009.** Resubmissions will be only accepted if the notice is reissued.

This announcement is for revision applications to active NIH Research Grants, including, but not limited to, R01, R03, R15, R21, R25, R33, R34, R37, R21/R33, R41, R42, R43, R44, SC1, SC2, SC3 grants, and Program Project grants, Center grants, Cooperative Agreements, Training Grants, and Institutional Career Development Awards. The notice emphasizes that these are 2-year awards and probably are most appropriate at the post-doctoral level.

Revision applications must be for costs to support new research objectives and aims that are outside of the scope of the approved parent grant. A request for funds to support work within the general scope of the peer-reviewed activities and aims approved within the parent grant should be submitted as an administrative supplement.

Examples of the types of revisions that would be appropriate include, but are not limited to the following: hiring students, postdocs or other personnel to accomplish new scientific objectives or to generate novel resources; making investments in technology essential to expand the goals of the project or to enhance energy efficiency in the expansion of the project; or requesting that a single PD/PI grant be changed to a multiple PD/PI grant or otherwise modifying the multiple PD/PI team in order to add and pursue new scientific goals. Other types of revisions may be appropriate but must be consistent with the goals of ARRA. It emphasized that ICs may have their own specific areas of emphasis, see [http://grants.nih.gov/recovery/ic\\_supp.html](http://grants.nih.gov/recovery/ic_supp.html).

The agency notes that funding for revisions to existing grants will be available from ARRA funds in FYs 2009 and 2010. Due to the limited, two-year nature of Recovery Act funds, revision applications may only be requested for up to two years; therefore the scope and budget of the requested revision must reflect aims and goals that can be accomplished within that limited timeframe. Requests selected for funding in FY2010 will be limited to one year for the project and budget period. There is no maximum dollar limit on the budget request for a revision application; however, the requested budget must be reasonable and appropriate for the proposed work.

For funding considerations, revision applications will be assigned to the ICs through which the parent grant was funded. To the extent possible, the locus of initial peer review will be that used for the evaluation of the parent application. As part of the scientific peer review, all applications will: a) Undergo a selection process in which only those applications deemed to have the highest scientific and technical merit, generally the top half of applications under review, will be discussed and assigned an overall impact/priority score; b) Receive a written critique; and c) Receive a second level of review by the appropriate national advisory council or board.

Applications submitted in response to this funding opportunity will compete for available ARRA funds with all other recommended applications. Consideration will be given for: Scientific and technical merit of the proposed project as determined by scientific peer review; Availability of funds; and Relevance of the proposed project to program priorities. While geographic variation will be a consideration in awarding ARRA funding, NIH stresses that "a proposal's scientific merit will always be the prevailing criterion."

For more information on NIH ARRA grant funding opportunities see <http://grants.nih.gov/recovery/index.html>. The agency has also posted a list of frequently asked questions on the recently announced challenge grants at [http://grants.nih.gov/recovery/fags\\_challenge.html](http://grants.nih.gov/recovery/fags_challenge.html).

## HHS ANNOUNCES FEDERAL COORDINATING COUNCIL FOR COMPARATIVE EFFECTIVENESS RESEARCH

On March 19, the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) announced the members of the Federal Coordinating Council for Comparative Effectiveness Research (FCCER). The Council which was authorized by the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) will help coordinate research and guide investments in comparative effectiveness research funded by ARRA.

The 15 member Council, named in accordance with a Congressionally-mandated timeline also outlined in ARRA, is designed to assist Federal agencies, including HHS and the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Defense, among others, to coordinate comparative effectiveness and related health services research. ARRA authorized \$300 million for the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality, \$400 million for the National Institutes of Health, and \$400 million for the Secretary of Health and Human Services to support comparative effectiveness research (see Update, [March 9, 2009](#)).

The release announcing FCCER's members emphasized that the Council will not recommend clinical guidelines for payment, coverage or treatment. It will, however, consider the needs of populations served by federal programs and opportunities to build and expand on current investments and priorities. FCCER will also provide input on priorities for the \$400 million fund in the Recovery Act that the Secretary will allocate to advance this type of research.

FCCER will hold a public listening session on April 14, 2009 to hear from the public. Its deliberations and recommendations will be public. The Council members include:

**Anne C. Haddix**, Ph.D. - Chief Policy Officer, Office of Strategy and Innovation, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention;  
**Thomas B. Valuck**, MD, MHSA, JD - Medical Officer and Senior Advisor, Center for Medicare Management Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services;  
**Peter Delany**, PhD, LCSW-C - Director, Office of Applied Studies, Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration;  
**Carolyn M. Clancy**, M.D. - Director, Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services;  
**Deborah Parham Hopson**, PhD, RN, FAAN - Associate Administrator, HIV/AIDS Bureau, Health Resources and Services Administration;  
**David Hunt**, M.D. - Chief Medical Officer, Office of the National Coordinator;  
**James Scanlon** - Acting Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation  
**Elizabeth Nabel**, M.D. - Director, National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute, National Institutes of Health;  
**Garth N. Graham**, M.D., M.P.H. - Deputy Assistant Secretary, Office of Minority Health;  
**Jesse L. Goodman**, M.D., M.P.H. - Acting Chief Medical Officer, FDA, Director, Center for Biologics Evaluation and Research, FDA;  
**Michael Marge**, Ed.D. - Acting Director, Office on Disability;  
**Neera Tanden**, J.D. - Counselor, Office of the Secretary, HHS;  
**Joel Kupersmith**, M.D. - Chief Research and Development Officer, Veterans Administration;;  
**Michael Kilpatrick**, M.D. - Director of Strategic Communications for the Military Health System, Department of Defense;  
**Ezekiel J. Emanuel**, M. D. Ph.D. - Special Advisor for Health Policy, Office of Management and Budget.

## 'BUILDING A DIVERSE SCIENTIFIC WORKFORCE' SUBJECT OF CONGRESSIONAL BRIEFING

On March 12, the Collaborative for Enhancing Diversity in Science (CEDs) along with 60 diverse organizations across the spectrum of education and science held a [congressional briefing](#), *Building a Diverse Scientific Workforce: Collaboration for Competitive and Healthy Nation*, to discuss the necessity and accompanying challenges of increasing the diversity of America's scientific workforce.

The briefing's speakers were: **Raynard S. Kington**, Acting Director, National Institutes of Health (NIH); **Wanda E. Ward**, Acting Assistant Director for the Education and Human Resources Directorate (EHR), National Science Foundation; and **Arthur L. Coleman**, Managing Partner and Co-founder of EducationCounsel. **Mary Ann McCabe**, Director, Office for Policy and Communications, Society for Research in Child Development, served as the event's moderator.



Mary Ann McCabe, SRCD

Welcoming the standing room only crowd, McCabe observed that the number of organizations co-sponsoring the event illustrated “the level of interest and concern across the diverse areas of science about these issues.” She noted that “most scientific disciplines share the same challenges” and that the level of interest is also “demonstrative of the type of collaboration among organizations that’s already started.” The enormous interest in the topic reflects that “everyone is concerned about the science workforce for the 21st century in order for our country to stay competitive and be a leader in innovation,” McCabe stated. She also clarified that for CEDS and many of the groups that cosponsored the briefing the challenges are for science across the board - “every area of science and technology.”

### ‘A Complicated Story’

Using what he called “the demographic imperative” slide that is “required” when discussing this issue, Kington explained that the “fundamental reason why many of us are deeply concerned about the scientific workforce today and the trends that we are seeing,” is that “clearly, the country is becoming more and more diverse.” The expectation is that by 2050, the white population will be less than half of the entire population of 18-year olds. “This obviously has significance for the scientific workforce because there are dramatically different probabilities of minorities - some higher, some lower - entering into scientific careers and succeeding in them,” he further explained.

Presenting data from the NIH, Kington noted that the agency’s starkest challenge is addressing the “startlingly low number” of NIH principal investigators (PIs) who are from underrepresented minorities, particularly African-Americans and Hispanics. He also pointed out that the percentage of Native American PIs is so “incredibly small” that it is hard to do a serious analysis. The number of Asian investigators is larger. Perhaps the most striking aspect of the NIH data Kington revealed is that there has not been a dramatic change over the last ten years. Another aspect of this situation is the low number of doctorates in science and engineering going to underrepresented minorities with no dramatic increases in recent years despite many efforts to achieve diversity. Some agencies have been working at this for literally 30 years, acknowledged Kington.



Raynard S. Kington, NIH

NIH has begun a series of analytic projects to address these challenges. According to Kington, the agency is doing two types of analysis, including modeling likely changes in the scientific work force by looking at demographic changes. While it is conventional wisdom that Asians are overrepresented in the scientific workforce, Kington shared that the analysis is discovering interesting patterns, particularly for Asians, over the course of careers. Another interesting and counter-intuitive finding, according to Kington, is that “both African-Americans and Hispanics are more likely to have a tenure-track position at seven years after the doctorate” than majority professors. Conversely, Native Americans are more likely to have NIH funding, controlling for such factors as: age, year of Ph.D., category of doctoral institution, the field, marital status, children, the employer’s characteristics, and publication. These results from the analysis run counter to the agency’s expectations. What the data reveals, Kington explained, is that there is “a huge need for empirical work looking at the actual evidence and understanding the dynamics of this system of careers.”

The picture is further complicated when one looks at the institutions where individuals achieve tenure, he stated, emphasizing that the NIH has just begun its analysis in this area. He also highlighted the NIH’s “major initiative” looking at the careers of women in science, largely as a result of the recent National Academies’ report on the topic.

Concluding, Kington warned the audience that “all of us need to be prepared for unpleasant evidence, evidence that might raise uncomfortable questions and uncomfortable issues.” It is a “complicated story” and “we will have to be willing to hear unpleasant things if we are finally going to have an important serious discussion about what we can do to correct the problem.”

### Meeting the ‘National Need for a Robust Scientific Workforce in the 21st Century’

Ward discussed NSF’s role in meeting the national need for a robust scientific workforce in the 21st century. She explained that she assumes that “there is a national imperative and that diversity does, in fact, strengthen the scientific enterprise by the intellectual diversity of thought.” Agreeing with Kington, Ward emphasized that there continues to be a crisis in the “underrepresentation of certain U.S. groups in the STEM fields - mainly women students, faculty of color, and persons with disabilities.”





Wanda E. Ward, NSF

Focusing on innovation, which remains the engine of U.S. economic competitiveness, Ward suggested the role of diverse intellectual capital is a topic of great interest to the NSF. She stressed that fostering an innovation ecosystem would require intellectual capacity building. Thus, STEM talent development for all Americans, scientists, technologists, engineers, technicians, the instructional workforce as well as the illiterate citizenry, becomes imperative.

Ward maintained that research infrastructure “is having learning platforms of places where creativity is fostered and intellectual diversity of thought would be encouraged and fostered.” These are some of the subjects that the NSF is increasingly examining. She informed the group that the NSF has “some 60 programs” at various levels and scales that it supports. Half of them are managed in EHR. The programs range from “focused programs” which center exclusively on either underrepresented minorities, to those that spotlight women, and others

that emphasize persons with disabilities. Still, there are other programs where “diversity is a central element that is embedded within the thrust of the entire program,” she explained.

Newer directions NSF has taken include its *Innovation through Institutional Integration program* (I<sup>3</sup>). This program allows the agency to address areas such as centrally broadening participation and addressing the issue of critical educational junctures, the integration of research in education which is a hallmark approach at NSF, a globally engaged workforce, as well as research and evaluation as a cross-cut to all of these issues. All of this, Ward described, occurs in the context of a global and cyber-enabled world. Basically, the program was designed to challenge faculty, administrators, and institutions of higher education “to think more strategically about the creative integration of NSF-funded awards, towards a whole that exceeded the sum of its parts,” she explained further. The agency’s approach, increasingly, is to look across the Foundation to see what it is doing in this area to move forward more robustly. Ward concluded by sharing the range of activities in which the NSF has supported professional associations on the topic of broadening participation.

### Policy and Legal Environments Affecting Issues of Access and Diversity

Stepping back from the programmatic and specific agency details, Coleman provided a “big-picture” look at the policy and legal environment that affects issues of access and diversity, focusing on science education and the science professions. He cautioned the audience that this was more than just an issue for lawyers. His perspective from working with colleges, universities and national associations around the country, is very much an institutional perspective, he stated. He stressed that “you have to know that terrain” and what is permissible. He concurred with Kington that “this is ultimately about the research and the evidence base to then drive good results.”

The question, he posited, is “what is the evidence?” Coleman suggested that “good policy development, while importantly focused on the legal sphere, has to be correspondingly focused on the question of research and data.” He counseled, however, that “the perfect cannot be the envy of the god” and stressed that it is his “strong belief” that “we know more than we sometimes give ourselves credit for.”



Arthur L. Coleman, EducationCounsel LLC

Coleman also stressed that in addition to the best research and data, it is also important to focus “on building stakeholder understanding and public will and support.” He explained that the dynamic we see “shifting literally before our eyes now” is moving from the “court of law to the court of public opinion.” Echoing Kington’s point on the imperative of “tackling hard and unpleasant evidence,” he emphasized that it is important to “let facts, as opposed to ideology, drive this conversation.”

Citing the Supreme Court affirmative action decisions in Grutter v. Bollinger and Gratz v. Bollinger, Coleman observed that these University of Michigan cases “framed a compelling case about their institutional mission-driven imperative.” That model, he contended, whether you are sued or not, “is a foundation for broad success in the political as well as the legal enterprise.” Noting NSF’s efforts to integrate its programs, Coleman argued that “if you follow the theory about the benefits of diversity in education and in science more specifically... there has to be

that integration because while the numbers are critically important . . . they are the necessary-but-not-sufficient condition for achieving the kind of benefits we say we care about in education and in society.” Highlighting the majority’s opinion in the Law School case, and the Court’s emphasis on the “substantial” and “real” educational benefits of diversity, Coleman explained that the arguments “are the foundations for them accepting the [University of Michigan Law School’s] argument that the benefits of diversity could justify some race and ethnicity-conscious practices. It was

compelling. There was social science evidence, there was institutional evidence, there were specific perspectives brought to the table that convinced, in that case five justices out of nine.”

Why do we care about diversity as an educational enterprise, Coleman asked. “If you understand the ultimate theory that diverse teams actually push and challenge and force new perspectives that lead to better thinking, that lead to better solutions, and ultimately lead to better outcomes, you actually understand that there’s no specific area around where diversity works and doesn’t,” he answered. And, he argued, “this isn’t just about the educational benefits . . .but this is about the economic imperative, thematically,” as laid out by Kington and Ward. It is also about national security and the U.S. having the kind of military it needs, Coleman concluded.

A transcript of the March 12th briefing and the speakers’ PowerPoint presentations are available on the web at <http://www.cossa.org/diversity/diversity.html>.

The House Diversity and Innovation Caucus led by Reps. Eddie Bernice Johnson (D-TX), Silvestre Reyes (D-TX), Michael M. Honda (D-CA), G.K. Butterfield (D-NC), Ruben Hinojosa (D-TX), and Zoe Lofgren (D-CA) promoted the briefing. The Caucus was created in 2007 to: Generate policy ideas for increasing the participation of groups underrepresented in the fields of Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math (STEM); Articulate the importance of pro-STEM and pro-innovation policies for groups under represented in STEM; Communicate the importance of promoting diversity in STEM for the achievement of America’s innovation and competitiveness goals; and Work with Congressional Leadership and relevant committees to ensure that innovation and competitiveness policy is shaped in such a way that it takes advantage of the potential offered by minority communities and by women, groups that are both under-represented in the STEM fields.

The organizations of the Collaborative for Enhancing Diversity in Science (CEDS) believe that collaboration is essential to enhancing recruitment and retention of underrepresented racial and ethnic minorities in science. CEDS seeks to forge opportunities for its member organizations to work together, learn from each other, and develop common approaches, where appropriate. In February 2008, led by COSSA the groups held a leadership retreat. The report with recommendations resulting from the meeting, *Enhancing Diversity in Science: A Leadership Retreat on the Role of Professional Associations and Scientific Societies*, is available at <http://www.cossa.org/diversity/diversity.html>.

## INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS CELEBRATED

In 1958 as a response to the Soviet Union’s launch of Sputnik, Congress passed the National Defense Education Act. As part of the legislation, there was a recognition that the U.S. needed to improve its capacity in training Americans in foreign languages and area studies. These programs and others added later became Title VI of the Higher Education Act in 1965. In 1961, Congress added the Fulbright-Hays or Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchanges to the package.

To celebrate more than fifty years of Title VI programs, two events took place. On March 18, the American Council on Education (ACE) and the Coalition for International Education (CIE), of which COSSA is a member, held a symposium on Capitol Hill. “Engaging the World: U.S. Global Competence in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century” received generous funding from the Carnegie Corporation of New York. On March 19-21, Michigan State University with support from the U.S. Department of Education organized the “official” Title VI 50<sup>th</sup> Anniversary Conference.

Former Clinton Administration Secretary of State Madeline Albright spoke to the banquet audience at the official event. Former Carter Administration National Security Adviser Zbigniew Brzezinski was the keynote speaker at the ACE/CIE event. Although each of the speakers noted the current challenges facing the U.S. in the world, they approached their talks differently. Albright focused on the importance of Title VI and international education, while Brzezinski presented a tour of the world’s trouble spots and what to do about them.

ACE President Molly Broad opened the symposium by suggesting that in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century U.S. global competence is essential to our international image around the world. Lee Hamilton, former Indiana Congressman and now President of the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, chaired the symposium, and called Title VI “one of the most successful pieces of legislation in the international area” because it “developed people we need to succeed in this country.” Current Indiana Senator Richard Lugar (R-IN), also made remarks.

### Brzezinski Presents Challenges and Worries about America’s Capacity to Confront Them

Brzezinski, now a Senior Fellow at the Center for Strategic and International Studies, introduced himself as an “idealist without illusions.” He began by announcing that it was time once again for a “rational, responsible, idealistic, and historically relevant American foreign policy.” This is necessary, he asserted, because America must find answers to

three large questions: 1) What are the geopolitical implications of the current economic collapse? 2) What are the central strategic challenges of our time? 3) Does America have the national capacity to respond effectively?

Brzezinski worries that the economic crisis, because many around the world blame the U.S. for its emergence, has led to further deterioration of the U.S. position. Currently, "there is massive resentment of America and its people," he asserted. This exists because America as a place where "self-gratification" and an excess of concern with financial well-being has become the defining view in the first years of the 21<sup>st</sup> Century.

Barack Obama's election was a hopeful symbol and led to a receding of anti-Americanism. Yet, Brzezinski suggested, the economic crisis has created political tensions, led some nations to question the value of globalization, and with the beginnings of protectionism raising its ugly head, fragmented the world community. What he called "defensive regionalism" was another result of the crisis as Southeast Asia contemplates its own regional currency and Latin America seeks its own answers led by some of its left-wing, anti-American governments. Add stagnation in Japan and unpredictability in Russia and the destabilization capacity increases, he added.

Although America's recovery is possible without a recovery elsewhere, the nation has always been "historically relevant to the world's well-being." When that recovery occurs, Brzezinski said we need to re-examine our excessive materialism and our "central values to defining the good life."

The strategic challenges are, according to Carter's National Security Adviser, first the Middle East, where for more than forty years now there has been "a poisonous atmosphere." He proclaimed, as he has for years in his books and lectures, that only the U.S. can articulate areas of agreement as a starting point for the principals to move on to a settlement.

The second challenge is Iran and the question is whether we negotiate or not. Clearly Brzezinski believes we should negotiate. The big problem is getting Iran to tell the truth about its nuclear goals. The third challenge is Pakistan and Afghanistan. Here we need, according to Brzezinski, a political solution that will ensure that the region is not a base for Al Qaeda. If this means dealing with 'moderate' Taliban, so be it.

On the U.S. capacity for confronting these challenges, Brzezinski addressed the age old question of how you sustain a foreign policy in a democracy. He expressed concern about interest group intervention that has produced intrusive legislation affecting Cuba, trade, and Middle East policy. He also decried the "remarkable ignorant people with regard to the world" we have in this country. People don't understand the cultures, geography, and history of other nations, he lamented. This only gets worse with the demise of daily newspaper reading, cutbacks in foreign coverage by those remaining newspapers and their counterparts in television. He saved his greatest vehemence for blogs, which he denounced as a place where "semi-literate idiots" think they have something profound to say. One result of this ignorance, he noted, is the ability to demagogue and use fear as a political tool as manifested in the response to 9/11. Brzezinski concluded that the need for improved education is clear and the Title VI programs are one hopeful effort in that direction.

The symposium also offered two panels. The first dealt with the Global Financial Crisis. Charles Calomaris of Columbia University suggested that we have not reached the bottom yet and that enormous political will and courage are necessary to eliminate the toxicities affecting the world economy. Nicholas Lardy of the Peterson Institute for International Economics focused on China and argued that it would be the first country to emerge from the economic downturn because its economic fundamentals are better than most of the rest of the world. Steven Hanson of the University of Washington addressed the situation in Russia and called the economic situation there "dire." An economy built on oil, natural gas, and minerals, will have trouble recovering anytime soon, he concluded.

The second panel focused on the countries of South Asia - India, Pakistan, and Afghanistan. Stephen Cohen of Brookings suggested that Pakistan presents a difficult scenario as a country with nuclear technology, a growing Islamic radicalism, and a weak government that could break apart. Pradeep Chhibber of the University of California at Berkeley argued that all three countries present problems since the authority of the state and the rule of law are not settled in any of them. For Nazif Shahbrani of Indiana University Afghanistan remains a nation where the central government cannot exercise control and must give way to local authorities for the country to work.

The ACE/CIE also produced a video celebrating the accomplishments of Title VI and Fulbright-Hays that featured Secretary of Defense Robert Gates, former U.S. Ambassador to Russia James Collins, and recipients of Title VI programs working with the Foreign Service in Nepal, the private sector in China, the think tank world in Washington, DC, medical teams in Guatemala, and young girls in India.

## Albright Says International Education Key to Global Competence

For former Secretary of State Albright, Title VI and Fulbright-Hays may seem like “mundane government programs,” but they are part of America’s necessary “inescapable connections to the world.” International education matters, Albright, now teaching at Georgetown University, declared, because it provides people with a “deeper understanding of the world” and helps us avoid the “arrogance” that gave the “promotion of democracy a bad name” during the last Administration.

In addition, students must be connected to the global economy and knowing foreign languages and about cultures is imperative to dealing with international markets. She called for all American students to learn a second language. She called for science curricula to have an international component. And she argued for a visa policy that “doesn’t drive legitimate visitors away” (a big applause line with the crowd of international educators). Global learning, Albright emphasized, gives us a chance to “explain ourselves” to the world.

She insisted that international education must become a long-term priority and that White House leadership is necessary to make it so. Clearly, we need to increase our investment in these programs, she said, but more is required. Partnerships among government, civil society groups, and the private sector are crucial to enhancing support for this important area of learning. Although Title VI and Fulbright-Hays had their origins as part of the Cold War, they are now more important than ever, she concluded.

The meeting also included a plenary session moderated by Craig Calhoun of the Social Science Research Council whose participants were: Gene Bloch, Chancellor of UCLA; Mark Gearen, former director of the Peace Corps and now President of Hobart and William Smith College; and Kim Wilcox, Provost of Michigan State University. They all concurred on the importance of international education, including student experiences abroad, worried about the ability of students from poor backgrounds to get that experience, and suggested that Federal funding for these programs would remain limited given the current budget situation, and that enhancements would have to come from private foundations and alumni gifts.

## NEW SOLICITATION FOR NSF’S DECISION MAKING UNDER UNCERTAINTY RESEARCH

For the past five years, NSF has funded a group of Decision Making Under Uncertainty (DMUU) collaborative groups to support research, education, and outreach that increase basic understanding of decision-making processes and of the information needed by decision makers; to develop tools to support decision makers and increase their ability to make sound decisions; and to facilitate interaction among researchers and decision makers.

NSF has now announced a new DMUU collaborative groups’ competition that will draw on these past experiences to address the need for larger-scale projects addressing decision making under uncertainty with respect to climate change and other long-term environmental change.

According to NSF, in the context of this competition, “decision making is defined broadly and includes actions associated with adaptation to climate change and related environmental risks as well as decisions associated with mitigation strategies.” “Decision makers” are defined broadly and may include private citizens; informal and formal groups, firms, and organizations; and governments ranging from the local to state, federal and international levels.

The goals of NSF’s Decision Making Under Uncertainty (DMUU) collaborative groups funding opportunity are:

- Improve understanding of all facets of decision making related to climate change and related long-term environmental risks for which much information exists but significant areas of uncertainty remain.
- Increase knowledge of the content and form of information needed by decision makers to make sound decisions.
- Develop tools to support decision makers and increase their ability to make sound decisions over multiple time scales.
- Facilitate interactions among researchers and decision makers, thereby enhancing fundamental research and increasing the speed with which new research findings are adopted and used by decision makers.

To accomplish these goals, NSF seeks proposals for interdisciplinary collaborative groups that will produce new knowledge, information, and tools related to decision making under uncertainty associated with climate change and related environmental risks. Collaborative groups are expected to conduct integrative research on scales larger than would be expected through individual research projects. The size, structure, collaborative arrangements, and



operation of each group should be appropriate for the proposed research, education, and outreach activities. To be competitive, proposals should outline plans for a collaborative group that will do all of the following:

- Conduct fundamental research on decision making associated with climate and related environmental change.
- Develop tools that people, organizations, and governments can use to better understand the risks associated with climate and related environmental change and the options they have to address related risks.
- Provide education and research opportunities for U.S. students and faculty.
- Develop and disseminate tangible products for researchers, decision makers, and other relevant stakeholders.

The collaborative group must consist of a multidisciplinary team of researchers, based at a U.S. institution, and the team's research must be firmly grounded in the social and behavioral sciences. The research may also draw on and contribute to theoretical frameworks based in other science and engineering disciplines. Collectively, collaborative group personnel should have the requisite expertise to pursue the research, tool-development, education, and outreach activities that they propose to undertake.

In addition, the collaborative group must establish a diverse external advisory board that will include both researchers and decision makers and that will provide guidance and advice on all group activities.

DMUU collaborative groups that were established in FY 2004 are eligible to participate in this competition, but other applicants also may submit proposals, with all proposals being evaluated based on their expected future contributions. NSF will coordinate its activities with those of other federal agencies. Depending on the lines of research and products likely to result from funded collaborative groups and the interests of other agencies, additional support from other agencies may be available.

NSF expects to support four to five collaborative groups through cooperative agreements between NSF and the lead institution. The anticipated funding amount is \$5,000,000 per year, subject to the availability of funds. NSF expects to commit at least \$5,000,000 annually for support of DMUU collaborative groups from FY 2010 to FY 2014. Each collaborative group will be supported at a level of \$900,000 to \$1,500,000 annually for up to five years. Total support over five years therefore would range from \$4,500,000 to \$7,500,000 for each collaborative group. In FY 2013, collaborative groups may request renewal awards for an additional five years of support from FY 2015 to FY 2019. The due date for proposals is July 14, 2009.

For more information contact the following program officers: Rita A. Teutonico, Lead DMUU Coordinator, telephone: (703) 292-7118, email: [rteutoni@nsf.gov](mailto:rteutoni@nsf.gov); Robert E. O'Connor, DMUU Program Director, telephone: (703) 292-7263, email: [roconnor@nsf.gov](mailto:roconnor@nsf.gov); or Thomas J. Baerwald, DMUU Program Director, telephone: (703) 292-7301, email: [tbaerwal@nsf.gov](mailto:tbaerwal@nsf.gov).

The full solicitation is available at: <http://www.nsf.gov/pubs/2009/nsf09544/nsf09544.htm>.

## NSF AND FOUNDATIONS OFFER OPPORTUNITIES FOR CYBER-ENABLED DATA ON INNOVATION IN ORGANIZATIONS

The National Science Foundation (NSF), the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation, and the Ewing Marion Kauffman Foundation are all offering funding opportunities for researchers interested in new ways of capturing, analyzing and protecting data to make possible a greater understanding of the relationship between the dynamics of human interaction, organizations, and the innovation process.

At NSF, programs support research to explore ways of collecting, analyzing, sharing, and disseminating data on organizations and innovation. NSF is particularly interested in encouraging broad interdisciplinary cooperation of researchers in the social and behavioral sciences and economics and computing fields to develop theoretically-guided methods of collecting and analyzing data on innovation. Proposals with the following features are particularly encouraged.

- The collection of data using cyber tools that enable the study of innovation by individuals within organizations.
- The study of cyber-enabled teams, broadly defined, that communicate and innovate.
- The design of new concepts and technologies that facilitate the innovation process.
- The capture and analysis of data describing how new communication modalities and technologies are used, adopted, and diffused within organizations and how they enable innovative processes.

- The capture and analysis of data on the role of IT and innovation within organizations, broadly defined, particularly the use of IT, the role of IT as a process enabling innovation, and IT as disruptive technology.
- A focus on privacy and confidentiality issues that emerge when collecting data on organizations and individuals within organizations. This would include policies to ensure anonymity and sanitization of the data, retention and storage protocols, transformation prior to dissemination, and retaining usability. Also of interest is how to convey the quality of such confidentiality measures to the humans who are the subjects of study.
- The development of approaches that ensure the collaboration and engagement of organizations in providing data to the research community as well as permitting data sharing so that empirical analyses can be generalized and replicated. The development of appropriate metrics to evaluate the success of the different approaches.

The key players at NSF are the Social, Behavioral and Economic Sciences Directorate, the Computer and Information Science and Engineering Directorate, and the Office of Cyberinfrastructure. For further information contact the relevant program officer from the list below.

#### Social, Behavioral and Economic Sciences Directorate

Science of Science & Innovation Policy Contact: Julia Lane ([jlane@nsf.gov](mailto:jlane@nsf.gov))

Science, Technology, and Society Contact: Laurel Smith-Doerr ([lsmithdo@nsf.gov](mailto:lsmithdo@nsf.gov))

Innovation and Organizational Sciences Contact: Jacqueline Meszaros ([jmeszaro@nsf.gov](mailto:jmeszaro@nsf.gov))

Law and Social Sciences Contact: Susan Haire ([shaire@nsf.gov](mailto:shaire@nsf.gov))

Economics Contact: Nancy Lutz ([nlutz@nsf.gov](mailto:nlutz@nsf.gov)) and Dan Newlon ([dnewlon@nsf.gov](mailto:dnewlon@nsf.gov))

Sociology Contact: Pat White ([pwhite@nsf.gov](mailto:pwhite@nsf.gov))

#### Computer and Information Science and Engineering Directorate

Trustworthy Computing Contact: Karl Levitt ([klevitt@nsf.gov](mailto:klevitt@nsf.gov)), Sylvia Spengler ([sspengle@nsf.gov](mailto:sspengle@nsf.gov)) and Lenore Zuck ([lzuck@nsf.gov](mailto:lzuck@nsf.gov))

Information and Intelligent Systems Contact: Doug Fisher ([dhfisher@nsf.gov](mailto:dhfisher@nsf.gov)) (Data Mining, Visualization); David McDonald ([dmcdonal@nsf.gov](mailto:dmcdonal@nsf.gov)) (Social Informatics)

Foundations of Data and Visual Analytics Contact: Larry Rosenblum ([lrosenbl@nsf.gov](mailto:lrosenbl@nsf.gov))

Creative IT Contact: Mary Lou Maher ([mmaher@nsf.gov](mailto:mmaher@nsf.gov))

#### Office of Cyberinfrastructure

Contact: Jon Stoffel ([jstoffel@nsf.gov](mailto:jstoffel@nsf.gov))

### **Alfred P. Sloan Foundation**

The Alfred P. Sloan Foundation is interested in the effects of government policy and industrial organization on innovation and productivity growth as part of its program on Economic Institutions, Behavior and Market Performance. Grants made in this new program should contribute significantly to reevaluating and redesigning how governments, markets, and other institutions (including copyright and patent policies) interact with and affect innovation and market performance (including efficiency and distributional impacts) in specific economic sectors. The Foundation is especially interested in empirical economic research that constructively engages scholars in other disciplines such as law, political science, psychology, and organizational behavior; and is focused on data about the actual behavior of people and organizations in the real world. Current topics of particular concern include regulatory reform and the economics of information. Research on how the economy in principle can and should perform must be tied to observable objectives, indicators, and metrics. The Foundation's goal for this program is to develop objective and nonpartisan research insights about innovation processes that will eventually inform critical decisions faced by policymakers and the public. Those seeking support should refer to the Foundation's Web site, which instructs them to submit a brief Letter of Inquiry that will be used to determine whether there is mutual interest.

Contacts: Economic Institutions, Behavior and Market Performance Contact: Daniel Goroff ([Goroff@sloan.org](mailto:Goroff@sloan.org)) or Gail Pesyna ([Pesyna@sloan.org](mailto:Pesyna@sloan.org))

### **Ewing Marion Kauffman Foundation**

The Ewing Marion Kauffman Foundation seeks to address both short-term and long-term limitations to data on entrepreneurship and innovation as a part of its efforts to improve research and policy that lead to growing economies and expanding human welfare. The Foundation is currently funding the creation of multiple research micro data sets, from the Kauffman Firm Survey to data on bankruptcies and a matched employer-scientist-entrepreneur data set. The Foundation supports a dialog among researchers that has informed the Foundation's activities in data collection and series construction, and has an interest in quality proposals which seek to address limitations in our understanding of how innovation in large and small as well as new and existing firms contributes to economic growth and dynamism. The

confluence of the Kauffman Foundation's investments in new and enhanced data collection, and the independent recognition by other organizations and individuals of the importance of understanding entrepreneurship makes this a time of great possibility for research and policy.

Contact: E.J. Reedy ([ereedy@kauffman.org](mailto:ereedy@kauffman.org))

## WANTED: PROPOSALS FOR EXPLORATORY GRANTS FOR BEHAVIORAL RESEARCH IN CANCER CONTROL

The National Cancer Institute (NCI) and the National Center for Complementary and Alternative Medicine (NCCAM) are seeking applications for grant proposals in developmental and formative behavioral research in cancer prevention and control. The funding opportunity announcement (FOA) is designed to support innovative pilot projects or feasibility studies which will facilitate the growth of research science in the cancer control continuum from a behavioral perspective. The announcement (PA-09-130) includes and incorporates the research interests of the NCI's Behavioral Research program, the Office of Cancer Survivorship, and the Community Oncology and Prevention Trials Research Group.

Research areas may include: a) health and risk communication in the cancer arena; b) enhancing cancer survivorship; c) promoting health diet and physical activity; d) prevention and control of tobacco use; e) interaction between psychosocial and biological mechanisms; f) cancer screening behaviors; and g) palliative and end-of-life care.

The announcement emphasizes that while individual branches within the Behavioral Research Program of the Office of Cancer Survivorship concentrate on tobacco cessation, health promotion, communication, biobehavioral mechanisms, and/or survivor issues, there are themes that are relevant to all areas of behavioral and social research and are strongly encouraged as crosscutting themes to be considered in applications in response to the FOA, including:

Consideration of ethnicity, social class, and culture - The development and testing of interventions with valid and reliable measurement tools that are practical and culturally competent are needed. Since little is known about the relative importance of sociocultural, economic, educational, literacy, and other behavioral factors to the differential burden of cancer in the U.S., special efforts are required to identify and reduce the risk, incidence, and mortality of cancer among population subgroups and underserved populations.

Methods and measurement - Innovative methods as well as measurement and analysis techniques are a critical need within many domains of the social and behavioral sciences. There is a need for the development of instrumentation methods and measurement that can be used to evaluate the impact of environmental and policy interventions and develop sociocultural/ecological perspectives as the context for behavior change.

Levels of analysis - Increased attention is encouraged to group as well as individual behaviors. Study designs, including intervention approaches and statistical analyses, must extend from individual analysis to an emphasis on multiple population levels (e.g., communities, clinics, neighborhoods, etc.).

Research settings - Applications which emphasize innovation are encouraged as are applications designed to collect feasibility data for later and larger research projects in the behavioral field. Applications are encouraged to include justifications of study designs, methods, and sample sizes.

Complementary and integrative approaches - Cancer patients and survivors use complementary and integrative approaches extensively. Accordingly, NCCAM is interested in research on the application of mind-body practices, manipulative and body-based interventions, and approaches derived from traditional medical systems to enhance adherence to cancer preventive behaviors including healthy diet, exercise, and tobacco cessation, as well as improving the quality of life of cancer patients and survivors throughout their trajectories.

For more information see <http://grants.nih.gov/grants/guide/pa-files/PA-09-130.html>.

## CNSTAT ISSUES NEW EDITION OF PRINCIPLES AND PRACTICES FOR A FEDERAL STATISTICAL AGENCY

Every four years since 1992, the Committee on National Statistics (CNSTAT) has produced *Principles and Practices for a Federal Statistical Agency*. This year's fourth edition updates the document to provide advice to members of the new President's administration.

According to CNSTAT, the new edition presents and comments on four basic principles that statistical agencies must embody in order to carry out their mission fully:

- (1) They must produce objective data that are relevant to policy issues;
- (2) they must achieve and maintain credibility among data users;
- (3) they must achieve and maintain trust among data providers; and
- (4) they must achieve and maintain a strong position of independence from the appearance and reality of political control.

The book also discusses 11 important practices that are means for statistical agencies to live up to the four principles. These practices include:

- 1) A clearly defined and well-accepted mission;
- 2) Continual development of more useful data;
- 3) Openness about sources and limitations of the data provided;
- 4) Wide dissemination of data;
- 5) Cooperation with data users;
- 6) Fair treatment of data providers;
- 7) Commitment to quality and professional standards of practice;
- 8) An active research program;
- 9) Professional advancement of staff;
- 10) A strong internal and external evaluation program; and
- 11) Coordination and cooperation with other statistical agencies.

The Federal statistical system is a decentralized one with its major components spread across fourteen agencies and units housed in nine cabinet departments and three independent agencies. The Interagency Council on Statistical Policy, created by the Office of Management and Budget and led by its Office of Statistical Policy headed by Katherine Wallman. There are also more than 80 other part so the Federal government that hare not statistical agencies, but have annual budgets of more than \$500,000 or more for statistical activities.

Copies of the book are available at [http://www.nap.edu/catalog.php?record\\_id=12564](http://www.nap.edu/catalog.php?record_id=12564).

## 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: Aletha C. Huston

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@cossa.org](mailto:newsletters@cossa.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  
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  
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