

COSSA WASHINGTON UPDATE

Volume XI, Number 16

September 14, 1992

COMMISSION TO EXAMINE FUTURE OF NSF *HS*

The National Science Board (NSB), acting on the recommendation of National Science Foundation director Walter Massey, has established a Special Commission on the Future of the National Science Foundation. The commission will examine options available to NSF in an external environment that has changed markedly in recent years. Questions facing the commission include how NSF can play a larger role in fostering connections between science and technology, and what new directions NSF can take while at the same time ensuring that the agency maintains its unique role as the major federal supporter of fundamental research and education.

The Commission will be co-chaired by William Danforth, chancellor of Washington University in St. Louis, and Robert Galvin, chairman of the Executive Committee and former CEO of the Motorola Corporation. The fifteen member commission includes two members trained as political scientists, Peter Magrath, president of the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges, and Donna Shalala, chancellor of the University of Wisconsin-Madison. (a complete list of the commission membership appears on p. 3)

Three commission meetings have been scheduled: September 17, October 16, and November 7 in Washington, DC. The commission is expected to present its report to the NSB on November 20.

In addition, the commission will accept written comments from the public. Persons wishing to file such comments should mail or FAX them by October 15, 1992 to NSB Commission on the Future of NSF, Room 546, National Science Foundation, 1800 G Street, NW, Washington, DC 20550. FAX# 202/357-7346. Charles Brownstein, Director, NSF Office of Planning and Assessment, is Executive Secretary of the NSB Commission.

Public comments are asked to address two questions:

1) NSF support plays an important role in the health of the nation's academic system, which is the source of new ideas and human resources in science and engineering. How can NSF maintain and enhance the health of this vital national resource?

2) In light of the many changes in both science and world affairs (such as the increasing inseparability of science and technology, the rise of the global economy, and the end of the cold war), should NSF build on its traditional mission by pursuing a broader array of research and education objectives and doing more to link academia and industry? If so, what strategies could the agency adopt to move in this direction?

Massey's Thoughts

NSF Director Walter Massey has already signalled to the NSB in which direction he thinks the Foundation should be moving. In a six page memorandum to the Board released on August 14, Massey expands on some of his earlier thoughts presented to the Coalition for National Science Funding (CNSF) (see *Update* June 29, 1992).

Massey clearly supports an NSF that builds on its traditional mission of strong support for academic research to exercise new leadership that "would be integrated with ongoing activities and

INSIDE UPDATE...

- Senate Passes NSF Appropriations Bill: Mikulski Expresses Views on NSF in New World Order
- Blumstein Testifies on Behalf of ASC and COSSA on Justice Research Office
- FY 1993 Agriculture Appropriations Bill Becomes Law
- Several New Developments at Education Research Office
- NSF Rescission Resolved
- Schultze Appears Before Joint Economic Committee
- COSSA Staff Hits the Conventions
- Sources of Research Support: Environmental Protection Agency

closely aligned with industry and other government agencies." He foresees NSF reflecting some of the following characteristics:

- 1) The intellectual boundaries between disciplines and between types of research would be lowered and made more permeable;
- 2) NSF would encourage increased interaction in areas of national concern between different institutional actors: academia, industry (large and small), Federal, state, and local government;
- 3) Human resource development and education would be integrated and expanded into all aspects of research activities and would link industry, colleges and universities, two year colleges and technical institutes, and precollege students and teachers;
- 4) NSF would articulate and demonstrate in a more comprehensive manner the outcomes and benefits of public investments in research and education.

According to Massey: "New directions for NSF could include opening research programs to greater participation by nonacademic personnel, making science and engineering education programs more responsive to the needs of industry, and developing stronger relationships with other agencies working on cutting edge technology."

NSF's new role would help "provide a comparative advantage in world markets," as "scientific advance and technological progress have come to be more dependent on each other." The national security rationale for support of science is

CONSORTIUM OF SOCIAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATIONS

Executive Director:	Howard J. Silver
Government Affairs:	Judy Auerbach
Public Affairs:	Michael Buckley
Administrative Officer:	Karen Carrion

President:	Joseph E. Grimes
------------	------------------

The Consortium of Social Science Associations represents more than 185,000 American scientists across the full range of the social and behavioral sciences, functioning as a bridge between the research world and the Washington community. Update is published fortnightly. Individual subscriptions are available from COSSA for \$50; institutional subscriptions, \$100, overseas mail, \$100. ISSN 0749-4394. Address all inquiries to COSSA, 1522 K Street, NW, Suite 836, Washington, D.C. 20005. Phone: (202) 842-3525, Fax: (202) 842-2788

over, according to Massey, and the new rationale has the nation looking to "science as the source of technological advances that are necessary for economic prosperity and an improved quality of life." NSF has to adapt to the times, Massey said.

Why a Commission?

The NSF is currently in the process of producing a strategic plan for the next five years. Massey presented some of the ideas noted above to the NSB at its June meeting, which is the Board's annual planning session. At his June presentation to the CNSF, Massey suggested the strategic plan would be available in September, however this has not happened. There was some consternation among NSB members about moving too fast for the scientific community in pushing NSF in new directions. The National Institutes of Health has also gone through a strategic planning process that has included attempts at public participation. Is the commission an attempt to placate the scientific community, which has been the most vigorous dissenter to the proposed changes for NIH, and could probably be expected to raise questions about the new direction for NSF?

Meanwhile, at the August NSB meeting, the Board released a report *The Competitive Strength of U.S. Industrial Science and Technology: Strategic Issues*, which decries the eight year decline in spending on non-military research and development and warns that the U.S. will lose its competitive advantage over its international economic rivals in the future. The report, produced by an NSB subcommittee co-chaired by NSB members Roland Schmitt, President of Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, and Arden Bemant Jr., Vice President for Science and Technology at TRW Inc., calls for a sharp reversal of priorities shifting research dollars from military to commercial endeavors, particularly those generic and pre-competitive technologies which have a broad range of commercial applications. Furthermore, the report calls for a team effort between the federal government and private industry, with NSF expanding its support for research tied to industrial interests. This dovetails nicely with Massey's thinking and the Senate appropriations report (see *Update* August 10 and this issue).

What does all this mean for the social/behavioral/economic/ science community? NSF Assistant Director for SBE Cora Marrett and others see this as a huge opportunity for these disciplines and its new NSF directorate to make

their mark in addressing NSF's new needs. Others are wary that danger lurks in any agency whose research agenda focuses on commercialization as an end product of basic research. The commission will likely provide an opportunity to sort out these concerns.

SENATE PASSES NSF APPROPRIATION BILL: MIKULSKI EXPRESSES VIEWS ON NSF IN THE NEW WORLD ORDER

On September 9, the Senate passed the VA-HUD-Independent Agencies appropriations bill by a vote of 92-3. An attempt to reduce funding for NASA's space station failed.

The bill appropriates \$2.7 billion for the National Science Foundation, with a \$20 million reduction from FY 1992 levels for research, and a \$45 million increase from FY 1992 for education and human resource programs.

Sen. Barbara Mikulski (D-MD), chair of the appropriations Subcommittee on VA-HUD-Independent agencies, in presenting the bill to the Senate, noted that with regard to NSF, the legislation "strengthens the Foundation's efforts to open up the Nation's academic research infrastructure to those endeavoring to build America's technology base and improve U.S. competitiveness."

"A totally isolated research community"

She pointed out that "this bill reaffirms a strong commitment to basic research with no apparent utility to the lay person such as mathematical research. However, the Federal government should not simply support a research community isolated in an ivory tower away from the rest of society. The taxpayers of America have maintained a strong commitment to funding research because of a deep belief that the knowledge gained would be of great utility in the near-term or in the long-term. A totally isolated research community is inconsistent with maximizing the utility of knowledge generated by that community."

Reflecting some of the thinking that led to the creation of the Commission on the Future of the NSF, Mikulski declared: "It is important to recognize that the role of the Federal government in support of science will change in the new world order." She further expressed the hope that the

Special Commission on the Future of the National Science Foundation

William Danforth (Co-Chair), Chancellor, Washington University

Robert Galvin (Co-Chair), Chair, Executive Committee
Motorola Corporation

Jacqueline Barton, Professor of Chemistry,
California Institute of Technology

Lindy Boggs, Former U.S. Representative, Louisiana

Lewis Branscomb, Professor of Public Service,
Harvard University

Peter Eisenberg, Director, Princeton Materials Institute,
Princeton University

Marye Anne Fox, Professor of Chemistry, University of Texas
at Austin

C. Peter Magrath, President National Association of State
Universities & Land-Grant Colleges

Ruben Mettler, Retired Chairman & CEO, TRW, Inc.

Percy Pierre, Vice President of Research & Graduate Studies,
Michigan State University

Frank Rhodes, President, Cornell University

Earl Richardson, President, Morgan State University

Ian Ross, President Emeritus, AT&T Bell Laboratories

William Rutter, Chairman of the Board, Chiron Corporation
of Emeryville, CA

Donna Shalala, Chancellor, University of Wisconsin, Madison

Commission "will provide a clear and decisive vision of the NSF's role in putting raw knowledge to work for the well being of the Nation."

The bill now goes to a House-Senate conference committee that is expected to meet the week of September 21. Of some concern is that the Senate report language setsides (see *Update* August 10, 1992) for the manufacturing and high performance computing initiative combined with a declining total research budget could mean that the core disciplinary research programs could lose up to 20 percent of their FY 1992 funding for FY 1993. The House report does not create the setsides.

BLUMSTEIN TESTIFIES ON BEHALF OF ASC AND COSSA ON JUSTICE RESEARCH BILL *MB*

Alfred Blumstein, President of the American Society of Criminology (ASC), testified on behalf of ASC and COSSA before the Senate Judiciary Committee, chaired by Sen. Joseph Biden (D-DE), at an August 10 hearing on the reauthorization of the Office of Justice Programs (OJP) at the Department of Justice. While OJP largely serves training and technical assistance roles, it does sponsor social and behavioral science research through the National Institute of Justice (NIJ), Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS), and the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP). There is concern on the part of some in the scientific community that the research programs of the OJP agencies have become adversely affected by political influence. Blumstein, Dean of the H. John Heinz III School of Public Policy and Management at Carnegie Mellon University, is a leading criminologist and a member of the Pennsylvania Sentencing Commission. Appearing before Biden's panel, he gave an overview of the need for a strong justice research program, outlined the concerns of the research community regarding OJP, and suggested several reforms for inclusion in reauthorization.

Blumstein began his testimony by noting that this year is the 25th anniversary of the report of the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, a report which recommended, among other things, the creation of a federal research and development program to address the nation's crime problems. Blumstein, who served on the Commission staff, said that the hope at the time -- which was reflected in the enacting legislation one year later -- was that this federal research effort on crime would someday achieve a success similar to that of the National Institutes of Health.

Arguing that the value of a research and statistics programs depends heavily on its credibility, Blumstein said, "in so ideologically driven a field as criminal justice policy, it is extremely easy to destroy the usefulness of research and statistics products." He said that current practices within the Justice Department are "damaging the effectiveness and the credibility" of the OJP programs. More specifically, Blumstein cited the Attorney General's delegation of grant and contract powers away from the OJP agency heads to the Assistant Attorney General for

OJP (an order the Comptroller General found "violates the terms of the statutes"), a tightening of control over OJP research publications to conform with Justice Department policies and priorities, a shifting of priority areas to short-term action programs and away from basic research, and research budgets which in real dollars have been at best flat. Blumstein noted that the current annual budget for criminal justice research is approximately \$10 million, and commented that this is in contrast with both policymakers and public opinion polls stating that crime is a major problem facing the nation.

Blumstein suggested several possible actions for Congress to take to strengthen OJP's research program. He urged the Senate to include in its reauthorization bill provisions to rescind the Attorney General's delegation of grant powers to the Assistant Attorney General for OJP, establish a direct reporting relationship between the OJP agency heads and the Attorney General, require a peer-review process overseen by an external advisory committee for awarding of grants and contracts, and mandate that OJP function only as a staff support agency for its component agencies and provide programmatic direction.

Biden Sharply Critical of Justice Department

Senator Biden sharply criticized OJP, saying it had become politicized and more responsive to the priorities of the administration than to the needs of state and local law enforcement authorities. He spoke of the need for researchers and practitioners to work together so "those on the front lines know what works." Biden cited the Bureau of Labor Statistics as an excellent model of data collection and dissemination free from political influence. Criticizing political influence over research, Biden decried "Luddites... people who seem to know the answer to every social dilemma facing this country."

With Congress expected to adjourn by mid-October, legislation to reauthorize OJP is likely to be acted upon in the coming weeks. The current authorization for the office expires on September 30. On the Senate side, Senator Biden is in the process of drafting OJP legislation. In the House, the Judiciary Committee recently approved legislation authored by Rep. Charles Schumer (D-NY) that is a "simple" reauthorization; the bill would continue the programs for another two years but does not make any programmatic changes at OJP.

FY 1993 AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATIONS BILL BECOMES LAW

President Bush signed the FY 1993 agriculture appropriations bill on August 14, making it the first of the thirteen spending bills to be enacted into law this year. Both Houses of Congress had passed the conference report on August 11.

The law provides \$97.5 million for the National Research Initiative Competitive Grants (NRI) program, the same as last year. The Markets, Trade and Policy component of the NRI received \$4 million, the same as last year. The Senate included report language that "for each of the other five research areas [of the NRI], a portion of the funds provided should be used to help identify the social, economic, and environmental impacts of alternative research directions and to identify research directions consistent with the full range of research goals."

Payments under the Hatch Act, were allotted \$168.8 million, the same as FY 1992. In the Special Grants category, the Rural Policies Institute at the Universities of Arkansas, Missouri, and Nebraska received \$692,000, which includes \$167,000 to establish the rural health care access project in southeast Arkansas.

The Economic Research Service received \$58.7 million, the same as FY 1992. The National Agricultural Statistical Service received \$81 million, a slight decrease from last year.

SEVERAL NEW DEVELOPMENTS AT EDUCATION RESEARCH OFFICE

ELLIOTT CONFIRMED TO HEAD NCES

Emerson Elliott, who has led National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) since 1984 and has been acting commissioner since 1988, was finally confirmed by the Senate on August 11 to head the agency until June 30, 1995.

As noted in an earlier *Update* (May 4, 1992), in 1987 Congress established a commissioner for NCES with a four year term that would not overlap with a presidential administration. To prevent this overlap the law stated that the new commissioner would not be appointed until June 20, 1991. After a search

NSF RESCISSION DENOUEMENT

In an exchange of letters between Congressional appropriations committees and the National Science Foundation, Congress has finally approved the plan submitted by NSF for taking the \$2 million rescission included in legislation passed on May 21. (see *Update* June 1, 1992).

In a letter dated June 12, NSF Director Walter Massey noted that he had reviewed the 31 previously awarded grants in social and behavioral sciences that Congress had targeted for elimination and deemed "them to be appropriate for NSF support." Therefore, Massey stated that NSF will prorate the \$2 million reduction across all of the research directorates. Each research directorate, including Social, Behavioral and Economic Sciences, lost one-tenth of one percent of their FY 1992 funding.

that wound up with the obvious candidate, Elliott was finally nominated by the administration on April 8, 1992. The Senate confirmation was by voice vote.

FIELD INITIATED AWARDS ANNOUNCED

The Office of Education Research and Improvement (OERI) at the Department of Education has announced the winners of the FY 1992 competition for Field Initiated Studies (FIS) awards. Thirteen grants were funded from 232 proposals.

The grants ranged from \$49,000 to \$98,000 and will support research on such topics as: evaluating Southeast Asian refugee student performance, examining the "story discussion" technique of teaching reading, examining why some minority students do not complete college, analyzing public and private partnerships in developing science enrichment programs, and assessing math skills and abilities among at-risk students.

Although the Department requested \$2 million for FY 1993 for FIS in the hope of increasing the number of awards, the House only appropriated \$966,000, the same amount as FY 1992. The Senate appropriation figure is still undetermined.

GOLDBERG LEAVES OFFICE OF RESEARCH

Milt Goldberg, former director of the Office of Research at OERI, has been appointed Executive Director of the National Commission on Time and Learning (NECTL). John Hodge Jones, Superintendent of Schools in Murfreesboro, TN is the Chairman of the Commission that will study how students spend their time in schools and focus on the question of increasing that time through longer school days and a longer school year. Joseph Conaty has replaced Goldberg as the Acting Director of the Office of Research.

SCHULTZE APPEARS BEFORE JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE

Continuing its series of conversations with leading economists, the Congressional Joint Economic Committee (JEC) heard from Brookings Institution Senior Fellow, Charles Schultze, on August 12. Schultze is a former head of the Council of Economic Advisers during the Carter administration and Director of the Bureau of the Budget during the Johnson years and a current member of the COSSA Board of Directors.

Speaking informally with JEC Vice-Chair Rep. Lee Hamilton (D-IN), Schultze gave his views concerning the short-run and long-term prospects for the American economy. He was not overly optimistic.

The outlook for the short-run, according to Schultze, was an "extremely sluggish recovery," caused by a cautious business community burdened by debt from the 1980s and a capital shortage because American banks, burned by bad loans in the 1980s, had moved their portfolios to safer securities and new lower interest rates were discouraging deposits.

The recession was shallow, but was lasting much longer than anticipated, according to Schultze. He told Hamilton to be wary of quick solutions that would add to the long-term problems facing the economy. Schultze did criticize the Federal Reserve Board for lowering interest rates too slowly.

According to Schultze, the recession does have a silver lining. Because people are much more disturbed by it, the recession has triggered a much greater awareness of the long-term problems.

Those problems include the fact that since the 1970s the growth rate in productivity and income have sharply slowed. There has also been significant maldistribution of growth favoring the upper quintile of the income distribution. In addition, the U.S. savings rate has collapsed in the past ten years (Latest figures suggest it is 3 percent in 1989-90 down from an average of 9.6 percent in the years 1959-80). By comparison the rate is 17 percent in Japan, and 11 percent in Germany. Hamilton speculated that the low savings rate may be due to cultural factors. Schultze did not see any prospects for improvement either, including proposals to revive tax deferred IRAs. As a consequence of these factors, there was less investment and greater borrowing from abroad. The key solution is not tax incentives, according to Schultze, but decreasing the federal deficit, a solution that he admitted might be economically easy, but may be "politically impossible."

The second long-term problem for the U.S. economy, according to Schultze, is the education system has collapsed. Education remains the biggest factor in income maldistribution, he said, stating that the premium to a college education has risen, mainly because non-college folks earnings have decreased substantially. In his opinion, the loss of blue-collar jobs is only part of the story, the exacerbated globalization of trade has made "skills, quality and competence of the workforce," the key to economic growth. How do we get there? Schultze is unsure about what proposed education reforms would work. He does favor proposals that would relate school performance to job performance, using high school transcripts in hiring decisions, and more training for people in the workplace. Providing incentives for businesses to spend 1 to 2 percent of their payrolls on retraining would help, Schultze said.

The third problem is the small fraction of federal support for civilian research and development, particularly outside of health and space research. Schultze would spend more for research with an economic and commercial payoff, but opposes government allocating R&D money, favoring instead a peer review system similar to NIH. (For more of Schultze's view on R&D see *Update*, May 18, 1992.)

Schultze also warned about the macroeconomic consequences of spending on health care. He noted that 60 percent of Gross Domestic Product (GDP) growth is for health care spending. By the end of

the 1990s, without curbs, the U.S. will be spending \$4,900 per capita, up from \$2,700 in 1989.

Hamilton inquired about the relationship between investment spending and deficit reduction. Schultze argued for \$4 of deficit reduction for every \$1 spent on public investment. Asking what the U.S. economy will look like in the next 10-20 years, Schultze foresaw slow growth persisting unless significant policy changes were made.

HS COSSA STAFF HIT THE CONVENTIONS

The COSSA staff spent August attending conventions, not the Republican and Democratic, but the annual meetings of COSSA members. Executive Director Howard J. Silver, chaired two

sessions at the American Political Science Association meeting in Chicago: "The Politics of Research: Sex, Pork and Science," and "Federal Funding For Political Science." He also attended the 100th Anniversary meeting of the American Psychological Association in Washington, DC.

Judy Auerbach, Associate Director for Government Affairs, also attended the APA meeting where she was a panelist for the symposium on "When Science and Policy Meet -- Sex Research and Government Restrictions." In addition, Auerbach attended the American Sociological Association meeting in Pittsburgh, participating in a session on "Funding for the Social Sciences."

KC SOURCES OF RESEARCH SUPPORT: U.S. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

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

Office of Exploratory Research

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), through its Office of Exploratory Research (OER) is seeking grant applications to conduct exploratory research in biology, chemistry, physics, engineering, or socioeconomics. Investigations are sought in these research disciplines which focus on any aspect of pollution identification, characterization, abatement or control, or address the effects of pollutants on the environment. In addition, research is sought on environmental policy and its social and economic consequences. Proposed projects must be investigative research which advances the state of knowledge in the environmental sciences and technology.

Application Procedure: Application kits are available from: U.S. EPA, Grants Operations Branch (PM-216F), 401 M Street, SW, Washington, DC 20460, (202)260-9266.

Eligibility: Academic and nonprofit institutions located in the U.S., and state or local governments are eligible under all existing authorizations. Profit-making firms are eligible only under certain laws, and then under restrictive conditions, including the absence of any profit from the project. Any applicant uncertain of the restrictions should contact EPA's Grant Operation Branch at (202)260-9266.

Budget: The typical grant issued by OER is for a total cost of approximately \$100,000 per year for two or three years. Funding ranges from a minimum of about \$40,000 to approximately \$150,000 per year.

Deadlines: The closing date to this solicitation is February 1, 1993.

Contact: Robert Papetti (202)260-7473 or write to: U.S. EPA, Office of Exploratory Research (RD-675), 401 M Street, SW, Washington, DC 20460.

MEMBERS

American Anthropological Association
American Economic Association
American Historical Association
American Political Science Association

American Psychological Association
American Sociological Association
American Statistical Association

Association of American Geographers
Association of American Law Schools
Linguistic Society of America

AFFILIATES

American Assembly of Collegiate Schools of Business
American Association for Public Opinion Research
American Educational Research Association
American Society of Criminology
Association for Asian Studies
Association for Social Sciences in Health
Association of Research Libraries
Eastern Sociological Society
History of Science Society
International Studies Association

Law and Society Association
Midwest Sociological Society
National Council on Family Relations
National Council for the Social Studies
North American Regional Science Council
North Central Sociological Association
Operations Research Society of America
Population Association of America
Rural Sociology Society
Social Science History Association

Society for Research on Adolescence
Society for Research in Child Development
Society for the Advancement of
Socio-Economics
Society for the Scientific Study of Religion
Society for the Scientific Study of Sex
Southern Sociological Society
Southwestern Social Science Association
Speech Communication Association
The Institute for Management Sciences

CONTRIBUTORS

American Council of Learned Societies
American University
University of Arizona
Arizona State University
Brookings Institution
University of California, Berkeley
University of California, Los Angeles
University of California, San Diego
University of California, Santa Barbara
Carnegie-Mellon University
Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences
University of Chicago
University of Cincinnati
University of Colorado
Cornell Institute for Social and Economic Research
Cornell University
Duke University
Emory University
University of Georgia
Harvard University
University of Illinois

Indiana University
Institute for Social Research, University of
Michigan
University of Iowa
Johns Hopkins University
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public
Affairs, Syracuse University
University of Michigan
Michigan State University
University of Minnesota
University of Missouri
National Opinion Research Center
University of Nebraska
New York University
University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill
North Carolina State University
Northwestern University
Ohio State University
University of Oregon

Pennsylvania State University
University of Pittsburgh
Princeton University
Purdue University
University of Rhode Island
Nelson A. Rockefeller College of Public
Affairs and Policy, State University of New
York at Albany
Social Science Research Council
University of Southern California
Stanford University
State University of New York, Stony Brook
University of Tennessee
Texas A & M University
Tulane University
University of Virginia
University of Washington
University of Wisconsin, Madison
University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee
Yale University

Consortium of Social Science Associations

1522 K Street, NW, Suite 836, Washington, DC 20005
