

COSSA WASHINGTON UPDATE

Volume XIV, Number 16

September 11, 1995

CONGRESS, PRESIDENT SQUARE OFF ON BUDGET; CAN CHAOS BE AVOIDED? *HS*

After an August recess spent listening constituent reaction to the GOP leadership's agenda and recovering from the toll that trying to implement it has taken, members of the 104th Congress return to face a budgetary showdown that threatens to shut down the federal government and send financial markets into disarray.

The chasm of disagreement between President Clinton and congressional leaders regarding the size and scope of government spending occurs at a time when several key pieces of legislation must be approved by Congress -- and signed by the President -- to operate the federal government for Fiscal Year 1996, which begins October 1. Hostages in this game of brinksmanship are individual appropriations for agencies of importance to social scientists (*see chart on page 3*), as well as non-budgetary legislation, such as the reauthorization of the National Science Foundation.

Questions abound. Can the Republican-led Congress and the Democratic-led Administration come together to pass legislation to appropriate funds for government agencies and programs, to provide major spending cuts to balance the budget, and to approve an increase in the debt limit? Or will political posturing and genuine disagreements over the future direction of the country lead to unprecedented turmoil, including shutting down the government because of the inability to spend and borrow funds? The timing of the process now points to mid-November as showdown time.

It appears that the Congress will not have passed all thirteen appropriations bills by the October 1 start of the new fiscal year. As of September 8, the House has passed 11, the Senate seven. Conference committees must still negotiate differences between House and Senate versions of the same appropriations bill, and only one has succeeded in this task so far. Thus, Congress must pass and the President must sign, a Continuing Resolution (CR) to keep

government agencies open past October 1. In the past, most Continuing Resolutions provided short-term funding at the current level or the House passed or Senate passed level for next year, whichever was lower. However, since either the House or Senate may have decided to eliminate an agency or program, new provisions may have to be devised to keep them functioning. At the moment, the House leadership has announced a plan for a 40-day CR that would carry funding into mid-November.

The reconciliation bill provides the broader package of multi-year budgetary reductions necessary to meet Congress' goal of a balanced budget by 2002. Under the instructions in the Budget Resolution that both chambers approved, 12 House and 11 Senate committees must recommend changes in current law to provide \$894 billion in spending cuts over the next seven years. This bill will include the major reductions for Medicare and Medicaid funding and the size of the tax cut. It may also include the major overhaul of the welfare system. Although House committees are supposed to make their recommendations by September 29, it will probably take significantly longer to pass the bill through both the House and Senate and reconcile differences, especially if the bill comes loaded with other legislative provisions.

INSIDE UPDATE...

- Chart: House FY 1996 Appropriations for Agencies that Support Social and Behavioral Science Research
- New Director for NSF Social Science Research
- OMB Continues to Weigh Race and Ethnicity Classification Shift
- NIDA Expands Behavioral Science Portfolio
- Brookings Study Looks at Social Science and Welfare Reform
- Child Care Research Assessed
- COSSA Membership Changes
- Sources of Research Support: Department of Education

The federal government's authority to borrow money in order to keep functioning, will expire in mid-November. This will necessitate an increase in the current debt ceiling of \$4.9 trillion. If the ceiling is not raised, the government can no longer borrow any money, thus disrupting government services. A significant number of Republicans in the House have declared they will not vote to raise the debt limit, unless the balanced budget goals are met and passed.

President Clinton has threatened to veto a number of appropriations bills over disagreements on spending priorities. He has also vowed to veto the reconciliation bill, if it includes extraneous matter, such as a welfare reform bill he opposes. The GOP thinks it can back the President into a corner by attaching reconciliation to the debt-ceiling increase and by shutting down the government. Republicans could accomplish the latter by not extending the CR after it runs out or by not raising the debt ceiling. The government has shut down before, but usually for only for a few days before a compromise was reached. Suspending the government's borrowing authority presumably could severely affect financial markets and delay the issuance of Social Security checks.

The President has announced he is willing to compromise within certain parameters of protecting programs, such as education and training, that he values. Senate Majority Leader Robert Dole (R-KS), campaigning for the Republican presidential nomination, has vowed "no compromise" on the principles that forged the new Republican majority in

CONSORTIUM OF SOCIAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATIONS

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

President:	Charles Schultze
------------	------------------

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 \$65; institutional subscriptions, \$130, overseas mail, \$130. 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

Congress. Members of the Republican leadership in the House are haunted by memories of 1990, the last time they compromised with a President over the budget. That year President Bush broke his "no new taxes" pledge and forged a budget agreement with the then-Democratic Congress, a deal that was denounced by many House Republicans including now-Speaker Newt Gingrich (R-GA).

NEW DIRECTOR FOR NSF SOCIAL SCIENCE DIVISION *145*

William P. Butz has replaced Allan Kornberg as the Director of the Division of Social, Behavioral and Economic Research (SBER) at the National Science Foundation. Kornberg has returned to Duke University, where he is a professor of political science.

Prior to his NSF appointment, Butz served, since 1983, as Associate Director for Demographic Programs at the U.S. Census Bureau. In this position he coordinated programs such as population estimates and projections, major household surveys, and international statistics. Butz has also served as senior economist and Deputy Director of Labor and Population Studies at the Rand Corporation, and as a senior consultant to the U.S. Agency for International Development, the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, the World Bank, and the National Academy of Sciences. He has also been a visiting lecturer in economics at both UCLA and the University of California at Santa Barbara.

Currently serving as the Vice President-Elect of the Population Association of America, Butz also is a member of the American Statistical Association, the American Economic Association, and the American Association for the Advancement of Sciences.

He earned his B.A. in economics from Indiana University in 1965 and pursued graduate study in economics from the University of Chicago. He has authored numerous publications regarding demographics and economics. Butz has also held a Danforth Fellowship and a National Institute of Mental Health Fellowship.

The SBER division is one of three divisions that comprise the Social, Behavioral and Economic Sciences Directorate at NSF.

FISCAL YEAR 1996 HOUSE APPROPRIATIONS FOR AGENCIES THAT SUPPORT SOCIAL AND BEHAVIORAL SCIENCE RESEARCH

(All figures in millions and include rescinded funds where denoted by asterisk)

Agency	Current Funds	FY 96 Request	FY 96 House
National Science Foundation			
Research and Related Activities	2,280.0	2,454.0	2,254.0
Academic Infrastructure	*118.0	100.0	100.0
Education and Human Resources	606.0	599.0	599.0
Dept. of Health and Human Services			
Centers for Disease Control	2,085.8	2,222.6	2,124.9
Asst. Sec. for Planning and Evaluation	*9.4	12.3	9.0
Nat. Inst. of Child Health and Human Dev.	568.8	586.9	595.2
Nat. Inst. on Aging	434.6	447.6	453.9
Nat. Inst. of Nursing Research	52.8	55.0	55.8
Nat. Inst. on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism	190.1	195.8	198.6
Nat. Inst. on Drug Abuse	437.4	452.0	458.4
Nat. Inst. of Mental Health	631.3	652.1	661.3
Department of Agriculture			
National Research Initiative	94.8	130.0	98.2
Economic Research Service	53.5	54.7	53.1
Dept. of Commerce/Census Bureau			
Periodic Censuses and Programs	142.0	193.5	135.0
Salaries and Expenses	136.0	154.8	136.0
Department of Education			
Education Research	86.2	97.6	106.4
Education Statistics	48.2	57.0	48.2
Assessment	32.8	38.0	32.8
Harris Fellowships	*10.1	0	0
Javits Fellowships	*6.8	0	0
International Programs	59.1	59.1	56.3
Law School Clinical Experience	*13.2	0	0
Dept. of Housing and Urban Development			
Policy Development and Research	42.0	42.0	34.0
Department of Justice			
National Institute of Justice	27.0	27.7	28.0
Bureau of Justice Statistics	21.4	22.0	21.4
Juvenile Justice	155.3	144.0	148.5
Department of Labor			
Bureau of Labor Statistics	*297.6	320.3	297.0
Natl. Endowment for the Humanities			
	*172.0	182.0	99.5
Smithsonian Institution			
Woodrow Wilson Center	*9.9	10.0	5.1
U.S Information Agency			
Educational and Cultural Exchanges	*238.3	252.7	192.1

OMB CONTINUES TO WEIGH RACE AND ETHNICITY CLASSIFICATION SHIFT *HS*

The Office of Management and Budget (OMB) continues to ponder the necessity of changing the way the federal government asks about and classifies federal data concerning the race and ethnicity of Americans. The answers to these questions guide policy development, program evaluation, and civil rights law monitoring and enforcement, as well as provide data for analyses of social, economic, and health trends for population groups. The August 28, 1995 Federal Register (pp. 44674-44693) provides an interim notice of review and possible revision of OMB's Statistical Policy Directive No. 15, which has governed this issue since 1977.

The eighteen year old policy directive has come under increasing criticism in recent years from those who believe that the minimum racial and ethnic categories it establishes do not reflect the increasing diversity of the nation's population. In response to these criticisms OMB has initiated a review of the directive that has included a workshop held in February 1994 by the Committee on National Statistics of the National Academy of Sciences, a series of public hearings around the country, comments from federal agencies on their requirements for racial and ethnic data, development of a research agenda and related literature reviews, and an earlier Federal Register notice (June 9, 1994) requesting public comment on possible changes. In addition, Congress has held a series of hearings on this subject.

The current notice summarizes suggestions for changes, discusses the research agenda for some of the identified issues, and sets forth proposed principles to guide the final decision on whether to change the categories. The public may comment on these by writing by September 30. For more details on commenting, contact OMB at (202) 395-3093.

Issues raised by the public comments include: 1) Should the federal government collect data on race and ethnicity? 2) Should Directive 15 be revised? Should there be different collection standards for different purposes? 3) Should "race/ethnicity" be asked as a single identification or should "race" identification be separate from Hispanic origin or other ethnicities? 4) Should self-identification or the perception of an observer guide the methods for collection of racial and

ethnic data? 5) Should population size and geographic distribution of groups be criteria in the final decision regarding Directive No. 15 categories? 6) What should the specific data and presentation categories be, including whether there is a need for a "multiracial" classification?

Others considerations for OMB include: maintaining historical continuity of the data; having the federal government and state governments using the same categories; and the costs of changing the classification system.

Options for Change

Some options proposed by agency and public comment include: collect data for White ethnic groups according to country of ancestral origin; create a separate category for Arabs/Middle Easterners; collect data for Black ethnic groups according to geographic origin of Black ancestors; provide a separate category for Cape Verdeans; split the "Asian/Pacific Islander" category in two; specify major Asian nationality groups (this was done in the 1990 census); develop a new category for original peoples of acquired American lands ("indigenous" populations); have a separate category of Native Hawaiians; collect data for population subgroups of the "Hispanic origin" category; and various suggestions for dealing with the "multiracial" option.

OMB continues to support research that focuses on some of the proposed options. The Bureau of Labor Statistics, through the Current Population Survey, is field testing options that will provide information about multiracial categorization and combining race and Hispanic origin. Other research is examining the idea of combining the concepts of race, ethnicity, and ancestry. The Census Bureau has been conducting cognitive research on these issues as well. The National Center on Health Statistics, the National Center for Education Statistics, and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention are all involved in exploring the effects of changing categories on administrative records at both the national and state levels.

A schedule laid out in the notice suggests that OMB will try to reach a final decision on this issue by mid-1997. One option for OMB is to not change anything.

NIDA EXPANDS BEHAVIORAL SCIENCE PORTFOLIO AS

In an effort to expand its behavioral science research initiative, the National Institute of Drug Abuse (NIDA) has established a Behavioral Sciences Research Branch (BSRB) in its Division of Basic Research. Created as part of a restructuring of the Institute, the office reflects NIDA Director Alan Leshner's efforts to broaden its commitment to behavioral science and to close some of what he believes are major gaps in its social and behavioral research portfolio.

Jaylan S. Turkkan, a research psychologist whose background and research experience is in behavioral physiology and behavioral medicine, will lead NIDA's efforts to widen the focus of its basic behavioral research to include social and cognitive research. Approximately \$2 million in grants will be available in Fiscal Year 1996 to support the expansion of NIDA's basic behavioral research. Turkkan noted that this will fund "6 to 7 new grants in new areas."

A "broader view of related behavioral processes"

According to Turkkan, who stressed the need for very basic kinds of behavioral research, the BSRB is taking a "broader view of related behavioral processes and aspects of drug abuse such as cognition and perception, motivation, and social factors." A result of this broader view is that the research does not have to focus on the use of abused drugs. However, it must have clear potential for further study regarding drug abuse in order to obtain support from BSRB. "Both laboratory studies and comparably controlled procedures that use behavioral measurements, that employ basic behavioral models that study basic behavioral processes will be considered." Behavior change models relating to HIV/AIDS will also be supported by BSRB.

For further information regarding BSRB, direct inquiries to: Jaylan S. Turkkan, National Institute on Drug Abuse, Room 10A-20, 5600 Fishers Lane, Rockville, MD 20852, phone: (301) 443-1263; fax: (301) 594-9043; email: jaylan@nih.gov.

BROOKINGS STUDY LOOKS AT SOCIAL SCIENCE AND WELFARE REFORM AS

As the Senate begins to overhaul our nation's welfare system, a new study from the Brookings Institution said that "political and budgetary calculations have often drowned out evidence about what is and is not likely to work in addressing the problems of poverty and dependence among low-income families." In releasing the report, *Looking Before We Leap: Social Science and Welfare Reform*, Brookings President Bruce MacLaury said, "this paper is intended to help fill in this gap." It recommends specific legislative steps that could be taken to improve poverty programs.

Edited by R. Kent Weaver and William T. Dickens, the study addresses a number of the issues surrounding the current debate such as family caps, teen mother exclusions, the potential for moving poor single-parent families from welfare to work and the consequences of the converting the AFDC program into a block grant. The editors state that "social science ... can provide important insights regarding the promise, limitations and risks associated with many of the welfare reform proposals currently on the policy agenda." They believe it is important that "federal policy makers look at available evidence before leaping into untested welfare reforms."

Cite Role of Social Science in Policy Formulation

Weaver and Dickens also state that "the degree as well as the direction of innovation in welfare policies should be guided by the information that social science provides." Social scientists have learned a great deal, and legislation should be formed by what we know, they state. Dickens, however, admits that there is much that social scientists do not know and that policy makers should proceed very cautiously and very carefully with limited experiments.

According to the editors, none of the "'looking before we leap' principles are being heeded in the current debate. The current round of welfare reform has been driven primarily by political competition, deficit reduction pressures, and wishful thinking about the behavioral effects of policy change." Dickens predicts "that we will be back at this again in a few years."

Chapter 2 of the study discusses the financing arrangements for the family assistance program, particularly the implications of block grants. A "welfare primer" focusing on specific problems within the welfare system, i.e., out-of-wedlock births, employment difficulties, and current proposals for addressing those problems are noted in Chapter 3. Chapter 4 examines the implementation of welfare programs and the capacity of states to assume a larger role. Chapter 5 takes a historical look at past welfare reform efforts and the traps that policy makers have encountered. Finally, Chapter 6 examines public opinion on welfare issues.

"Look before we leap"

Weaver and Dickens acknowledge that the report is not meant to be considered as a comprehensive plan for welfare reform, however, "the 'look before we leap' principles suggest a number of specific policy recommendations for this round of welfare reform."

Contributors to the study included: Rebecca Blank, Northwestern University; Evelyn Z. Brodtkin, University of Chicago; Gary Burtless, The Brookings Institution; Lawrence Jacobs, University of Minnesota; LaDonna Pavetti, The Urban Institute; Robert Reischauer, The Brookings Institution; Mark Rom, Georgetown University; and Robert Y. Shapiro, Columbia University.

For a copy of the study contact Brookings at (202) 797-6105.

CHILD CARE RESEARCH ASSESSED *MB*

At the request of the Department of Health and Human Services, the National Academy of Sciences' Board on Children convened three workshops on child care for low-income families. The first two have been summarized in a new report that focuses on what is known from research on this topic. The findings of the third, involving research priorities, will be released later this year.

The key conclusions of the report:

- The price of child care and the job demands of low-wage workers pose serious constraints to the

child care options realistically available to low-income working families;

- There is consistent evidence of a relatively low supply of care for infants, school-age children, children with special needs, and children whose parents work unconventional or shifting hours. This exacerbates other barriers these parents may face;
- The quality of care available to low-income families is highly uneven, with this variation in quality having discernible effects on development;
- Federal funding levels that restrict states' capacity to provide subsidies to all eligible families and pressures on state budgets that affect their willingness to match federal dollars, as well as fragmented structure of subsidies, lead to a series of detrimental consequences.

For a copy of the report, *Child Care for Low-Income Families: Summary of Two Workshops*, contact the Board at (202) 334-2998.

COSSA MEMBERSHIP CHANGES *MB*

COSSA is pleased to announce that Bowling Green State University has joined the Consortium as a Contributor.

Also, two COSSA Affiliates, the Operations Research Society of America and The Institute for Management Sciences, have merged. The new organization, Institute For Operations Research and the Management Sciences, (INFORMS) will be an Affiliate.

We look forward to working with both organizations in the future on issues of common concern.

**SOURCES OF RESEARCH SUPPORT:
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION** *kc*

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.

Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education

The purpose of this program is to provide grants or enter into cooperative agreements to improve postsecondary education opportunities.

Application Procedure: In evaluating applications for grants under this program competition, the Secretary uses the following selection criteria:

- *Significance for Postsecondary Education*
- *Feasibility*
- *Appropriateness of Funding Projects.*

All applicants must submit a preapplication to be eligible to submit a final application. For preapplications greater weight will be given to the selection criteria under Significance for Postsecondary Education. Equal weight will be given to Feasibility and Appropriateness of Funding Projects. For final applications, all criteria are equally important.

Eligible Applicants: Institutions of higher education or combinations of such institutions and other public and private nonprofit educational institutions and agencies.

Available Funds: The Administration's request for the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education for FY 1996 is \$17,543,000. Of this amount, it is anticipated that approximately \$5,325,000 will be available for an estimated 75 new awards under the Comprehensive Program.

The Congress has not yet completed action on the FY 1996 appropriation. The estimates in this notice assume passage of the Administration's request. Awards will range from \$15,000 to \$150,000 per year.

Deadlines: The deadline for preapplication transmittal is October 18, 1995, with the final deadline being March 18, 1996.

Contact: For applications or information contact:

Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE)
U.S. Department of Education
Room 3100, ROB-3
600 Independence Avenue, SW
Washington, DC 20202-5175

Telephone: (202)708-5750

MEMBERS

American Anthropological Association
American Economic 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

AFFILIATES

American Agricultural Economics Association
American Assembly of Collegiate Schools of Business
American Association for Public Opinion Research
American Council on Consumer Interests
American Educational Research Association
Association for Asian Studies
Association for Public Policy
Analysis and Management
Association of Research Libraries
Eastern Sociological Society

History of Science Society
International Studies Association
Institute For Operations Research
and the Management Sciences
Midwest Sociological Society
National Council on Family Relations
North American Regional Science Council
North Central Sociological Association
Population Association of America
Rural Sociological Society

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 Sexuality
Sociologists for Women in Society
Southern Sociological Society
Southwestern Social Science Association
Speech Communication Association

CONTRIBUTORS

American Council of Learned Societies
American Institutes for Research
University of Arizona
Arizona State University
Bowling Green 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
Clark University
University of Colorado
Columbia University
Cornell Institute for Social and Economic Research
Cornell University
Criminal Justice Center, Sam Houston State University
Duke University
Emory University

University of Georgia
Harvard University
University of Illinois
Indiana University
Institute for Social Research, University of
Michigan
Institute for the Advancement of
Social Work Research
Institute for Women's Policy Research
University of Iowa
Johns Hopkins University
Kansas State University
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public
Affairs, Syracuse University
University of Michigan
Michigan State University
University of Minnesota
National Bureau of Economic Research
National Opinion Research Center
Nelson Rockefeller Institute of Government

New York University
University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill
North Carolina State University
Northwestern University
Ohio State University
University of Oregon
Pennsylvania State University
Princeton University
Purdue University
University of Rhode Island
Social Science Research Council
State University of New York, Binghamton
State University of New York, Stony Brook
University of Tennessee
University of Texas, Austin
Texas A & M University
Tulane University
University of Washington
University of Wisconsin, Madison
University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee
Yale University

Consortium of Social Science Associations

1522 K Street, N.W., Suite 836, Washington, D.C. 20005
