

COSSA WASHINGTON UPDATE

Volume XIV, Number 18

October 16, 1995

HOUSE PASSES OMNIBUS SCIENCE BILL *HS*

On October 12 the House of Representatives passed an omnibus science bill that included authorizations for seven agencies under its jurisdiction including the National Science Foundation (NSF). The debate on the House floor and the changes in the bill did not affect NSF at all.

The authorization that emerged from the Science Committee on June 28 remains intact. The two year authorization still includes the provision requiring NSF to reduce the number of its directorates from seven to six and reduces authorized funding for the SBE directorate by \$2.5 million to \$111.3 million for FY 1996. (see *Update*, July 3). It also includes language asking for a report by November 15 on how NSF is going to fulfill the mandate to reduce the number of directorates. Since the bill has only passed the House, NSF officials have taken a wait-and-see attitude and have told Walker they are contemplating a review of the whole structure of NSF, with reducing the number of directorates as a possible option.

The intention of House Science Committee Chairman Rep. Robert Walker (R-PA) to combine the seven authorization bills was to allow Congress to consider science as a whole package. Walker has also been promoting the idea of a Department of Science and the omnibus legislation could be seen as a prelude to consolidation of these agencies. The six other authorizations included in the omnibus legislation are: EPA research and development, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Energy Department civilian research, the Fire Administration, NASA (excluding the Space Station whose authorization was passed in a separate bill), and the National Institute for Science and Technology.

Many of these agencies' authorizations, including NSF, have not been considered or passed by the Senate. Since committee jurisdictions in the Senate would preclude one committee from bringing all these authorizations to the floor at once, either most of the authorizations will have to wait until next year, or they could be slipped into some legislative vehicle late in

the session. In addition, the White House has indicated that it has problems with the omnibus bill as it currently exists.

SENATORS DISCUSS SOCIAL SCIENCE DIRECTORATE DURING NSF DEBATE *HS*

During the Senate debate on the VA, HUD, Independent Agencies Appropriations bill on September 27, three key Senators discussed the importance of the Social, Behavioral and Economic Sciences (SBE) directorate at the National Science Foundation.

Sens. Christopher 'Kit' Bond (R-MO), Barbara Mikulski (D-MD), and Daniel Inouye (D-HI) engaged in a colloquy to impress upon the members of the Senate and the NSF the necessity to support funding for SBE. Bond is chairman of the VA, HUD, Independent Agencies appropriations subcommittee, Mikulski, the ranking Democrat on the Subcommittee, and Inouye, a member of the full appropriations committee.

Inouye initiated the conversation, asking Bond: "Is it the chairman's intention that ... NSF's programs

INSIDE UPDATE...

- Senate Alters Crime, Statistics Funding
- Agricultural Funding Compromise Retains Research Mix
- Troubles Continue for Foreign Study Program
- Congress Revises Job Training: Research to Stay at Federal Level
- Task Force Outlines Priorities In Aging Research
- Massive Study of Research Doctorate Programs Released
- Justice Department Releases Report on Juvenile Offenders
- Sources of Research Support: Arms Control and Disarmament Agency

in the Social, Behavioral and Economic Sciences Directorate will receive equitable treatment with other research disciplines?" Bond responded: "It is my intention and my expectation that the NSF would continue the current practice of recommending support levels for that Directorate and for the programs represented by the Human Capital Initiative, within the overall funding recommendations of the committee in its operating plan. ... We generally accord the recommendations of the Foundation considerable deference given the technical nature of many of these allocation decisions, and it is my intention to continue this practice."

Mikulski, who as past chair of the appropriations subcommittee strongly supported the creation of the SBE directorate in 1991, noted: "It would be a matter of great concern to me if any area of research at the National Science Foundation is singled out and given inappropriate reductions in funding. Our support for the Social, Behavioral and Economic Sciences Directorate and for the Human Capital Initiative must continue to be strong and I hope to see those programs funded as generously as our appropriations will allow."

A colloquy on the floor is intended to clarify congressional intent and to send a message. In this case, the strong support sounded by these three Senators provides an antidote to the language denigrating SBE research in the report of the House Science Committee (see *Update*, August 14).

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

The NSF appropriation emerged from the Senate unscathed from the funding provided by the appropriations committee (see *Update*, September 25). The full VA, HUD, Independent Agencies bill remains a major veto target, and thus the conference committee needed to reconcile the \$40 million difference in NSF research funding (House \$2.254 million, Senate \$2.294 million) may be delayed pending negotiations between the White House and Congress over larger budgetary issues.

SENATE ALTERS CRIME, STATISTICS FUNDING

m/b

On September 29 the Senate adopted Fiscal Year 1996 funding for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State. Unless noted below, appropriations for programs affecting social and behavioral scientists remain the same as those reported in the September 25 issue of *Update*.

The Senate deleted provisions in the bill, drafted by Commerce, Justice, State Appropriations Subcommittee Chair Phil Gramm (R-TX), that were similar to the anti-crime package adopted by the House. In February the House voted to eliminate most of the federal crime prevention and domestic spending programs of the 1994 crime bill and replace them with block grants to the states for their own anti-crime efforts. The Senate bill had incorporated provisions, initiated and advocated by COSSA, that would reserve \$60 million of the block grants in FY 1996 for federally-sponsored research and evaluation of anti-crime programs. Senate Democrats had threatened to block the bill if it included the repeal of the 1994 crime law.

Also during the full Senate consideration of the bill, Sen. Pete Domenici (R-NM) successfully offered an amendment to restore \$340 million to the Legal Services Corporation. To help offset the costs of this addition, Domenici's amendment reduced the salaries and expenses item at the Census Bureau from \$144.8 million to \$133.8 million and the Commerce Department's Economic and Statistical Analysis line item was reduced from \$57.2 million to \$46.9 million.

AGRICULTURAL FUNDING COMPROMISE RETAINS RESEARCH MIX

HS

For the past few years the research supported by the U.S. Department of Agriculture has been a mix of competitive, peer-reviewed grants, and special grants, usually supported by particular members of Congress. The appropriations bill that emerged from the House-Senate conference committee preserved the combination amidst shifting of funding priorities.

The National Research Initiative Competitive Grants program (NRI) went into the conference having received \$98.2 million from the House and \$99.6 million from the Senate. Instead of following usual conference committee actions and splitting the difference, the conferees agreed on a reduced figure of \$96.4 million, still a \$1.8 million increase over the comparable FY 1995 funding. The Markets, Trade, and Policy component of the NRI wound up with a slight increase of \$300,000 to \$4 million.

The decrease for the NRI occurred to help fund the Special Grants appropriation at \$49.9 million. The House had allocated \$31.9 million, the Senate \$42.7 million, for over 100 non-competitively awarded grants. The Senate defeated 64-34 an amendment on the Senate floor by Sens. Russell Feingold (D-WI) and John McCain (R-AZ) to subject these grants to peer review. The grants include \$1.6 million for continued research on global change, and \$644,000 for the Rural Policies Institute. Under federally administered programs, the Senate provided continued funding, at last year's level of \$939,000, for the development of geographic information systems. The House did not provide any funding, but the conference committee agreed with the Senate.

Payments under the Hatch Act received \$168.7 million from the conference committee, splitting the difference between the House and Senate recommendations. This is a \$2.6 million reduction from last year's appropriated level. The Economics Research Service received the House passed \$53.1 million, rather than the Senate allocation of \$53.5 million. The conference committee provided \$427.8 million for extension activities, a \$9 million decrease from last year's appropriated level.

Unlike a number of other appropriations bills, the White House has not threatened to veto this one.

TROUBLES CONTINUE FOR FOREIGN STUDY PROGRAM

HS

The oft-troubled National Security Education Program is facing yet another challenge on Capitol Hill. NSEP, which supports area studies programs from a trust fund drawn from money that had been allocated for defense and intelligence, has survived significant legislative and bureaucratic obstacles since its 1991 creation.

This year is no exception. Earlier this year to the House voted to effectively abolish the program. A last-minute effort by Sen. Paul Simon (D-IL) led to the Senate appropriating \$7.5 million from the trust fund for FY 1996.

While a conference committee sided with the Senate number, the agreement that on one hand saved NSEP also included language that would significantly alter the program. The conference report changed NSEP to require grantees to serve two years in the Defense Department or in the intelligence community or repay the grant in full. Furthermore, recipients must now be engaged in a field of study that is considered a critical shortage to the defense or intelligence community. NSEP leaders and exchange advocates say that these changes would sharply decrease both the number of applicants and the stature of the program.

The conference agreement was recently rejected by the House because of its several key defense programs it contained. As the issue now returns to a conference committee, international education advocates are once again fighting to save NSEP.

CONGRESS REVISES JOB TRAINING; RESEARCH TO STAY AT FEDERAL LEVEL

HS

Both the House and Senate have recently passed legislation to overhaul the nation's job training system. Although the system has generally relied on State and local governments to provide most of the programs, the new bills specifically block grant federal funds to the States for adult and vocational education and workforce development and training. Both bills maintain research and data collection on labor market information and evaluation of State programs as part of a substantially reduced federal role.

The bills repeal the Job Training Partnership Act, the Carl Perkins Vocational and Adult Education Act, and the School-to-Work Opportunities Act and the Senate bill eliminates the Employment and Training Administration at the Department of Labor and the Office of Adult and Vocational Education at the Department of Education.

The House bill (H.R. 1617), passed on September 19 by a vote of 345-179, creates three separate block grants: Youth Development and Career Preparation; Adult Employment and Training; and Adult Education and Family Literacy. The first grant provides states and localities maximum flexibility to design youth development programs focusing on in-school activities, school, community and business partnerships, and programs addressing at-risk youngsters. Twenty percent of the authorized funds, or at least \$25 million, are reserved to carry out research, including assessment, data collection, development, technical assistance and dissemination on activities that combine academic, vocational-technical, and work-based learning. Both bills establish a competitively awarded National Center for Research in Education and Workforce Development. The Center would be required to produce an annual report for the Congress summarizing key research findings.

The Adult Employment and Training consolidation provides States funds to establish and run their own "integrated career systems" for adults. The States must develop plans to demonstrate how they will serve the employment and training needs of dislocated workers, economically disadvantaged individuals, older workers, individuals with disabilities, displaced homemakers, and veterans. Services the States can provide include basic skills training, occupational skills training, on-the-job training, and entrepreneurial training.

The research section includes activities supported by the U.S. Department of Labor to conduct continuing research to determine the extent to which individuals who participate in these programs achieve self-sufficiency as a result of such participation. Congress is particularly interested in whether the job training and job placement programs raise the hourly wage rates of individuals receiving training through such programs. Fifteen percent of the authorized funds for this block grant are set-aside for these research and evaluation programs as well as targeted

grants for major economic dislocations, disaster relief employment assistance, and workforce skills and development loans.

The third block grant in the House bill devolves to the States funding for adult literacy and parent training. It preserves the National Institute for Literacy and includes national programs for research and evaluation activities on these state programs. This block grant also consolidates federal library service programs through grants to the States, the Senate does not include this provision.

Bureau of Labor Statistics Retains Key Role

Both bills also preserve a federal role in strengthening the planning, administration, oversight and evaluation of the nation's labor market information system. The Bureau of Labor Statistics will continue to be the primary agency responsible for this system.

Another feature the House bill includes is the repeal of authorizations from the Higher Education Act. Some of these programs have never been funded, but others such as the Harris and Javits fellowship program and the Law School Clinical Experience program did receive funds for FY 1996 in the Senate Labor, HHS, Education appropriations bill that emerged from the appropriations committee.

The Senate bill (S. 143), passed on October 11 by a vote of 98-2, creates a single block grant that covers many of the same areas as the House bill. The national activities portion of the bill includes the development of a formal Workforce Development Partnership between the Secretaries of Education and Labor (a prelude to combining the Departments?), directed by a 13 member Board. The Board will be responsible for insuring that there is a relationship between the labor market information system and a State job training accountability system. This accountability system will depend on quantifiable performance benchmarks for job placements as well as academic achievement.

The bills need reconciliation by a House-Senate conference committee. Given the large margins for enactment in both Houses, and general support for these ideas in the White House, it appears likely that major reform of workforce preparation and development programs will occur.

TASK FORCE OUTLINES PRIORITIES IN AGING RESEARCH

AS

Recommendations for priorities in future research on aging are included in the recently released Federal Task Force on Aging Research, *The Threshold of Discovery: Future Directions for Research on Aging*. The panel, consisting of 38 members from Congress, federal agencies and the public was authorized by Congress in 1990 to "assess progress in the scientific understanding of aging."

More than 190 specific recommendations for increased emphasis in 10 general areas of research are cited in the report. Those areas include: biological processes, diseases and disabilities, mental disorders, health care, social and behavioral functioning, an aging society, economic securities, social and supportive services, special populations, and research and data resources.

The report, a culmination of more than two years of effort, cites three overarching observations that can be made that argue for increased support for aging research:

- The impressive knowledge base that has been provided by past research;
- "The current aging of the American population and the coming tidal wave of aging baby boomers constitute a compelling argument for increasing public investment in aging research;"
- The potential that "exists for major scientific advances in the near future."

Social and Behavioral Functioning

In the report's social and behavioral functioning section, the task force acknowledges that "an understanding of social and behavioral functioning is central to maintaining vitality, health and independent function in late adulthood." The panel further states that "behavioral issues are at the core of many of the recommendations" contained in other sections of the report and investments in behavioral research on aging has resulted in some important successes. It is the panel's judgement that research in the social and behavior functioning areas can "lead to significant gains in the quality of the lives of older adults and can have economic implications for health care expenditures as well as for our workforce." The panel believes its recommendations "should make clear that

both basic and applied research in the behavioral sciences have much to contribute toward ensuring sustained well-being and health into late adulthood."

The National Institute on Aging is the lead federal agency conducting and supporting research on biomedical, social, and behavior aspects of aging. Ronald P. Abeles, NIA Associate Director for Behavioral and Social Research served as executive secretary of the task force. Copies of the report are available from NIA at (800) 222-2225.

MASSIVE STUDY OF RESEARCH DOCTORATE PROGRAMS RELEASED

AS

On September 12, the National Research Council released its massive study of *Research Doctorate Programs in the United States*. The 740 page report assessing the quality and effectiveness of doctoral programs updates a 1982 report produced by the same organization. A sixteen member committee co-chaired by Marvin L. Goldberger, Dean for Natural Sciences at the University of California, San Diego, and Brendan Maher, Professor of Psychology at Harvard, oversaw the preparation and production of the report.

The study examines more than 3,600 doctoral programs in 41 fields at 274 universities. Under the criteria established by the committee, some newer and smaller programs were omitted. According to its producers, the data presented should be useful to prospective graduate students in selecting programs, and by administrators and policy-makers in setting priorities and allocating resources.

The study analyzed graduate education from a number of perspectives. It utilized data provided by universities about the students and faculty participating in their programs. National data bases produced indicators of faculty research productivity and furnished demographic characteristics of program graduates. In addition, the study relied on survey results from nearly 8,000 university faculty members who assessed each program's effectiveness in training scholars and research scientists and the scholarly quality of faculty.

These data provided the basis for the ranking of institutions in each discipline along a number of dimensions. Despite attempts by those who put the

report together to downplay the rankings, the who's number one, who's in the top ten, mentality so common to other facets of American life will clearly affect this study as well. Programs at the top of the lists will boast of their proficiency. Programs at the bottom will face the choice of elimination or upgrading.

Comparing the findings from the recent study to the earlier 1982 effort indicated:

- Programs that were included in the earlier study tended to have similar ratings 10 years later;
- It is taking longer to earn a doctorate at almost every institution in almost every field, although, on average, the time to degree is greatest at lower rated programs;
- Women and minorities are still underrepresented in many fields, but they are as likely to graduate from highly rated programs as non-minority males;
- Highly rated programs tend to be larger, as measured by the number of faculty members, graduate students, and degrees conferred; and
- On average, the number of program faculty has increased since 1982 in every field common to both assessments, including many fields in the social and behavioral sciences and arts and humanities where the number of program graduates has declined.

The committee encouraged scholars to use data in the report to test hypotheses and conduct analyses. An electronic file of selected tables from the report is available on the World Wide Web at <http://www.nas.edu>. In addition, a CD-ROM that will include more detailed program level data is being developed and will be distributed for public use.

To purchase copies of the report contact the National Academy of Sciences Press 1-800-624-6242.

JUSTICE DEPARTMENT RELEASES REPORT ON JUVENILE OFFENDERS MB

The Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention has released a new report containing a comprehensive summary of authoritative statistics on the nature and extent of juvenile offending and victimization.

The document, *Juvenile Offenders and Victims: A National Report*, will be a primary reference source for all those interested in juvenile justice issues. The publication is designed as a series of short briefing papers on specific topics -- with clear, nontechnical writing and easy-to-understand graphs and tables.

The authors of the report, Howard Snyder and Melissa Sickmund of the National Center for Juvenile Justice, have answered the most frequently asked questions about juvenile crime and the juvenile justice system. The topics range from the expected growth in the U.S. juvenile population, child poverty, single-parent families, unwed mothers, and school dropout rates, to the violent victimization of children, official responses to child abuse/neglect, violent crime by juveniles, juvenile drug use, juvenile arrest, prosecution and commitment trends, and the imposition of the death penalty. Throughout the report, geographical variations are emphasized in State-level tables and county-level maps.

To obtain a copy, contact the Juvenile Justice Clearinghouse at (800) 638-8736.

SOURCES OF RESEARCH SUPPORT: *KC*
UNITED STATES ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT 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.

Hubert H. Humphrey Doctoral Fellowship Program

The United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency will conduct a competition in 1996 for one-year Hubert H. Humphrey Fellowships in support of unclassified doctoral dissertation research in arms control, nonproliferation and disarmament studies.

Eligible Applicants: In addition to Ph.D. candidates, law candidates for the Juris Doctor are also eligible if they are writing a substantial paper in partial fulfillment of degree requirements. Qualified applicants must be citizens of the United States and degree candidates at a U.S. college or university.

Funding: The fellowship stipends for the Ph.D. candidates will be \$8,000 plus reimbursement for tuition and fees up to a maximum of \$6,000. Stipends and tuition for law candidates will be prorated according to the number of credits given for the research paper.

Deadlines: The application deadline for the 1996 competition is March 15, 1996. Awards will be for a twelve month period beginning in September, 1996 or January, 1997.

Contact: For information and application materials please write to: Hubert H. Humphrey Doctoral Fellowship Program, U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, 320 21st Street, NW, Washington, DC 20451; or call (703) 302-7714.

William C. Foster Fellows Visiting Scholars Program

The U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency (ACDA) will conduct a competition to select visiting scholars to serve at the Agency during the 1996-97 academic year. University faculty from a variety of fields are sought, including those in the physical sciences, international relations, economics, engineering, chemistry, biology, mathematics and computer science.

Up to six fellows will be selected in 1996. Visiting scholars participate in a wide range of Agency activities, such as performing arms control research and analyses, evaluating data relating to compliance with treaties in force, supporting interagency development of arms control policy, and taking part in international arms control and disarmament negotiations.

Deadline: The application deadline for assignments for the 1996-97 academic year is January 31, 1996. ACDA expects to announce tentative selections in June, 1996.

Contact: For an information brochure, please write to: Foster Fellows Program, U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, 320 21st Street, NW, Washington, DC 20451; or call (703) 302-7714.

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
