

1997 IN WASHINGTON: BUDGET AGREEMENT, SPENDING INCREASES, FOCUS ON ACCOUNTABILITY *HS*

With Congress back home and the President and Vice President busy attending opening events at the new downtown MCI Center arena, a look back at the political year in Washington seems appropriate. It was clearly a year dominated by an agreement to balance the budget by 2002, even though an expanding economy may preempt the deal by balancing the budget sooner. The pact between the President and Congress also allowed appropriations to rise and taxes to go down. In addition, a four year old law became the focus of agency activities and congressional oversight.

The year began with continuing tensions over efforts to balance the federal budget. The Republican majority in Congress still sought a constitutional amendment to force the issue, while the President presented a budget that, he claimed, would produce a surplus in 2002. His critics accused him of backloading the spending cuts necessary to reach that goal at the end of the period when he would no longer hold the presidency. The Congressional Budget Office (CBO) predicted a FY 1997 deficit of around \$165 billion.

In early May, CBO estimated that the deficit for FY 1997 would only amount to \$65 billion and that the federal deficit would be \$225 billion less in the next five years than previously anticipated. This served as the impetus for the deal between the White House and Congress to balance the budget, through some entitlement reform, limits on discretionary spending and tax relief. The details were left to the appropriating and tax writing committees of Congress.

By the time those decisions reached completion in early November, the FY 1997 deficit turned out to be only \$23 billion, the lowest fiscal year deficit in 25 years. This allowed spending on domestic

discretionary programs to rise by almost 9 percent, the largest increase in eight years. By contrast, defense spending rose by a little over 2.2 percent from last year's level. Policymakers began scheming on how to spend a surplus that might occur next year. Already, legislation has been introduced to double funding for NIH in five years and for other science agencies in ten years. A report to the President's Committee of Advisers on Science and Technology has called for spending \$1.5 billion a year on education research.

This increase in domestic spending allowed the two major science agencies, the National Institutes of Health and the National Science Foundation (NSF), to receive 7 and 5 percent increases, respectively, over their previous year's funding. Education programs, a presidential priority, did remarkably well both in spending decisions and in the enactment of a new set of tax provisions to help people finance higher education. (For a full description of appropriations decisions see the chart on page 3).

Government Performance and Results Act

This year also saw an obscure law passed in 1993 jump to center stage. The intention of the Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) is to force government agencies, through strategic plans and performance measures, to justify their

INSIDE UPDATE

- **Infrastructure and Databases in the Social and Behavioral Sciences Focus of Meetings**
- **Kelling Speaks at NIJ Lecture; Sherman Testifies Before Congress**
- **Federal Appointments Roundup**

expenditure of taxpayer money. On September 30, all agencies presented their strategic plans to Congress; the House Republican leadership has graded most of these plans as failing to meet GPRA requirements (The Departments of Education, Transportation and the National Science Foundation were judged the top three).

In February, the agencies, with the release of their FY 1999 budget proposals, will present performance plans that will include outcome measures and attempt to explain how their budget expenditures will relate to these measures. The agencies that support basic research are trying to convince the GPRA judges, the Office of Management and Budget and the Congress, that the results of the programs they support need to be measured differently. Although some have viewed GPRA as another in a long line of government attempts to impose efficiency -- Zero Based Budgeting; Management by Objectives; Planning, Programming and Budgeting -- the agencies have been pushed hard to meet the deadlines. In addition, during this year's NSF appropriations hearings in the Senate, Sen. Kit Bond (R-MO), chair of NSF's spending subcommittee, made it clear that he wanted measurable results and performance guidelines for NSF's major new initiative, Knowledge and Distributed Intelligence.

CONSORTIUM OF SOCIAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATIONS

Executive Director: Howard J. Silver
 Public Affairs: David A. Hess
 Government Affairs: Angela L. Sharpe
 Administrative Officer: Karen E. Carrion

President: Eleanor Maccoby

The Consortium of Social Science Associations (COSSA), an advocacy organization for federal support for the social and behavioral sciences, was founded in 1981 and stands alone in Washington in representing the full range of social and behavioral sciences. *Update* is published 22 times per year. Individual subscriptions are available from COSSA for \$65; institutional subscriptions, \$130, overseas mail, \$130. ISBN 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.

Other major issues in 1997 included a still unresolved dispute over the use of sampling in the 2000 Census. Most of the Republicans oppose sampling. The White House vetoed a supplemental appropriations bill that included a ban on sampling and threatened to veto the regular Commerce appropriations bill on the issue. A compromise for the moment has been worked out, but the issue will surely be revisited in the next budget cycle. The Office of Management and Budget also revised its directive on race and ethnicity. For the first time Americans will be able to check off more than one response to the race question on the 2000 Census and other federal statistical surveys.

Discussed, but not enacted in 1997, were a series of bills to reauthorize a number of agencies and programs. These included the National Science Foundation, Higher Education Act, the research programs at the Department of Agriculture, the State Department bill that would have moved the U.S. Information Agency into the department, and juvenile justice programs. All of these will be on the agenda in 1998.

The House Science Committee initiated another attempt to redefine U.S. science policy. Rep. Vern Ehlers (R-MI), a Ph.D. physicist, was put in charge of this effort. Using the new technology of the world wide web, the Committee hopes to generate input from many sources. House Speaker Newt Gingrich (R-GA) told the Committee to develop "a mission large enough to mobilize a nation."

Two White House initiatives have focused the social and behavioral science community to provide input and expertise. The initiative on race has led the American Sociological Association to shepherd an effort to produce a document detailing research results dealing with the many aspects of this topic. The children's initiative has become the basis for research activities across a myriad of federal agencies with contributions on agenda setting from the community.

Finally, much discussion was engendered on the issue of infrastructure and databases in the social and behavioral sciences (see related story on page 5). In addition, Congress slapped NSF on the wrist for

**FISCAL YEAR 1998 APPROPRIATIONS
FOR AGENCIES THAT SUPPORT
SOCIAL AND BEHAVIORAL SCIENCE RESEARCH**
(all figures in millions)

Agency	FY 1997 Funding	FY 1998 Proposed	FY 1998 House	FY 1998 Senate	FY 1998 Final
National Science Foundation					
Total	3,270.0	3,367.0	3,487.0	3,377.0	3,429.0
Research and Related Activities	2,432.0	2,514.7	2,537.5	2,524.7	2,546.0
Education and Human Resources	619.0	625.5	632.5	625.5	632.5
Dept. of Health and Human Services					
Centers for Disease Control	2,302.2	2,315.8	2,388.8	2,368.1	2378.0
Agency for Health Care Policy and Research	143.5	149.0	149.0	139.6	90.2
Asst. Sec. for Planning and Evaluation	18.5	9.0	14.0	9.5	14.0
Nat. Inst. for Child Health and Human Development	631.6	647.3	666.7	676.9	674.6
Nat. Inst. for Aging	484.3	497.1	509.8	520.7	519.3
Nat. Inst. for Nursing Research	59.6	61.1	62.5	64.0	63.6
Nat. Inst. for Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism	211.3	219.3	226.2	228.6	227.2
Nat. Institute for Drug Abuse	490.1	521.9	525.6	531.8	527.2
Nat. Institute of Mental Health	700.7	728.2	744.2	753.3	750.2
Department of Agriculture					
National Research Initiative	94.2	130.0	105.7	100.0	97.2
Economic Research Service	53.1	54.3	71.6	51.1	71.6
Dept. of Commerce/Census Bureau					
Periodic Censuses and Programs	210.5	523.1	550.1	520.8	555.8
Census Salaries and Expenses	135.0	138.1	136.5	138.1	137.3
Bureau of Economic Analysis	45.9	52.2	47.0	47.9	47.5
Department of Education					
Education Research & Laboratories	123.6	134.5	139.5	126.1	128.6
Education Statistics	50.0	66.3	66.3	52.0	59.0
Assessment (incl. NAGBE)	32.6	38.4	38.4	32.6	35.5
Javits Fellowships	5.9	0	(3.2)	(5.9)	(5.9)
Graduate Assistance in Areas in National Need	24.1	30.0	30.0	30.0	30.0
International Programs	59.8	60.3	60.3	60.4	60.4
Dept. of Housing and Urban Development					
Policy Development and Research	34.0	39.0	39.0	34.0	36.5
Department of Justice					
National Institute of Justice	31.4	50.1	42.6	48.7	42.6
Bureau of Justice Statistics	21.4	21.5	21.5	21.5	21.5
Juvenile Justice	174.5	230.4	237.9	380.4	238.7
Department of Labor					
Bureau of Labor Statistics	308.8	326.6	327.6	320.1	327.6
National Endowment for the Humanities					
	110.0	136.0	110.0	110.7	110.7
Smithsonian Institution					
Woodrow Wilson Center	5.8	5.8	0	5.8	5.8
U.S. Information Agency					
Educational and Cultural Exchanges	185.0	197.7	193.7	200.0	197.7

supporting a study they did not like. The "Candidate Emergence Study," funded by the political science program became the focus of controversy during the appropriations process because some members believed it was encouraging people to run against incumbents. The study, certified by NSF's Inspector General as meeting all the requirements for NSF funding, follows a long established line of inquiry into candidate recruitment decisions. The House, in a somewhat symbolic move, reduced NSF's appropriation by the cost of the study. This reduction, however, did not make it into the conference report.

With predictions that the mostly harmonious relations between the President and Congress that existed in 1997 will not be repeated in 1998, Washington will grow more contentious as an election year begins and the biennial fight for partisan control of the legislative branch takes center stage. In addition, the jockeying for presidential nomination politics will hover over many issues for both parties. See you next year!

INFRASTRUCTURE AND DATABASES IN THE SOCIAL AND BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES FOCUS OF MEETINGS

MS

Continuing a discussion that has occurred for over a year, the social and behavioral science community focused on the issue of infrastructure and databases at three recent meetings: on November 13 the Commission on Behavioral and Social Sciences and Education (CBASSE) at the National Academy of Sciences, on November 17 at the COSSA Annual Meeting, and the following day at the gathering of NSF's Social, Behavioral and Economic Sciences (SBE) Directorate Advisory Committee. (For earlier stories on this issue, see *UPDATE* August 11 and June 2, 1997).

The short term results of these discussions remain NSF's determination to phase out some existing infrastructure (such as the Center for Survey Methods) and to re compete other programs. SBE Assistant Director Bennett Bertenthal and

Social, Behavioral and Economic Research Division Director Bill Butz, reiterated what they have been saying for a while: that spending for SBE infrastructure should be expanded. SBE spends only 13-14 percent of their funds on these items, significantly less than any of NSF's other research directorates. Yet, at the same time, with the National Science Board issuing policy that all old large projects should be re competed, Bertenthal and Butz insist that new competitions affecting the three major databases, and other SBE supported large projects, such as the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences, must take place.

In early December the NSF plans to announce that it will be seeking help from the SBE community to conduct workshops on how this competition should occur (see www.nsf.gov/sbe). SBE will listen for the next eight months and then it expects to produce a solicitation in Spring 1998 for proposals. If the announced timetable is followed, these will be reviewed in Fall 1998, with funding decisions in Spring 1999. What this solicitation will look like and how it will be reviewed are determinations SBE is hoping to make with the community's help.

With regard to the three major database collections — the Panel Study of Income Dynamics (PSID), the National Election Study (NES) and the General Social Study (GSS) — there is a sense that these will at least have a competition for who will conduct them. Dan Newlon, economics program officer, announced at the advisory committee meeting that NSF will put the PSID "up for bid" and seek a "lower cost provider."

James Gibson, University of Houston Political Science Professor, who chaired an advisory subcommittee on infrastructure, argued that it was time to reconsider these databases and agreed with the SBE leadership that there may be significant new data collections waiting for SBE support. Michael Rothschild, Dean of the Woodrow Wilson School at Princeton University, defending the PSID in particular, worried about "wrecking a lot of fragile things," and wondered "what's so broken about the current process?"

Need to Expand Infrastructure Definition

The longer-run problem is how to expand the definition of infrastructure and the resources to support it to include not only data collections, but large equipment which is becoming increasingly important in behavioral research, training -- particularly in methodology -- and other activities such as advanced centers for intellectual inquiry and exchange.

Can we increase resources to continue historical time series, while supporting new data collections? Felice Levine, executive officer of the American Sociological Association, noted at the COSSA meeting that NSF spending on infrastructure has decreased considerably in constant dollars since 1980. In addition, there did not seem to be anyone to promote and coordinate these activities since Murray Aborn, former NSF program officer, retired and the databases were moved into the programs -- PSID into economics, NES into political science, and GSS into sociology -- in 1981 to protect the programs from Reagan-Stockman budget slashing. Bertenthal suggested he was considering reestablishing a program in SBE that would focus on infrastructure in a much more expansive way than the current Methodology, Measurement, and Statistics program.

The other long term question is whether social and behavioral science infrastructure needs are being met in other ways. NSF is not the only supporter of large scale data collections. The National Longitudinal Survey of Labor Market Experiences and its recent youth cohorts are funded by the Department of Labor. The National Institute on Aging is providing primary support for the Health and Retirement Survey. Tim Smeeding of Syracuse University told the CBASSE meeting the difficulties of securing support for the Luxembourg Income Study, a multi-national survey, that is funded by many governments, including the United States.

CBASSE expects to produce a document in Spring 1998 laying out the criteria for decision making in this area. One suggested recommendation, made by David Featherman, director of the Institute for Social Research at the University of Michigan, is that CBASSE, COSSA and the Social Science Research Council (SSRC) collaborate in appointing a Standing Committee on

Social Science Infrastructure to identify and monitor the status of social and behavioral science infrastructure. Eric Wanner, president of the Russell Sage Foundation, worried about the opportunity costs of producing these data collections. Can you place an economic value on these surveys, what marginal utility is there, he asked. It is a difficult trick, he admitted, to apply "our own model to ourselves."

Finally, there is the promise of the "hunger for the new," as Wanner put it. Bertenthal told the CBASSE meeting that it was difficult "to compete the past against the future." But this seems to be what SBE is considering and how to accomplish that will continue the discussion.

KELLING SPEAKS AT NIJ LECTURE; SHERMAN TESTIFIES BEFORE HOUSE

DH, ITS

"Broken Windows," the metaphor first introduced in the 1970s to describe how crime stems from small breakdowns in order and civility, has been seriously distorted by both ideological extremes in the criminal justice policy debate. This was one of many observations of George Kelling, coauthor with James Q. Wilson of the seminal article "Broken Windows" (*Atlantic Monthly*, 1972), as he spoke December 2 to a crowd of 300 policy makers, social scientists, police officers and government officials at the National Institute of Justice's Perspectives on Crime and Justice Lecture Series.

Kelling noted, specifically, that those on the left contend crime is the result of certain societal root causes and claim that attempts to fix small crimes before they become big ones lead to heavy handed police enforcement and brutality. Those on the right think the metaphor calls for zero-tolerance police efforts and long prison sentences. "Broken Windows," according to its coauthor, is more nuanced than either of those two views.

In part, Kelling blamed the rise of urban crime in the 1960s, 70s and 80s on misguided policies which "destroyed the cohesion of urban life." These policies included the failure of urban renewal, the building of high-rise public housing, and the construction of neighborhood-destroying

urban highways. Despite this, all citizens want a restoration of order, he declared.

What Kelling learned from his earlier studies of the Kansas City police, is that how policing is done has an impact on crime. Kelling remarked that the key to falling crime rates is communication between police officers and citizens and the reassertion of community control. As an example, Kelling added that citizens, community groups and police officers in New York have begun working together to address crime and violence; these efforts have been rewarded with declining crime rates. Kelling noted that the decrease in crime in New York and other big cities, most notably San Diego and Newark, is indicative of new and more imaginative crime control and prevention efforts, including fixing the "Broken Windows."

Communities and the criminal justice system have to move beyond the policy of simply "processing offenders," Kelling announced. This change, he noted, has several attributes, including: the achievement of justice as well as enforcement; the use of legal methods of crime control; a central role for communities, community groups and citizens; and collaborative efforts between the police, criminal justice agencies and the community. The responsibility for these changes rests on the shoulders of the community, the police, and local political leaders. The police must reintroduce themselves into their communities. Citizens must reassert their rightful place in the crime policy debate.

In addition, in many cities and communities, cops have been used only in an emergency response mode or, what Kelling called a "send in a car" approach. This, according to Kelling, has resulted in the "depolicing of the cities" and in public distrust of police officers and the subsequent alienation of police enforcement efforts. This has to change as well.

Asked about efforts to evaluate crime prevention programs, Kelling responded that most federal evaluation efforts offered little benefit. He said that it was primarily up to the communities to determine what works and what doesn't to thwart crime and violence. In general, however, Kelling noted that the federal government was "allowing good things to happen" and that crime reduction was one of the subsequent benefits.

Sherman Seeks More Evaluation Studies

Lawrence Sherman, chairman of the University of Maryland's Department of Criminology and Criminal Justice, offered a divergent view about federal evaluation efforts. Sherman called on the federal government to do more to ensure evaluation and coordination of crime control initiatives. Sherman recently testified at hearing of the Senate Subcommittee on Youth Violence, chaired by Sen. Jeff Sessions (R-AL). He claimed that many federal crime prevention efforts are not well evaluated. (According to the General Accounting Office, federal crime prevention programs receive over \$4 billion in federal funds.)

There are currently three bills before the Congress that would address, in part, Sherman's concerns regarding the juvenile justice system in this country. A bill, H.R. 3, sponsored by Rep. Bill McCollum (R-FL), emerged from the House Judiciary Committee and focuses on increasing punishment for juvenile offenders. A bill, H.R. 1818, sponsored by Rep. Frank Riggs (R-CA), endorsed by the House Education and Workforce Committee, focuses on prevention programs. The Senate Judiciary Committee's bill, S. 10, sponsored by Sen. Orrin Hatch (R-UT), attempts to combine both. The legislation, however, will not be reconciled until next year. Two of the three bills — H.R. 3 and S. 10 — include \$50 million in funds for research and evaluation. The House bill gives the funds to the National Institute of Justice for grants and contracts. The Senate bill allocates the funds to a National Institute of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

Sherman, who led the team that produced the report *Preventing Crime: What Works, What Doesn't, What's Promising*, told the Subcommittee that: 1) most crime prevention funds are being spent where they are needed least; 2) most crime prevention programs have never been evaluated; and 3) among the evaluated programs, some of the least effective receive the most money.

Serious violence is concentrated in a few areas in this country, Sherman remarked. Most of the homicides occur in cities in a handful of concentrated poverty areas. He noted that the formulas that provide federal funds for crime prevention programs are spent in low risk areas. Congress is often more concerned about reelection

than implementing useful programs. He accused Congress of using formulas that “put violence prevention funding where the votes are, not where the violence is.” He called for spending at least half the federal funds for juvenile crime prevention in police districts where homicide rates are at least 5 times higher than the national average.

As an example of his second point — that most crime prevention programs lack a formal evaluation — Sherman noted that the largest single program supported by the Justice Department’s Byrne Grant Funds is the multijurisdictional law enforcement task forces against crime. Sherman testified that after a decade of funding, the effect of these task forces on drug use and violence “remain completely unknown.” In order to reverse this, he proceeded to call for a 10 percent set-aside for funding program evaluations.

To illustrate his point regarding the misdirection of federal funds, Sherman pointed to Denise Gottfredson’s analysis of evaluation of the DARE (Drug Abuse Resistance Education) program. At COSSA’s seminar last Spring, entitled *Juvenile Crime: A Research Perspective* (see *UPDATE*, April 7), Gottfredson noted that after reviewing evaluations of the DARE program it was clear that it is ineffective as it is most commonly implemented.

FEDERAL APPOINTMENTS ROUNDUP

HS

Katharine Abraham will remain as Commissioner of the Bureau of Labor Statistics for another four year term.

Arthur Bienenstock was confirmed by the Senate as the Associate Director for Science at the Office of Science and Technology Policy.

William Ferris, has been confirmed as the new Chairman of the National Endowment for the Humanities.

Margaret Hamburg, has been confirmed as the new Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation at the Department of Health and Human Services.

Kent MacGuire, program officer for Pew Charitable Trusts K-12 education reform and restructuring program, has been nominated as Assistant Secretary for the Office of Educational Research and Improvement.

Ernest Moniz, former Associate Director for Science, has returned to Washington as the new Under Secretary at the Department of Energy.

Audrey Penn, has been named Acting Director of the National Institute of Neurological Disorders and Stroke.

David Satcher, after a very supportive confirmation hearing before the Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee, has NOT been confirmed as U.S. Surgeon General and Assistant Secretary of Health. The appointment has been held up because a number of Republican Senators object to Satcher’s opposition to banning all late term abortions.

EDITOR’S NOTE

This is the last issue of *UPDATE* for 1997. The next issue of *UPDATE* will be published on January 16. The staff at COSSA hopes you have a wonderful holiday season and a happy new year.

Happy
Holidays



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
Society for Research in Child Development

AFFILIATES

AACSB - The International Association for Management Education
American Agricultural Economics Association
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 Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration
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 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
Urban Affairs Association

CONTRIBUTORS

American Council of Learned Societies
American Institutes for Research
University of Arizona
Bowling Green State University
Brookings Institution
Brown University
University of California, Berkeley
University of California, Davis
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
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
University of Maryland
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
New York University

University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill
North Carolina State University
Northwestern University
Ohio State University
University of Oregon
University of Pennsylvania
Pennsylvania State University
Princeton University
Purdue University
Social Science Research Council
Stanford University
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
