On February 6th the Bush Administration revealed its priorities for federal spending by releasing its Fiscal Year (FY) 2007 budget. Congress will now scrutinize the $2.77 trillion spending plan, hoping to complete its appropriations process by the start of FY 2007 on October 1, 2006. In the past few years, this has been a daunting task and most observers believe that a post-election lame-duck session will be necessary to complete this year’s process.

The President’s priorities are fighting and winning the war on terror, protecting the homeland, promoting a strong U.S. economy, improving our schools and reducing the cost of health care. The President has also picked up on congressional and outside efforts to promote science and innovation (see UPDATE, January 30, 2006) by touting the American Competitiveness Initiative (ACI).

What follows is COSSA’s preliminary look at the President’s proposed budget. As we have done in the past, COSSA will produce a special issue of UPDATE, which will be published on March 6, 2006, which will fully examine the proposed FY 2007 budgets for over 50 agencies that fund social/behavioral research.

NSF Up Eight Percent

As part of the ACI, the President’s budget provides a significant increase for the National Science Foundation (NSF). In what NSF Director Arden Bement called “a great day for NSF,” the President proposed a $439 million or almost eight percent increase for NSF in FY 2007 to $6.02 billion. ACI also returns attention to doubling the NSF budget. Unlike the authorization bill signed by the President in 2002, which would have doubled NSF’s budget in five years, the current plan is to do it by 2016. The Research and Related Activities account, which funds the research directorates, including Social, Behavioral and Economic Sciences (SBE), and which now includes not only the Office of Polar Programs but a new Office of Cyberinfrastructure, would receive $4.666 billion, a $334.5 million or 7.7 percent boost under the President’s proposal. NSF proposes to increase the SBE directorate’s budget by $13.9 million. Most of the increase would go to implement a Science Metrics program called for by Presidential science adviser John Marburger at the AAAS policy forum meeting last April and reiterated at COSSA’s meeting in November (see UPDATE, May 2, and November 7, 2005).

Despite significant calls for increased funding on Math and Science Education, NSF’s Education and Human Resources Directorate (EHR) would only receive a $19.5 million or 2.5 percent increase to $816.2 million.
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The Administration is once again proposing to phase out NSF’s role in the Math and Science Partnership program. NSF proposes to invest $104 million in a Discover Research K-12 program that will support targeted studies to develop effective science and mathematics assessments for K-12 and to improve science teaching and learning in the elementary grades. In addition, EHR is combining its old Division of Research, Evaluation and Communication with its Division of Elementary, Secondary and Informal Education into a new Division of Research on Learning in Formal and Informal Settings.

NIH Level Funded; Director’s Office Gets Increase

The President’s FY 2007 budget request for the National Institutes of Health (NIH) is disappointing. The agency is funded at the same level as its FY 2006 budget, $28.587 billion. Nearly all of the various institutes and centers, however, will see a decrease in funding in FY 2007. The budget provides the Office of the Director (OD) with a significant increase of $140.3 million, for a total budget of $667.8 million. It allocates $443 million for the NIH Roadmap for Medical Research, an increase of $113 million, or 34 percent over FY 2006. This sum includes $110.7 million from the Director’s Discretionary Fund. The Roadmap is “a set of trans-NIH research initiatives that are designed to accelerate the pace of discovery and improve the translation of research findings into healthcare interventions for public benefits.”

For the newly created Office of Portfolio Analysis and Strategic Initiatives (OPASI), the FY 2007 budget provides $3 million, an increase of $1 million (see UPDATE, December 12, 2005).

The budget provides level funding of $26.1 million for the Office of Behavioral and Social Sciences Research (OBSSR).

Finally, the FY 2007 budget provides $15 million to establish a new program to provide “increased and stable support for new investigators” (see related story).

The FY 2007 budget requests a total program level of $8.2 billion for the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) and the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR), a net decrease of $179 million below the FY 2006 funding level. For the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality, the budget provides a total program level of $319 million, the same as FY 2006.

Agriculture: Big Boost for NRI

The Administration has once again proposed a significant boost for the National Research Initiative Competitive Grants program (NRI), increasing its budget from $181.2 million to a proposed $247.5 million. Again, the Administration has eliminated $198 million in Special Project funding, which it has tried to do in the past only to have Congress restore the funds often using proposed increases for the NRI as an offset.

The Economic Research Service has a proposed eight million increase to $83 million. The National Agricultural Statistics Service would get $153 million, including $37 million for the Census of Agriculture, up from $139 million and $29 million this year, respectively. Unlike last year, the Administration is not proposing to reduce or eliminate the formula grant programs in the Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service. Most of these programs are proposed for level funding.

Education: New Fund for Critical Foreign Languages

The new budget includes $24 million in the Department of Education (ED) for a program called Advancing America Through Foreign Language Partnerships to award competitive grants to institutions of higher education in partnership with elementary and secondary schools to establish programs of study in languages critical to U.S. national security. This is part of the president’s National Security Foreign Language Initiative announced weeks ago (see UPDATE, January 16, 2006). The already established International Educational and Foreign Language Studies program would receive a $1 million increase to $106.8 million.

The Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE), stripped of its earmarks in FY 2006, would receive the same $22 million in FY 2007. Javits Fellowships are level funded again at $9.7 million, while the Thurgood Marshall Legal Education Opportunity program is one of 42 ED programs slated for elimination. Many of these programs like Marshall have been on the chopping block before only to get restored by Congress.

The Administration proposes $554.5 for the Institute for Education Sciences (IES) activities in FY 2007. Research, Development and Dissemination gets a small decrease, Statistics and Assessment small increases, with a more than doubling of the Statewide Data Systems program to help State educational agencies design, develop, and implement longitudinal
data systems to track individual student achievement. Unlike previous years, the Administration does not propose to eliminate the Regional Educational Laboratories.

Census: ACS and 2010 Get Increases; SIPP Eliminated

The Administration proposes $872.2 million for the Census Bureau, about a ten percent increase over FY 2006. Of that total, $511.8 million, an increase of $64 million or 14 percent, will go toward planning the 2010 Census. It includes about $180 million for the American Community Survey (ACS). The Salaries and Expenses account would go down almost $12 million to $184.1 million. Part of the decrease is a proposed elimination of the Survey of Income Program Participation (SIPP), part of a Census Bureau effort to restructure its data on poverty.

Justice: New Leadership, Same Old Budget Story

The Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS) will have a new leader in 2006 (see accompanying story). The proposed budget for BJS is $59.8 million, an increase of close to $14 million. However, most of this is accounted for by a separate management line, a move Congress has previously rejected. The National Institute of Justice would receive $56.2 million, a very slight increase over FY 2006. In addition, the Administration proposes to cut in half the $5 million NIJ received from the Violence Against Women program.

ARROW TO RECEIVE NATION’S HIGHEST SCIENCE PRIZE

On February 13th, President Bush will award Kenneth J. Arrow, Professor Emeritus of Economics at Stanford University, the National Medal of Science. Arrow will join seven other distinguished scientists at a White House ceremony and celebratory dinner.

The 84 year old Arrow, recipient of the Nobel Prize in Economics in 1972 for his “pioneering contributions to general economic equilibrium theory and welfare theory,” is considered one of the most prominent economic theorists of the 20th Century. His early career was spent with the Cowles Commission in Chicago and the RAND Corporation. He arrived at Stanford in 1949 and except for an eleven year hiatus at Harvard from 1968-79 he has remained based at Palo Alto ever since, taking emeritus status in 1991. Like many economists he served a stint on the staff of the President’s Council of Economic Advisers. In 1957, he received the John Bates Clark medal from the American Economic Association given to promising economic scholars under 40.

His research has influenced many parts of economics and social policy. He has conducted seminal work on general equilibrium theory, on education and racial discrimination, on risk bearing, on public investment with uncertainty, on the theory of teams, and on social choice and social welfare.

Arrow is a member of the National Academy of Sciences and the Institute of Medicine. He has been president of the International Economic Association, the American Economic Association, the Econometric Society, the Institute of Management Sciences, the Western Economic Association, and the Society for Social Choice and Welfare. He is a Fellow of the American Statistical Association and the American Association for the Advancement of Science.

He received his B.A. from the City College of New York and his M.A. and his Ph.D. from Columbia University.

BUSH NOMINATES POLITICAL SCIENTIST TO LEAD JUSTICE DATA AGENCY

President Bush has nominated another political scientist to lead a federal statistical agency. Following Mark Schneider, who is now the Commissioner of Education Statistics (see UPDATE, January 30, 2006), the Administration has now nominated Jeffrey Sedgwick, a political science professor at the University of Massachusetts, Amherst, as head of the Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS). Sedgwick replaces Lawrence Greenfeld who resigned at the end of last year.

In 1984-85 Sedgwick was BJS’s Deputy Director for Data Analysis under director Steven Schlesinger. Other than that year in Washington and some visiting professorships, Sedgwick has taught political science at Massachusetts since 1978, where he also served as Assistant Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences.

He has a forthcoming book on The Character of the Presidency: Ambition, Expectation and Opportunity and previously authored Law Enforcement Planning: The Limits of Economic Analysis. He also wrote a monograph on Deterring Criminals: Policymaking and the American Political Tradition. In recent years he has
In recent years he has appeared at meetings of regional political science associations, including the Southern, on panels discussing presidential power. In the 1980s Sedgwick was active in The Center for the Study of the Constitution. He also has given a number of speeches overseas on U.S. history and politics.

He is a current member of the Benjamin Franklin Tercentenary Commission and served from 2002-2005 on the National Board of the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education. He has conducted peer reviews for the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs at the Department of State and for the old Office of Educational Research and Improvement at the Department of Education.

Sedgwick has a B.A. from Kenyon College and an M.A. and Ph.D. from the University of Virginia.

VETERAN AGRICULTURAL EDUCATOR NAMED RESEARCH/EDUCATION/ECONOMICS HEAD

Gale Buchanan spent nearly 25 years as an agricultural administrator at two land-grant universities and 40 years as an agricultural educator. In 2005 he announced his retirement. On January 11 President Bush announced his intention to nominate Buchanan to the post as Under Secretary of Agriculture for Research, Education, and Economics (REE). Buchanan would replace Joseph Jen.

Buchanan spent the first 21 years of his professional career with Auburn University in the Department of Agronomy and Soils primarily teaching about weed science. For five years in the early 1980s he was Dean and Director of the Alabama Agricultural Experiment Station. He joined the University of Georgia faculty in 1986 as associate director of the Georgia Agricultural Experiment Station and resident director of the Coastal Plain Experiment Station in Tifton, GA. In 1995 he became dean of Georgia’s School of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences, a post he held for ten years before retiring in 2005.

Buchanan received his B.S. and M.S. degrees in Agronomy from the University of Florida. He earned his Ph.D. in Plant Physiology from Iowa State University.

His purview at the Department of Agriculture will include the Agricultural Research Service, the Economic Research Service, the National Agricultural Statistical Service, and the Cooperative State Research Education and Extension Service. Buchanan must be confirmed by the Senate before he assumes the position.

TWO KEY HIGHER EDUCATION GROUPS GET NEW LEADERSHIP

Both the Association of American Universities (AAU) and the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges (NASULGC), two major players in advocacy for higher education, have new leaders.

AAU, which is an association of 62 leading research universities in the United States and Canada, has announced that Robert Berdahl, former Chancellor of the University of California, Berkeley, will be its new President. Berdahl will assume the office in late spring replacing Nils Hasselmo, who announced his retirement in September after leading AAU since 1998.

Berdahl led Berkeley from 1997 to 2004. He came there after heading the University of Texas, Austin from 1993 to 1997. Berdahl also served as Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs at the University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign. For 20 years he was a member of the history faculty at the University of Oregon, where from 1981-86 he was the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences. He received his B.A. from Augustana College in South Dakota, his M.A. from the University of Illinois, and his Ph.D. in history from the University of Minnesota.

Berdahl will join Peter McPherson, President Emeritus of Michigan State University, who became NASULGC’s new President on January 1, (for biographical information about McPherson, see UPDATE, October 24, 2005) in promoting higher education in Washington, DC. NASULGC is a voluntary association of land-grant institutions, which includes many of the nation’s public university systems, with 214 members across the United States.

Both new leaders face many tough issues, including reauthorization of the Higher Education Act, the university’s role in balancing science and security issues, a government-appointed commission examining American higher education, and a budget climate that makes large increases for university research less likely in the near future.
ELECTION REFORM FOCUS OF NEW BROOKINGS-AEI PROJECT

"November 7, 2000 was election reform’s birthday," touted Doug Chapin of electionline.org at the launching of a new Brookings-American Enterprise Institute (AEI) Election Reform project. Directed by Thomas Mann of Brookings and Norman Ornstein of AEI, the project hopes to link the research and policy communities about ongoing reform efforts spurred by the complaints engendered by the conduct of the 2000 and 2004 elections in some states.

Responding to complaints about hanging chads and other happenings in the 2000 election, Congress enacted the Help America Vote Act (HAVA) in 2002. This was an attempt by the federal government to help the states, who have prime responsibility for running elections in the U.S., to reform their election systems. HAVA established an Election Assistance Commission (EAC) and required the states to comply with its provisions, including the generation of statewide voter registration lists, by January 1, 2006.

The new project’s launch included keynote address by Senator Barack Obama (D-IL) who described how Americans go from “shock to trance” when thinking about election reform. Immediately after the 2000 and 2004 elections people concerned themselves with how elections are administered in this country, but most Americans soon lost interest in the topic. Obama argued that conducting elections in a manner so that every voter can cast a ballot without intimidation and ensuring that every voter’s vote will get counted is “not an inherently difficult problem.”

He professed his faith in technology to help take the “politics out of election reform.” The Senator expressed hope that the Supreme Court will soon make a statement about gerrymandering that will lead to more competitive House districts and said that although both efforts failed, he agreed with the 2004 referenda in California and Ohio to remove legislatures from drawing district boundaries. He condemned the recent Georgia law requiring photo identification to vote, since it placed a burden on the poor and disabled and argued that concern about voter fraud is overblown. He agreed that the most significant changes will come at the state and local level, particularly as HAVA takes full effect.

Paul DeGregorio, chairman of the four-member EAC, noted how delays in appointing the commissioners and in funding HAVA have made compliance slower than it should have been. However, he indicated that $3.1 billion has been distributed to the states that have allowed them to buy new machines so that unreliable punch card and lever machines should disappear by the 2006 elections. He said that the EAC had conducted significant research on counting votes, human factors, ballot design, voter fraud, and set up a election law research clearinghouse. He mentioned the increasing demand for voter-verified paper audit trials (VVPAT) with the new electronic voting machines.

Deborah Markowitz, Vermont’s Secretary of State, also commented on state implementation of HAVA. She noted that at the recent meeting of the National Association of Secretaries of State, there was much discussion of taking a regional approach to registration verification, including recognition that many New Englanders have second homes in Florida. She cited a MIT-Cal Tech study that found error due to election administration had declined 42 percent from 2000 to 2004. In addition, although the initial burst of HAVA funding was useful, she argued, more is still needed and lamented that the FY 2007 proposed budget does not include any new funding for the EAC.

Although Chapin agreed with DeGregorio that much has changed for the better in the past five years, he expects disputed elections to continue. The states are still too diverse and the federal government’s interest in this area was a “one-shot deal,” Chapin stated. He also decried the lack of resources for the EAC.

The Brookings-AEI project hopes to monitor the continuing implementation of HAVA and if necessary, encourage constructive changes to the law. The project’s website is www.electionreformproject.org.

NAS PANEL FOCUSES ON EXPANDING ACCESS TO RESEARCH DATA

Data collected by statistical agencies and others under a pledge of confidentiality is often the cornerstone of information provided to policymakers. Often the most vital data are information about individual people, households, businesses and other organizations, so-called microdata.

The Committee on National Statistics of the National Academies (NAS), with funding from the National Institute on Aging, appointed a panel to examine how to expand access to such research data. The Panel on Data Access for Research Purposes, chaired by Eleanor Singer
of the University of Michigan, has issued its report *Expanding Access to Research Data: Reconciling Risks and Opportunities* (http://books.nap.edu/catalog/1134.html).

Referencing an earlier report, *Private Lives and Public Policies: Confidentiality and Accessibility of Government Statistics*, which was published in 1993, the new document reflects changes in the external environment in the past 12 years. Singer suggests that one change has been the frustration on the part of researchers over delays in access to the very rich data collected by federal statistical and research agencies. In contrast, there are increasing concerns about maintaining confidentiality in an age when protecting privacy has become an important public concern. This issue was discussed by former Census Director Ken Prewitt at a COSSA Seminar on Protecting Privacy in 2005 (see UPDATE, July 11, 2005). Prewitt also served on the panel that produced the latest report.

The challenge, according to the report, “is to ensure a variety of approaches to both data collection and research,” activities that occur in a decentralized system in the U.S. where federal agencies and their staffs and university based researchers are the key actors. In addition, the panel addressed the tradeoffs between the risks and benefits of data access, particularly with microdata that sometimes include linked longitudinal information about individuals.

The panel decided that “no one way is optimal for all data users or all purposes.” The report concluded: “To meet society’s needs for high-quality research and statistics, the nation’s statistical and research agencies must provide both unrestricted access to anonymized public-use files and restricted access to detailed, individually identifiable confidential data for researchers under carefully specified conditions.”

According to the report, we need research using detailed confidential data for well-informed policy making and to improve public-use data files. Maintaining restricted access to detailed microdata is, however, still necessary. At the same time, conditions for obtaining access to these data also need improvement. The panel recommended expanding the use of licensing agreements, and providing easier access, including through remote means, to research data centers, such as those maintained at universities and other institutions by the U.S. Census Bureau.

Furthermore, the report argued that legal sanctions against violating confidentiality need strengthening; users, as well as agencies, should be held accountable for safeguarding confidentiality. Agencies should also audit license holders and set up procedures for monitoring any breaches of confidentiality. Yet this isn’t enough, according to the panel. “What is needed in addition to the legal sanctions is a system of norms and values concerning the ethical use of such data,” with education and training in these ethical principles and practices for all who work with confidential research records.

**NIH CREATES PROGRAM TO FOSTER THE INDEPENDENCE OF NEW RESEARCHERS**

On January 27, National Institutes of Health (NIH) Director Elias Zerhouni, announced the creation of new program to foster the independence of new investigators. The program, *NIH Pathway to Independence*, features a “new opportunity for promising postdoctoral scientists to receive both mentored and independent support from the same award.”

“Encouraging independent inquiry by promising new investigators is a major goal for NIH,” related Zerhouni. “We must invest in the future of our new scientists today if we expect to meet the nation’s health challenges tomorrow . . . We must take action now to maintain the tremendous momentum that we’ve experienced in science. Talented people with new ideas are at the core of our success — we must support them all the way. Nothing is more important, especially in times of tight budgets,” Zerhouni declared.

The new program responds to a 2005 National Academy of Sciences (NAS) report, “Bridges to Independence” which called for new ways to mentor and support early career scientific investigators from their post-doctoral studies to independent research programs.

The award is designed to allow an initial one to two year mentored phase so that investigators can complete their supervised research work, publish results, and search for an independent research position. A second phase of the award, years three through five, will allow recipients to obtain an assistant professorship, or equivalent position, to establish their own research program and successfully apply for an NIH investigator-initiated (R01) grant.

The award will be up to $90,000 in the mentored phase and $249,000 in the independent investigator phase. For more information see: http://grants.nih.gov/grants/guide/pa-files/PA-06-133.html.
NIGMS TO SUPPORT RESEARCH INTO NON-MEDICAL ISSUES RELATED TO PHARMACOCOGENETICS

At its 130th meeting, the National Advisory General Medical Sciences Council (NAGMSC) approved a concept clearance for the development of a program announcement soliciting grant proposals on the “Economic, Ethical, Legal, and Social Issues (EELSI) related to Implementation of Pharmacogenetic Knowledge into Medical Practice.”

Presently, the National Institutes of Health (NIH) is funding the Pharmacogenetics Research Network (PGRN) to discover genetic variation and to make functional and clinical assessments of how that contributes to predicting individual’s responses to therapeutic drugs. The network is a nationwide collaboration of scientists focused on understanding how genes affect the way a person responds to medicines. Its long-term goal is to make information available to doctors that will “ensure the right dose of the right medicine the first time for everyone.” Since its inception five years ago, the network scientists have studied genes and medications relevant to a wide range of diseases, including depression, cancer, heart disease, and asthma. The agency anticipates spending more than $150 million over five years to renew PGRN.

The program is being spearheaded by the National Institute for General Medical Sciences (NIGMS) and is supported by nine NIH institutes and centers. These include: Heart, Lung, and Blood; Cancer; Genome; Environmental Health Sciences; Library of Medicine; Drug Abuse; Mental Health; and the Office of Research on Women’s Health.

According to NIGMS program staff Rochelle Long, “Attention to ethical and ancillary issues is part of a balanced approach to research.” The Institute has tried several distinct strategies, including establishing a Populations Advisory Group, creating brochures to aid individuals in understanding the purposes of the research, participating in granting programs sponsored by other institutes at NIH, offering supplements to add underrepresented populations to studies, and promoting thoughtful policies. Despite these efforts, NIGMS has funded or co-funded only four R01s (investigator-initiated grants) in the past six years. These were on the topics of informed consent, interactions with identified communities, and relations with industry, said Long.

She observed that one of the Department of Health and Human Service’s 5000 day goals is “personalized medicine.” The implementation of the basic results, explained Long, is a slow process because there “are many [appropriate] barriers to applying research knowledge to clinical situations.”

Long emphasized that research is needed to identify and study the barriers to implementing the basic research results in clinical situations, often as pharmacogenetic tests. NIGMS should seek proposals that address the fundamental questions underlying implementation of pharmacogenetics knowledge into medical practice. This research may include but is not necessarily limited to:

- Recommendations for intellectual property rights;
- Economics of decision-making in managed care organizations;
- Cultural preferences in personalized medicine;
- How pharmacogenetic tests differ from other genetic testing;
- Data-sharing in research and medical records.

The Council’s approval allows NIGMS to seek input into these questions from the research community, and to tentatively announce plans for a limited, research-focused program announcement.
### GOVERNING MEMBERS
- American Society of Criminology
- American Sociological Association
- American Statistical Association
- Association of American Geographers
- Association of American Law Schools
- Law and Society Association

### MEMBERSHIP ORGANIZATIONS
- Justice Research and Statistics Association
- Midwest Sociological Society
- National Association of Social Workers
- National Council on Family Relations
- North American Regional Science Council
- North Central Sociological Association
- Population Association of America
- Social Science History Association

### COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University of Illinois</th>
<th>Indiana University</th>
<th>John Hopkins University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Iowa</td>
<td>Johns Hopkins University</td>
<td>Kansas State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Maryland</td>
<td>University of Kentucky</td>
<td>University of New York, Stony Brook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts Institute of Technology</td>
<td>Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs, Syracuse University</td>
<td>University of Texas, Austin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington University, St. Louis</td>
<td>Tulane University</td>
<td>Texas A &amp; M University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill</td>
<td>Vanderbilt University</td>
<td>University of Virginia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Arizona</td>
<td>University of Washington</td>
<td>University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California, Berkeley</td>
<td>Washington University in St. Louis</td>
<td>Yale University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California, Davis</td>
<td>Stanford University</td>
<td>University of Wisconsin, Madison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona State University</td>
<td>Purdue University</td>
<td>University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown University</td>
<td>Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey</td>
<td>University of Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California, Los Angeles</td>
<td>University of South Carolina</td>
<td>University of Wisconsin, Madison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California, San Diego</td>
<td>State University of New York, Stony Brook</td>
<td>University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California, Santa Barbara</td>
<td>Texas A &amp; M University</td>
<td>University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carnegie-Mellon University</td>
<td>Tulane University</td>
<td>Yale University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Chicago</td>
<td>Vanderbilt University</td>
<td>University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark University</td>
<td>University of Virginia</td>
<td>University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia University</td>
<td>University of Washington</td>
<td>University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell University</td>
<td>Washington University in St. Louis</td>
<td>University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duke University</td>
<td>West Virginia University</td>
<td>University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Mason University</td>
<td>University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee</td>
<td>University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Washington University</td>
<td>University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee</td>
<td>University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Georgia</td>
<td>University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee</td>
<td>University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvard University</td>
<td>University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee</td>
<td>University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard University</td>
<td>University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee</td>
<td>University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CENTERS AND INSTITUTES
- Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences
- Cornell Institute for Social and Economic Research
- Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan
- Institute for the Advancement of Social Work Research
- Institute for Women's Policy Research
- National Bureau of Economic Research
- National Opinion Research Center
- Social Science Research Council

---

**Consortium of Social Science Associations**

1522 K St., NW, Suite 836, Washington, D.C. 20005