

# COSSA WASHINGTON UPDATE

Volume IX, Number 1

January 5, 1990

## NSF FY 1990 OPERATING PLAN HOLDS SLIGHT INCREASES FOR SOCIAL AND BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES *HS*

The National Science Foundation (NSF) has sent to Congress its FY 1990 spending plan. Increases for Foundation research programs are slight in almost all disciplines, but some programs in the science and engineering education directorate scored notable victories. House and Senate VA-HUD-Independent Agencies appropriations subcommittees will examine the plan and suggest improvements if they wish.

Limited by the 5 percent (\$81 million) increase in the appropriation for research and related activities, NSF injected extra dollars into the disciplinary-based research programs by excluding any FY 1990 funds for new Science and Technology Centers. This decision reflects a warning from the appropriations subcommittees that NSF should "carefully consider the advisability of funding any new centers in fiscal 1990." Funding is included for those centers already in operation.

The increase over FY 1989 for the Biological, Behavioral and Social Science (BBS) Directorate is \$12.1 million (4.3 percent) -- not as much as the Computer and Information Science and Engineering Directorate (11.7 percent on a smaller base), but not as little as the Mathematics and Physical Sciences Directorate (3 percent on a larger base). The Division of Social and Economic Science (SES) receives a \$1.4 million increase (4.5 percent), while the Division of Behavioral and Neural Science is slated for a \$1.1 million increase (2.3 percent).

The Science and Engineering Education Directorate receives a \$33.3 million increase (19.4 percent), and following congressional directives, the Teacher Preparation and Enhancement Division receives a \$17.5 million increase (27.5 percent). Undergraduate Science, Engineering and

Mathematics Education receives a \$6 million increase (21.4 percent).

Also included in the plan are \$19.7 million for the academic research facilities program. (The NSF has recently published the program solicitation for the facilities program: *Federal Register*, December 21, 1989, pp. 52768-72.) Another \$2.6 million is allotted to the Inspector General's office; press reports suggest that the office plans to scrutinize more closely the expenditure of NSF grant funds.◀

## CAFLIS RELEASES PLAN OF ACTION FOR INTERNATIONAL COMPETENCE *HS*

The Coalition for the Advancement of Foreign Languages and International Studies (CAFLIS) released on December 6 its plan to enhance the international competence of Americans. The proposal's centerpiece was a call for the creation of a new national endowment to complement and expand upon the activities of existing foreign language and area studies programs.

### Inside Update . . .

- Panel to Examine Confidentiality and Data Access *HS*
- Economists Say Peace Dividend Should Be Used for Deficit Reduction or Domestic Spending, Not Lower Taxes *JT*
- OERI Centers Competition Looms; FIS Applications Sought *HS*
- Commerce Seeks Comments on Census Adjustment *HS*
- Moore Leaves NSF; Bryant Gets Recess Appointment at Census *HS*
- Report Says Research Enterprise Must Re-evaluate Basic Premises *JT*
- Conference to Focus on America in 21st Century *HS*
- Sources of Research Support: National Science Foundation *JT*



After two years of deliberations by representatives of 165 organizations in three working groups, CAFLIS exclaimed: "We must make the study of world geography, history, cultures, economies, languages and systems -- and exchanges of students and citizens -- a major component of educational reform. We must consolidate and mobilize existing resources for international education; develop new resources; and establish new partnerships between government, labor, business and education."

The federal government, though admittedly constrained by scarce resources, must play a central role in the effort, according to CAFLIS. Increased funding for Title VI of the Higher Education Act, the Fulbright-Hays Exchange programs, and other existing international and foreign language training programs is critical, the report noted, but it is not enough! The federal government needs to provide leadership, coordination of effective support, and a real sense of national priorities if the nation is to make real progress. This federal role can best be organized, according to CAFLIS, through the creation of an endowment. The proposed agency would sponsor comprehensive research programs of advanced area and international studies research and training; promote joint business/education programs to provide advanced training in international business, foreign languages and area studies; and support pilot programs to improve pedagogy in these subjects.

CAFLIS also suggests that state and local policy makers -- from state legislatures to school boards -- should work with their counterparts in education and business to provide leadership and commitment. These officials should also establish collaborative programs; develop and implement comprehensive, statewide and institutional plans for international competence; and adopt incentives and accountability systems to make international education an essential component of quality education.

Finally, CAFLIS argues that American business' ability to compete in the global marketplace will depend on its effective deployment of internationally competent employees. Therefore, the report contends, efforts should be made to encourage collaborative programs among the education, international exchange, and private sectors. Businesses should make international competence a corporate priority by identifying and assessing global training and human resource needs and through hiring and promotion policies which send clear market signals to schools about their demands for internationally competent personnel. Examples of successful collaborations are provided in the report of CAFLIS Working Group #3, "Spanning the Gap: Toward a Better Business and Education Partnership for International Competence."

CAFLIS has organized an Executive Leadership Council to help implement its recommendations. Among its members are Vermont Governor Madeline Kunin, Miami Mayor Xavier Suarez, former Deputy CIA Director Bobby Inman, Smithsonian Secretary Robert Adams, and American Stock Exchange President Kenneth Leibler. CAFLIS Steering Committee Chairman Robert Rosenzweig, president of the Association of American Universities, noted that federal budget constraints will require that implementation efforts for the time being be focused at the state and local level. For further information about CAFLIS contact: Lillian Pubillones, Executive Director, 202/778-0819.◀

## PANEL TO EXAMINE CONFIDENTIALITY AND DATA ACCESS

How can the increasing tensions between data access and confidentiality be resolved? To answer that question, the National Academy of Sciences has

The COSSA Washington Update is published 20-24 times per year by the Consortium of Social Science Associations (COSSA), 1522 K Street, NW, Suite 836, Washington, DC 20005 (202/842-3525). Individual subscriptions are available from COSSA for \$50.00; institutional subscriptions, \$90; overseas mail, \$90. ISSN 0749-4394. COSSA members, affiliates, and contributors are listed on the back cover. Update is written and produced by the Consortium's staff: Howard J. Silver, Stacey E. Beckhardt, Joe Thorndike, and Katrina R. Styles-McDowell. The Consortium 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.

Raymond E. Wolfinger, President

Howard J. Silver, Executive Director



established a panel of the Committee on National Statistics (CNSTAT) to provide workable recommendations to federal agencies. Established for two years and chaired by Prof. George T. Duncan of the School of Urban and Public Affairs at Carnegie-Mellon University, the new panel will build on CNSTAT's previous work, drawing particularly on the committee's 1985 report, *Sharing Research Data*.

The concern, according to CNSTAT Executive Director Miron Straf, is how to expand the use of social science research data bases and the sharing of federal agencies' data without impinging on the public's concern for privacy invasion and social control. Even President Bush in *Building A Better America* recognized the need to "improve the quality and reliability of socio-economic data to improve the effectiveness of federal programs and meet the information needs of users." Yet, Duncan suggests, problems persist: non-response rates are up for some surveys, agencies do not release data in the nonaggregated form that users desire, and researchers often fail to report their results to the citizenry. The question Duncan asks is how we meet the competing needs of respondents for privacy assurance and researchers for detailed data?

One possible solution is for agencies to employ effective statistical masks that will lead to the development of statistical methods for the analysis of masked data. Another is to place more responsibility on researchers as data stewards, including the imposition of legal sanctions for improper use of data. Finally, Duncan argues that respondents should be increasingly informed of the intended and potential uses of data and apprised of the possibility -- however remote -- of re-identification.

The CNSTAT panel will sponsor two conferences. The first, on disclosure limitation to permit data access, will examine ways in which statistical, administrative, and legal controls can sufficiently lower disclosure risk, thereby allowing dissemination of data to researchers. The second conference, on respondent impacts and cooperation, will examine ethical issues of privacy protection for both individuals and establishments. It will also explore the impact of confidentiality pledges on nonresponse and evasive response. Social and behavioral scientists interested in these issues should

contact Prof. Duncan at Carnegie-Mellon, 412/268-2172.«

## **ECONOMISTS SAY PEACE DIVIDEND SHOULD BE USED FOR DEFICIT REDUCTION OR DOMESTIC SPENDING, NOT LOWER TAXES**

With massive political and economic reform underway in Eastern Europe, many Washington policy makers are speculating on the possibility of large-scale defense cuts. Often referred to as the "peace dividend," the prospect of substantial money freed by defense cuts has legions of Washingtonians angling for a slice of the pie.

The size, impact, and possible uses of a peace dividend, however, are the subject of much debate. Indeed, many observers even question whether such a creature will ever materialize. In the hope of shedding some light on the subject, Congress' Joint Economic Committee, chaired by Rep. Lee H. Hamilton (D-IN), has convened a series of hearings to explore the probability and possible uses of a peace dividend.

In a December 19 hearing on "Economic Adjustment After the Cold War," the committee heard testimony from three economists. While differences of opinion were evident, all three agreed that defense cuts should not be rebated to Americans in the form of lower taxes. Rather, they argued variously that the money should be used for substantial increases in domestic spending programs, economic aid for Eastern Europe, and reductions in the federal deficit.

While he acknowledged that aid to Eastern Europe is the top priority, Brookings Institution economist Charles L. Schultze, who served as chairman of the White House Council of Economic Advisers under President Carter, contended that the appropriate amount of American aid is not yet clear. Consequently, his suggestions for the use of any peace dividend focused on its role in reducing the federal deficit. In conjunction with a looser monetary policy, he said, deficit reduction would induce a fall in interest rates and an increase in the production of goods favored by lower interest rates. Exports, housing construction, and business invest-



ment in new plant and equipment would all benefit from such a course of action, he predicted.

"A short while ago I was asked by a reporter whether or not we would be unfortunate enough to have most of the peace dividend absorbed into the sinkhole of budget deficit reduction," Schultze recounted. "Mr. Chairman, given what a reduced budget deficit and lower interest rates could do for the long-term vigor of the American economy, I can't think of a better sinkhole."

A second call for deficit reduction came from Roger Brinner, chief economist and group vice president at Data Resources, Inc. "The interest burden from a persistent \$150 billion shortfall imposes a chronic, significant drag on the U.S. standard of living," Brinner said. While supporting the expenditure of federal money on infrastructure, education, and other productive investments, he stressed the need to evaluate the costs and benefits of spending programs without regard for larger budget concerns. "Hardheaded cost-benefit calculations must be applied regardless of the size of the federal deficit or the defense program," he said. "My advice is to push for the earliest and largest defense reductions that national security and rational purchasing management will allow; then ignore this dividend as you evaluate new programs and review old ones."

Donald Straszheim, chief economist and first vice president at Merrill Lynch Capital Markets, differed with Schultze and Brinner on the use of a peace dividend. While conceding that smaller deficits would offer substantial economic benefits, he argued that well-targeted domestic spending would be more valuable. Savings in the defense budget should be used for investments in areas that promote long-term economic vigor, he suggested, including infrastructure, education, and drug rehabilitation.◀

#### BUDGET DELAY

The Bush Administration announced January 2 that it would be late in submitting the FY 1991 budget. Delivery to Capitol Hill is now slated for January 29.

## OERI CENTERS COMPETITION LOOMS; FIS APPLICATIONS SOUGHT

The Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI) will soon announce its competition for 12 national research and development centers whose missions will influence the federal education research agenda well into the 1990s. The new centers will become operational in fall 1990 when federal funding expires for 14 of the 21 currently existing centers.

After a year-long planning process that included meetings held around the country and consultations with researchers, practitioners, and policy makers, OERI identified 12 topics for research and development centers. They are:

- Families, communities, and young children's learning;
- Student learning;
- Writing and literacy;
- Mathematics teaching and learning;
- Science teaching and learning;
- Learning to teach;
- Education in the inner cities;
- Education policies and student learning;
- Assessment, evaluation, and testing;
- Adult literacy;
- Educational quality of the workforce; and
- Postsecondary learning and teaching assessment.

At a December 5 meeting of OERI officials and representatives of education groups, some participants expressed concern that the proposed center topics were shortchanging the postsecondary area since there would be only one center (instead of the current two) dealing explicitly with higher education. In addition, the never-ending problem of disseminating research results to those who must apply them was a focus of the discussion. All agreed that dissemination strategies need to be explicitly spelled out in the grants themselves, not -- as is too often the case -- in an after-the-fact fashion. For more information about the Centers Competition contact Joseph Conalty, OERI, 555 New Jersey Avenue NW, Washington, DC 20208; 202/357-6079.



Although the Centers program utilizes most of the OERI funds for education research, the office does solicit proposals for Field Initiated Studies (FIS). The current solicitation period seeks proposals by February 7, 1990. In FY 1989 the Office of Research awarded nine grants totaling \$575,000; approximately \$750,00 will be available in FY 1990. Topics that received awards in FY 1989 included: the impact of education reform, schools, values, and the courts, dropout prevention, developing language skills, developing a data archive of America's teachers, and education finance. For more information about the FIS awards contact Delores Monroe, 202/357-6223.«

## COMMERCE SEEKS COMMENTS ON CENSUS ADJUSTMENT

The Department of Commerce, home of the Census Bureau, has published proposed guidelines for considering whether or not a statistical adjustment of the 1990 census should be made to cover possible undercounting or overcounting of the population. (*Federal Register*, December 11, 1989; pp. 51002-51006). The guidelines are the result of a summary agreement stemming from the suit brought by New York City to force the Census Bureau to prepare for a possible adjustment of the census.

Among the proposed guidelines are: (1) "the evidence to be acceptable must show overwhelmingly that the count can be improved by statistical adjustment in order to overturn the premise that the actual enumeration is the best count possible;" (2) "The 1990 Census may be adjusted only if the adjusted counts are consistent and complete across all jurisdictional levels: national, state, local, and census block;" (3) "The 1990 Census may be adjusted only if the general rationale for the adjustment can be clearly and simply stated in a way that is understandable to the general public;" (4) "The 1990 Census may be adjusted only if the resulting counts are of sufficient quality and level of detail to be usable for Congressional and legislative reapportionment, redistricting and for all other purposes and at all levels for which the Census Bureau publishes decennial census data;" (5) "The 1990 Census may be adjusted only if the adjustment is fair and reasonable, and is not excessively disruptive to the orderly transfer of political representation."

The summary order also says that if the Secretary of Commerce determines that an adjustment is necessary, the Department shall publish corrected 1990 Census information at the earliest practical date, but no later than July 15, 1991. The population figures for reapportionment, by law, are to be reported by December 31, 1990. This deadline may make it difficult to avoid the disruption problem noted in number five above.

The Commerce Department seeks comments by January 25, 1990 in order to publish the guidelines in final form by March 10, 1990. For further information contact: Mark W. Plant, Deputy Under Secretary for Economic Affairs, U.S. Department of Commerce, 202/377-3523.«

## MOORE LEAVES NSF; BRYANT GETS RECESS APPOINTMENT AT CENSUS

John H. Moore, deputy director of the National Science Foundation since 1985, has resigned his post to become director of the new International Institute at George Mason University in Virginia. No replacement has been named.

Moore, who has a Ph.D. in economics and experience as a research chemist, focused his efforts at NSF on international science issues and on his work as chairman of the task force on minorities in science. Prior to his NSF position, Moore was associate director and senior fellow at the Hoover Institution. He has also taught law and economics at Emory University, the University of Virginia, and the University of Miami. Moore's resignation increases speculation regarding NSF Director Bloch's future plans; his six-year term expires in September 1990.

On December 7, President Bush gave a recess appointment to Barbara Everitt Bryant to become director of the Census Bureau. The appointment provides a leader for the agency as it readies for the administration of the decennial census four months from now. Bryant was nominated by Bush on September 27, but the Senate did not confirm her before adjourning for the year. Recess appointees can serve until the end of the congressional session without confirmation. Sen. Jeff Bingaman (D-NM) and others on Capitol Hill have been highly critical



of the nine-month delay in selecting a director. Prior to her appointment Bryant was a Vice-President of Market Opinion Research of Detroit.«

## REPORT SAYS RESEARCH ENTERPRISE MUST RE-EVALUATE BASIC PREMISES

The American academic research enterprise is showing the strains of rapid growth and "extraordinary" success, according to the Government-University-Industry Research Roundtable. In a recent report, the Roundtable Group on the Academic Research Enterprise concluded that over the past four decades, the United States has developed a research capability "vastly larger and more decentralized" than could have been foreseen at the end of World War II. Past success breeds great hope for the future, the report notes, but maintaining the quality of the American research enterprise depends upon a reconsideration of its major premises.

"By pressing for an expansion of frontier research, as well as greater geographic diversity," the report notes, "the nation now faces decisions of how, to whom, to what extent, and for what purposes to allot limited resources." The report goes on to suggest that current research institutions and programs will require increased financial and human resources, as well as organizational innovation, if they are to maintain the high quality of American research.

The report's second section offers quantitative descriptions of the long-term trends at work in the academic research enterprise. The descriptions are intended, the paper states, "to provide a necessary historical perspective to many of the current challenges facing the enterprise and [to] add additional insights into many of the underlying influences which now shape its future." The quantitative information focuses primarily on inputs to the academic research enterprise, such as financial and human resources; output measures are not sufficiently refined to add meaningfully to analyses of academic research, the paper notes. Copies of the report, *Science and Technology in the Academic Enterprise: Status, Trends, and Issues*, are available free of charge from the Research Roundtable, 2101 Con-

stitution Avenue, NW, Suite NAS 340, Washington, DC 20418.«

## CONFERENCE TO FOCUS ON AMERICA IN 21ST CENTURY

A conference to examine the impact of demographic forces on American social, economic and political institutions as the nation prepares for the 21st Century, will take place on March 29, 1990 in Washington, DC. The conference will feature presentations by Sen. Daniel Patrick Moynihan (D-NY), former San Antonio Mayor Henry Cisneros, former Secretary of Labor Ray Marshall, and a number of social and behavioral science researchers. Topics for consideration will include human capital, educational reform, the challenge of an aging society, environmental protection, transportation and other infrastructure needs, the political landscape, and economic competitiveness. The Population Resource Center and the Population Reference Bureau are co-sponsoring the conference. For further information contact the Population Resource Center, 1725 K St., NW, Washington, DC 20006; 202/467-5030.«

### COSSA NEWS

With this issue, UPDATE enters the world of desktop publishing. We have significantly simplified our production process and dramatically increased the space available for news stories. Our new format is, we hope, an aesthetic improvement on the old; comments, criticism, and especially compliments are heartily encouraged.

COSSA also welcomes back Government Liaison Stacey Beckhardt, who has been busy these last few months with her new son, Aaron.«



## SOURCES OF RESEARCH SUPPORT: NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

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.

### Small Grants for Exploratory Research (SGER)

The National Science Foundation (NSF) is seeking proposals for small-scale, exploratory, high-risk research in all fields of science, engineering, and education normally supported by NSF. Such research, the foundation notes, is characterized as:

- preliminary work on untested or novel ideas;
- ventures into emerging research areas;
- application of new expertise and new approaches to "old" research topics;
- multi-disciplinary work, particularly projects crossing NSF program boundaries;
- research having a severe urgency with regard to availability or access to data, facilities, or specialized equipment;
- efforts of similar character likely to catalyze rapid and innovative advances.

Interim and final projects reports will be required, and grantees are expected to document efforts and outcomes, whether or not they consider themselves successful.

**Application Procedure:** One copy of the proposal is required. The project description should be two to five pages and include clear statements as to why the proposed research should be considered particularly exploratory and high-risk. The description should also explain the nature and significance of the project's potential impact on the field and why an SGER grant would be a suitable means of support.

Brief biographical information is required for principal or co-principal investigators only and should list no more than five significant publications or other research projects. Additional material is discouraged.

**Funding Mechanism:** SGER awards will not exceed \$50,000. Awards are non-renewable and normally made for one year; in no case will awards exceed two years. Continued support may be requested only through submission of a complete non-SGER proposal.

**Deadlines:** There is no formal deadline, but applicants are advised to submit proposals early in the fiscal year.

**Contact:** Prospective applicants are strongly encouraged to contact the relevant NSF program officer to determine whether the proposed work meets SGER guidelines. Officers can also offer information on the availability of SGER funding.



# CONSORTIUM OF SOCIAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATIONS

## MEMBERS

American Anthropological Association  
American Economic Association  
American Historical Association

American Political Science Association  
American Psychological Association  
American Sociological Association  
American Statistical Association

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

## AFFILIATES

American Agricultural Economics Association  
American Assembly of Collegiate Schools of Business  
American Association for Public Opinion Research  
American Educational Research Association  
American Psychological Association  
American Society of Criminology  
Association for Asian Studies  
Association for Social Sciences in Health  
Eastern Sociological Society

Gerontological Society of America  
History of Science Society  
International Studies Association  
Law and Society Association  
Midwest Sociological Society  
National Council on Family Relations  
National Council for the Social Studies  
North Central Sociological Association  
Northeastern Anthropological Association  
Operations Research Society of America  
Population Association of America

Regional Science Association  
Rural Sociological Society  
Social Science History Association  
Society for the History of Technology  
Society for Research on Adolescence  
Society for Research in Child Development  
Society for the Scientific Study of Religion  
Southern Sociological Society  
Southwestern Social Science Association  
Speech Communication Association  
The Institute for Management Sciences

## CONTRIBUTORS

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

Harvard University  
Howard University  
University of Illinois  
Indiana University  
Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan  
University of Iowa  
University of Maryland  
Massachusetts Institute of Technology  
Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs, Syracuse University  
University of Michigan  
University of Minnesota  
University of Missouri  
National Opinion Research Center  
University of Nebraska  
New York University  
University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill  
Northwestern University

Ohio State University  
University of Oregon  
Pennsylvania State University  
University of Pittsburgh  
Princeton University  
Rutgers University  
Social Science Research Council  
University of Southern California  
Stanford University  
State University of New York at Stony Brook  
University of Tennessee, Knoxville  
Texas A & M University  
Tulane University  
University of Virginia  
University of Washington  
University of Wisconsin, Madison  
University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee  
Yale University

---

Consortium of Social Science Associations

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

---