NEW CONGRESS CONTINUES ORGANIZING; FY 2007 FUNDING COMPLETION ON THE HORIZON

Almost a month into its first session, the new 110th Congress continues to organize as Committees set up their Subcommittees and choose leaders for these important panels, which often get first crack at new legislation and oversight of the Administration.

With the passage of the six bills in their first 100 hours agenda, the House now awaits Senate action on those bills. In addition, the Senate will vote on a non-binding resolution regarding President Bush’s latest strategy for Iraq. The newly organized Committees and Subcommittees have begun their initial rounds of hearings with the usual beginning of the year reports on the economy, (see below) but with the new majority taking advantage of its leadership positions to convene sessions on the Iraq war and on the consequences of poverty (see below).

With the President’s FY 2008 budget scheduled for release on February 5, the House has announced that it will vote on January 31 to complete the FY 2007 funding process. The Senate expects to take up the legislation the week of February 5 and the new appropriations leadership knows it must complete action before February 15, when the current Continuing Resolution funding all the agencies not in the defense or homeland security appropriations bills expires. The announced plan is that all those agencies will receive funding at the FY 2006
level, with some exceptions. The past month has witnessed feverish lobbying to influence
decisions on which agencies will obtain exemptions from the freeze. We will know soon.

New Subcommittee Leaders

The House Science and Technology (S&T) Committee has appointed Rep. Brian Baird (D-WA), a
Ph.D. psychologist, to lead its Research and Science Education panel. Rep. Vern Ehlers (R-MI),
a Ph.D. physicist, serves as Ranking Member. On the Senate side, Sen. John Kerry (D-MA), no
longer running for president, will chair the Science, Technology, and Innovation Subcommittee
of the Commerce, Science, and Transportation Committee. Sen. John Ensign (R-NV) serves as
Ranking Member. Any NSF reauthorization bill will begin its legislative journey in these panels.

Also on the House S&T panel, Rep. Brad Miller (D-NC) will head a new Subcommittee on
Investigations and Oversight. Former full Committee chairman, Rep. James Sensenbrenner (R-
WI) is the Ranking Member. This Subcommittee expects to examine the Administration’s so-
called “war on science.”

The House Committee on Education and Labor named Rep. Dale Kildee (D-MI), Chairman, and
Rep. Michael Castle (R-DE), Ranking Member, for its Subcommittee on Early Childhood,
Elementary and Secondary Education. This panel will also have jurisdiction over the Institute
of Educational Sciences. The Committee’s Higher Education, Lifelong Learning, and
Competitiveness Subcommittee will have Rep. Ruben Hinojosa (D-TX) as its chairman, and Rep.
Ric Keller (R-FL) as its Ranking Member.

As expected, Rep. William Lacy Clay (D-MO) will lead the Subcommittee on Information Policy,
Michael Turner (R-OH) is the Ranking Member.

Rep. Frank Pallone (D-NJ) takes over the Subcommittee on Health, with Rep. Nathan Deal (R-
GA) as Ranking Member. This panel has jurisdiction over the National Institutes of Health
(NIH). With the enactment of the reauthorization at the end of 2006, this panel will play a
mostly oversight role with regard to that agency.

The Senate Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee has established two new
Subcommittees. Sen. Mary Landrieu (D-LA) will lead a panel on Disaster Recovery. Sen. Ted
Stevens (R-AK) will serve as Ranking Member. Sen. Mark Pryor (D-AR) will head the
Subcommittee on State, Local, and Private Sector Preparedness and Integration, with Sen. John
Sununu (D-NH) as Ranking Member.

Rep. Bobby Scott (D-VA) chairs the House Judiciary Committee’s Subcommittee on Crime,
Howard Berman (D-CA) leads the Subcommittee on Courts, the Internet, and Intellectual
Property, with former Chairman Rep. Howard Coble (R-NC) as the Ranking Member. Rep. Jerry
Nadler (D-NY) heads the Subcommittee on Constitution, Civil Rights, and Civil Liberties.

On the Senate side, Sen. Joe Biden (D-DE), chair of Foreign Relations and running for President,
heads the Subcommittee on Crime and Drugs. Sen. Lindsey Graham (R-SC) is the Ranking
Member. Sen. Russ Feingold (D-WI) chairs a Subcommittee on the Constitution, Civil Rights,
and Property Rights, with presidential aspirant, Sen. Sam Brownback (R-KS) as Ranking
Member. Feingold has already announced hearings on how the Congress can reassert its
lawmaking powers to stop the war in Iraq. Sen. Diane Feinstein (D-CA) heads a Subcommittee
on Terrorism, Technology, and Homeland Security. Sen. John Kyl (R-AZ) is the Ranking
Member.
STATEMENT OF ELIAS A. ZERHOUNI, NIH DIRECTOR ON THE NIH REFORM ACT OF 2006 AND NEXT STEPS

I am pleased to announce that the President signed the National Institutes of Health Reform Act of 2006 on January 15, 2007. This follows bipartisan support by the Congress. The Act affirms the importance of the NIH and its vital role in advancing biomedical research to improve the health of the Nation.

This is only the third omnibus reauthorization in the NIH’s history, and the first in 14 years.

We have initiated an implementation process at NIH to carry out the new legislation. The work is already under way. I have formed an Ad Hoc Working Group of the NIH Steering Committee, to be chaired by the NIH Deputy Director, Dr. Raynard Kington, and comprising Institute and Center (IC) Directors and leadership in legislation, policy, management, communications, extramural and intramural activities, budget, and the Office of the General Counsel, to make recommendations on the implementation of the legislation. The Ad Hoc Working Group will be charged to complete a careful, detailed analysis of the legislation and propose plans for its implementation that will aid the NIH in serving the public and our scientific community more effectively.

Key provisions in the Act include items related to (1) the Division of Program Coordination, Planning and Strategic Initiatives; (2) the Common Fund; (3) the Council of Councils; (4) the Scientific Management Review Board; (5) Authorization of Appropriations; (6) Reorganization; and (7) Reporting.

1. The Division of Program Coordination, Planning and Strategic Initiatives (DPCPSI) The DPCPSI, within the Office of the Director, is officially established. The purpose of DPCPSI is to identify and report on research that represents important areas of emerging scientific opportunities, rising public health challenges, or knowledge gaps that deserve special emphasis and would benefit from the conduct or support of additional research that involves collaboration between two or more ICs, or would otherwise benefit from strategic coordination and planning.

2. The Common Fund
The Common Fund (CF) will support trans-NIH research. CF amounts will be reserved by the NIH Director, subject to any applicable provisions in appropriations Acts, but the amount reserved as a percentage of the total appropriation in any fiscal year may not be less than the percentage from the preceding fiscal year. The first year that the CF reaches the 5 percent mark, the Director will be required, in consultation with the Council of Councils, to submit recommendations to Congress for changes regarding amounts for the CF.

3. Council of Councils
A new Council of Councils will advise on research proposals that would be funded by the Common Fund. It will be composed of 27 members selected from the IC Advisory Councils, individuals nominated by OD offices, and members of the NIH Council of Public Representatives.

4. Scientific Management Review Board (SMRB)
At least every 7 years, the SMRB will be required to examine the use of the NIH’s organizational authorities, provide a report on the review, and make recommendations regarding the use of such authorities. If the SMRB recommends an organizational change, the process to effect the change must begin within 100 days of the report, and the change must be fully implemented within 3 years. These requirements do not apply if the NIH Director
formally objects to all or part of the recommended organizational change within 90 days, and the objection includes a rationale.

5. Authorization of Appropriations
Most expired authorizations of appropriations sections relevant to the NIH will be deleted from the Statute and replaced with one authorization of appropriations for the entire Agency for the following amounts: $30,331,309,000 for FY 2007; $32,831,309,000 for FY 2008; and such sums as may be necessary for FY 2009.

6. Reorganization
The legislation requires a public process for certain reorganizations and identifies procedures for any reorganization.

7. Reporting
Most reports pertaining to NIH in current law will be deleted and replaced by one biennial report to Congress. Additional reports with respect to collaboration with other DHHS agencies, clinical trials, tissue samples, whistleblowers, and experts and consultants are required. Reports will be required from each institution receiving an NIH award for the training of graduate students for doctoral degrees. ICs will also be required to report to the Director of NIH on the amount of that IC’s budget made available for trans-NIH research. Detailed information about these elements and others is available on the Web at http://www.nih.gov/about/reauthorization/.

This affirmation from Congress and the President has come at a critical time, and we want to ensure that we take the best possible advantage of this opportunity. We will be communicating with the community regularly as we make progress in this process.

/s/
Elias A. Zerhouni, M.D.
NIH Director

NIH OPASI DIRECTOR SELECTED

On January 25, National Institutes of Health (NIH) Director Elias Zerhouni announced the selection of Alan Krensky as the first NIH Deputy Director for the Office of Portfolio Analysis and Strategic Analysis (OPASI). He will assume the position on July 8, 2007. According to Zerhouni, Krensky “will play a key leadership role” as OPASI is designed to be an “incubator space to address critical research efforts in cross-cutting areas of NIH priorities” (see Update, December 12, 2004).

Krensky graduated from the University of Pennsylvania in 1973 and received his M.D. also from the University of Pennsylvania in 1977. He most recently served as a professor of pediatrics, Chief of the Division of Immunology and Transplantation Biology, Associate Chair for Research in the Department of Pediatrics, and Associate Dean for Children’s Health at the Stanford University School of Medicine. His research interests are in human cellular and molecular immunology, transplantation immunology, and tumor immunology. He is a member of the American Society for Clinical Investigation and the Association of American Physicians and is a co-author of more than 240 research papers. Krensky has received numerous awards.

Built on the success of the NIH Roadmap for Medical Research, OPASI has two goals: 1) to identify important areas of emerging scientific opportunities or rising public health challenges, and 2) to help accelerate investments in these areas to make sure new ideas have a chance to
The Office also provides new opportunity for trans-NIH dialogue, decision-making, and funding for scientific priorities and opportunities that the agency feels would be difficult to support otherwise.

OPASI provides the NIH institutes and centers with the methods and information necessary to manage their large and complex scientific portfolios, identifies - in concert with multiple other inputs - important areas of emerging scientific opportunities or rising public health challenges, and assists in the acceleration of investments in these areas, focusing on those involving multiple institutes and centers. Additional information on OPASI is available at http://opasi.nih.gov.

BROOKINGS SCHOLAR ORSZAG NEW CBO DIRECTOR

Following the recommendation of the Chairmen and Ranking Members of the House and Senate Budget Committees, Sen. Kent Conrad (D-ND), Rep. John Spratt (D-SC), Sen. Judd Gregg (R-NH) and Rep. Paul Ryan (R-WI), House Speaker Nancy Pelosi (D-CA) and Senate Pro-Tem Robert Byrd (D-WV) have selected Peter Orszag as the new director of the Congressional Budget Office (CBO).

Orszag, who becomes CBO’s seventh director since its creation in 1974, began a four-year term on January 18, 2007. He replaces Douglas Holtz-Eakin, who left at the end of 2005. Donald Marron, who had served as Acting Director through 2006 returns to his position as Deputy Director. CBO plays an important role in the congressional consideration of budgets and other economic activities by providing objective, nonpartisan, and timely analyses as well as estimates on the costs of new programs.

Orszag comes to CBO from the Brookings Institution where he was the Joseph A. Pechman Senior Fellow and Deputy Director of Economic Studies. At Brookings, he also served as Director of The Hamilton Project, which provides a platform for scholars to offer proposals for promoting broad-based economic growth (see Update, December 12, 2006). He also led the Retirement Security Project and was Co-director of the Tax Policy Center.

Before moving to Brookings, during 1997 and 1998 Orszag served as Special Assistant to President Clinton for Economic Policy and Senior Economic Adviser at the National Economic Council. In 1995 and 1996, he was Senior Adviser and Senior Economist at the President's Council of Economic Advisers (CEA). He joined the CEA as a staff economist in 1993 and 1994.

Orszag has a B.A. from Princeton University and earned M.Sc. and Ph.D. degrees in economics from the London School of Economics, which he attended as a Marshall scholar. He has co-authored a number of books, including Protecting the Homeland 2006/2007, Aging Gracefully: Ideas to Improve Retirement Security in America, and Saving Social Security: A Balanced Approach, and co-edited American Economic Policy in the 1990s. His main areas of research have been pensions, Social Security, budget policy, higher education policy, homeland security, macroeconomics, and tax policy - topics on which he has published widely in academic journals.

Projecting a Balanced Budget Does Not End U.S. Economic Difficulties

In his first days on the job, Orszag presented CBO’s budget and economic outlook for 2008-2017 to both the House and Senate Budget Committees. His testimony included projections of smaller deficits for the next four years, roughly one percent of GDP. “Under the assumptions that govern CBO’s baseline projections, the budget would essentially be balanced in 2011 and
then would show surpluses of about one percent of GDP each year through 2017,” he told the panels.

Despite this favorable outlook, Orszag noted that “the aging of the population and continuing increases in health care costs are expected to put considerable pressure on the budget in coming decades.” He warned that economic growth alone is unlikely to alleviate the future problems for Medicare, Medicaid and Social Security. Therefore, he argued that “either a substantial reduction in the growth of spending, a significant increase in tax revenues relative to the size of the economy, or some combination of spending and revenue changes will be necessary to promote the nation’s long-term fiscal stability.”

For Orszag’s full testimony and other CBO projections go to: www.cbo.gov

HOUSE PANEL EXAMINES CONSEQUENCES OF POVERTY

On January 24th, the House Ways and Means Committee, with its new Chairman Rep. Charles Rangel (D-NY), held a hearing on poverty in America. The session focused on two reports that synthesized an enormous amount of social science research, particularly in economics, on the subject.

The first, Poverty in America: Consequences for Individuals and the Economy produced by the Government Accountability Office (GAO), described the current state of the research without prescribing policy solutions. Sigurd Nilsen, GAO’s Director for Education, Workforce, and Income Security Issues, summarized the report for the Committee. (The report is available at www.gao.gov/cgi-bin/getrpt?GAO-07-343T )

The second, The Economic Costs of Poverty in the United States, released by the Center for American Progress (CAP), was written by Harry Holzer of Georgetown University and the Urban Institute, Diane Whitemore Schanzenbach of the University of Chicago, Greg Duncan of Northwestern, and Jens Ludwig of Georgetown. Holzer testified. (The report is available at www.americanprogress.org/issues/2007/01/poverty_report.html )

The GAO report described the increased risk of adverse outcomes faced by the 37 million people, approximately 13 percent of the population, defined by the Census Bureau as living below the poverty line in 2005. Nilsen indicated that research (including a reference to a 1997 study co-authored by current NIH Deputy Director Raynard Kington) suggests that poor individuals “face an increased risk of … poor health and criminal activity, both of which may lead to reduced participation in the labor market.” Nilsen admitted that “while the mechanisms by which poverty affects health are complex,” there is some evidence “that adverse health outcomes can be due, in part, to limited access to health care as well as greater exposure to environmental hazards and engaging in risky behaviors.” Poverty limits individuals’ development of skills to fully participate in the labor force, which in turn negatively impacts economic growth by affecting the accumulation of human capital and rates of crime and social unrest, GAO concluded.

The CAP report, Holzer testified, makes the “economic (his emphasis) case for reducing child poverty.” The paper reviews a range of studies that estimate the average statistical relationships between children growing up in poverty and their earnings, propensity to commit crime, and quality of health later in life. It also reviews the estimates of the costs that crime and poor health impose on the economy. All of these average costs per poor child are then aggregated across the total number of children growing up in poverty in the U.S. to estimate the aggregate costs of child poverty to the U.S. economy.
The results, Holzer declared, is that “the costs to the U.S. associated with childhood poverty total about $500 billion per year, or the equivalent of nearly 4 percent of GDP.”

Childhood poverty, the CAP report estimates: reduces productivity and economic output by about 1.3 percent of GDP; raises the costs of crime by 1.3 percent of GDP; and raises health expenditures and reduces the value of health by 1.2 percent of GDP.

What to do about this? The CAP report says “our conclusions point unmistakably to several clear options:” universal pre-kindergarten programs; various elementary and secondary school reforms; expansions of the Earned Income Tax Credit and other income supports for the working poor; job training for poor adults; higher minimum-wage and more collective bargaining; low income neighborhood revitalization and housing mobility; and marriage promotion and faith-based initiatives.

The Committee invited its former staff member, Ron Haskins, now a Senior Fellow at the Brookings Institution, to comment on the CAP report and the topic in general. Haskins, who played a major role in the enactment of the welfare reform legislation in 1996, called the CAP report “a challenging and exceptionally interesting product of sophisticated social science methods.” He expressed some concern with the costs necessary to reduce childhood poverty, given the government spent over $600 million in 2005 on programs for poor and low-income individuals and families and the child poverty rate was still 17.6 percent.

Reflecting on his experiences with welfare reform, Haskins declared that “the poor are poor in large part because they make decisions that greatly increase the likelihood that they will be poor.” He remarked that many people “born with disadvantages manage to overcome them.” “Changes in the behavior” of poor parents and poor children, Haskins argued, are necessary conditions in order to realize the gains to the economy that the CAP report envisions. Citing Northwestern Professor Susan Mayer’s research, Haksins noted her conclusion that “influencing child outcomes requires more than just money.”

Haskins, referencing his Brookings colleague Isabel Sawhill’s work, contended that “the most effective way to reduce poverty would be to increase work levels; the second most effective way would be to increase marriage rates.” He noted that after welfare reform forced many poor mothers to work, child poverty rates dropped. In addition, increased personal responsibility, such as not having babies out-of-wedlock and not dropping out of school, “is vital to reducing poverty.” He does favor government intervention to help support those who work such as the EITC and other tax benefits. He also believes that “the intervention program that has the best evidence of having long-term impacts on children’s development is high quality pre-school.” He is not convinced that large-scale programs like Head Start produce long-term effects. There are some model programs that have worked well, but “we do not have the knowledge to implement effective large-scale programs,” Haskins concluded.

Two other witnesses, Jane Knitzer of the National Center for Children in Poverty, associated with Columbia University’s School of Public Health, and David Jones, President and CEO of the Community Service Society of New York City, reinforced the conclusions of the GAO and CAP reports. Knitzer focused on the importance of successful cognitive development of children and forcefully advocated for programs that “address poverty in the earliest years.” Jones discussed the importance of jobs and the real unemployment rate that includes those folks, including many black men and teenagers in New York City, who have simply stopped looking for work and therefore are not included in the official unemployment data. He also reinforced the CAP report call for increased collective bargaining noting that New York City’s 63,000 private security guards are mostly men of color who are non-union, make 55 percent of the median for all workers in NY metro area, and have no sick leave or health benefits.
The Ways and Means members reacted to all this in perhaps typical fashion. Republicans such as Rep. Wally Herger (R-CA) reinforced Haskins’ discussion of improving the marriage rate, which led his fellow Californian Rep. Pete Stark (D-CA) to call government-supported marriage programs “wacky” and Rep. Sander Levin (D-MI) to express skepticism on the ability for government to “impact the marriage dynamic in our society.” Holzer responded by noting the “marriagability” problem, since many young men, lacking jobs and education and sometimes having prison records, are not viewed as good catches by young women.

Ranking Member Jim McCrery (R-LA) began a discussion, later picked up by Rep. Dave Camp (R-MI), on how to measure the poverty rate by indicating that most of the cash transfers and in-kind services the poor receive from government programs are not counted as income in determining poverty. Haskins referred to a National Academies’ report suggesting revisions and alternative models to the “official poverty rate.” But he also warned that any attempt by Congress to force a change in the measurement would face fierce opposition from Members whose districts would lose formula program funds under any new definition.

Finally, Chairman Rangel noted that the Committee would try to cope with the consequences of poverty “to stop things from hemorrhaging,” but in a “fiscally responsible way.”

FORMER COSSA PRESIDENT WINS INTERNATIONAL CRIMINOLOGY PRIZE

Alfred Blumstein, J. Erik Jonsson University Professor of Urban Systems and Operations Research at Carnegie Mellon University and former COSSA President, has been named one of two winners of the 2007 Stockholm Prize in Criminology.

The prize, first awarded in 2006 to John Braithwaite and Friedrich Losel, was established to recognize achievement in the field of criminological research. Financed by the Jerry Lee Foundation and other foundations in Japan and Sweden, the winners are selected by an independent jury of eleven criminologists from Asia, Latin American, North America, Africa, Australia, and Europe. Professors Jerzy Sarnecki of the University of Stockholm and Lawrence Sherman of the University of Pennsylvania currently co-chair the selection panel.

The Committee recognized Blumstein for his “major contribution to the research into criminal careers” and “for his analyses of variations in the frequency of offending in the careers of active criminals in U.S. jurisdictions.” His research, the Committee concluded, has also “had a global impact on justice policies and practices, as well as on the rapid growth in the influence of developmental and life-course criminology.”

In 1986 Blumstein chaired a National Academy of Sciences Panel on Research on Criminal Careers, which examined the state of knowledge about patterns of offending. His most recent work includes two volumes, one looking at *Reentry as a Transient State between Liberty and Recommitment* (edited with A.J. Beck) and explaining *The Crime Drop in America* (with J. Wallman). He has served as President of the American Society of Criminology and has been a mentor to and collaborator with many younger criminology researchers.

Aside from his presidency, Blumstein served on the COSSA Board for six years, participated in a number of COSSA congressional seminars, and addressed the COSSA Annual Meeting.

The other 2007 winner is Terrie E. Moffitt, Professor of Social Behavior and Development at the Institute of Psychiatry of the University of London and Professor of Psychology at Duke University. Moffitt was cited for her “leadership role in major social, psychological and biological studies of crime and human development around the world.” In particular, her work
on the Dunedin Multidisciplinary Health and Development Study in New Zealand has identified patterns of intimate as well as stranger crime, including discoveries about the role of females as initiators of violence.

The prize, which includes a cash award of one million Swedish Kroner, will be presented on June 5, 2007 at a ceremony in Stockholm City Hall during the International Stockholm Criminology Symposium, which will take place from June 4-6.

NIH SEEKS RESEARCH PROPOSALS ON CLINICAL DECISION MAKING IN LIFE-THREATENING ILLNESS

The National Institute of Nursing Research (NINR) and the National Cancer Institute (NCI) have reissued the program announcement (PA-07-316) soliciting applications Research on Clinical Decision Making in Life-Threatening Illness. The institutes seek to stimulate research on the decision-making processes made by persons faced with life-threatening illnesses. These illnesses are the ones that almost always lead to death in a fairly short period of time if left untreated, but may be chronic - or even cured - if dealt with early in the disease process. HIV infection, when treated, is cited as an example of a life-threatening illness that may be chronic. Early-staged breast cancer is an example of a life-threatening illness that may be cured in its early stages.

Clinical decision-making is a complex process that requires research into how decisions are made from both intrinsic and social perspectives. Decision-making becomes even more complex when the clinical condition at issue is life threatening. Despite recent advances, the decisions to be made are usually fraught with uncertainty. The program announcement seeks research on how patients (and, where appropriate, patients and families/support systems) cope with uncertainty and arrive at decisions. These decisions may occur at all points along the disease continuum. As before, the announcement also seeks out research to build on knowledge needed for patients to become increasingly involved in the clinical decision-making process. At the same time, it is meant to stimulate research on decision making styles that involve not only the individual, but also other participants.

Examples of areas of clinical decision-making research that would be responsive to the program announcement include:

- Determine the manner in which person-level factors, such as gender and racial/cultural identity influence clinical decision-making among persons faced with life-threatening illness.

- Test interventions that improve the decision-making process for persons undergoing genetic screening, genetic diagnosis, and genetic therapies.

- Investigate the factors that influence decision making regarding new or experimental diagnostic or therapeutic innovations.

- Investigate the factors influencing the decision -making process to undertake testing for serious genetic disorders among patients and their families. Studies of decision making around next steps after receiving results, in particular where there is no curative therapy, as yet, are also welcome.

- Identify and test different communication approaches (e.g., technology-based, face-to-face, print, video) to promote understanding by the patient of the clinical decision-making process.
• Evaluate different approaches to end of life decision making besides advanced directives.

• Test interventions to assist patients and families in clinical decisions near the end-of-life. Such interventions may assess whether familial conflict is lessened, and include outcomes targeted to bereaved family members.


INTERNATIONAL RESEARCH AND STUDIES PROGRAM
SOLICITATION

The Department of Education seeks applicants for its International and Research Studies program funded under Title VI of the Higher Education Act. The program hopes to make 12 new awards with an estimated $1.6 million. The deadline for transmittal of applications is March 12, 2007.

The International Research and Studies Program provides grants for research to improve and strengthen instruction in modern foreign languages, areas studies, and other international fields. The solicitation includes preference priorities for “instructional materials for critical language studies,” defined as Arabic, Chinese, Japanese, Korean, Russian, and the Indic, Iranian, and Turkic language families, and for “research, surveys, proficiency assessments, or studies that foster linkages between K-12 and postsecondary language training.”

For more information contact:  Ed McDermott, U.S. Department of Education, 202/502-7636 or ed.mcdermott@ed.gov.
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