

Editor's Note: If you wish to continue receiving COSSA Washington Update, please add newsletter@coffa.org to your address book (or "buddy", "safe", "approved" or "trusted sender" lists). If you are receiving a forwarded copy of Update and would like to receive it directly, please email us at newsletter@coffa.org or visit us on the web at www.coffa.org.



COSSA Washington Update

Volume 26, Issue 3

February 12, 2007

IN THIS ISSUE:

- [President Releases FY 2008 Budget Proposal; FY 2007 Appropriations Completion Near](#)
 - [NSF Budget Increased In FY 2007 And FY 2008](#)
 - [NIH Receives \\$620 Million Increase For FY 2007; Cut In Proposed FY 2008 Budget](#)
 - [Agriculture Research Spending In Flux](#)
 - [Census 2010 Ramp Up Continues](#)
 - [Jay Waite Named Deputy Director Of The Census Bureau](#)
 - [Are We Ringing The Bell Too Early?](#)
 - [Public Schools And Social Conflict](#)
 - [Drug Abuse, Risky Decision Making And HIV/Aids: Research Proposals Wanted](#)
 - [Luxembourg Income Study Summer 2007 Workshop](#)
-

PRESIDENT RELEASES FY 2008 BUDGET PROPOSAL; FY 2007 APPROPRIATIONS COMPLETION NEAR

On February 5, President Bush released his proposed budget for FY 2008, which begins on October 1, 2007. Unfortunately, the budget documents do not include final congressionally-appropriated numbers for FY 2007, with the exception of the Department of Defense and Department of Homeland Security. On January 31, the House has passed H.J. Res 20 (hereafter JR), a resolution that will complete the process by extending FY 2006 funding levels for most programs, with exceptions for some agencies including the National Science Foundation (NSF), the National Institutes of Health (NIH), and the Census Bureau. The Senate hopes to finish up the FY 2007 process the week of February 12 before the current Continuing Resolution funding the government runs out on February 15.

The President's proposed budget continues his propensity to build a budget around increases for defense and homeland security, almost level spending for everything else, extension of his enacted tax cuts, and small attempts to rein in mandatory spending. The FY 2008 budget proposes outlays of \$2.9 trillion with receipts expected to total \$2.7 trillion. The

Administration estimates the Gross Domestic Product (GDP) at \$14.5 trillion, so the projected deficit of \$239 billion is only 1.6 percent of GDP.

The discretionary spending request is \$929.8 billion about 6.5 percent above the FY 2007 requested level. This does not include the \$175 billion to fund the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan requested in FY 2007 (\$72 billion already enacted, and another \$103 billion about to come up for congressional consideration). Almost all the increase in discretionary spending will come in what is now called "Security Funding." This category, proposed at \$553.9 billion, almost 11 percent above last year, includes funding for the Department of Defense, homeland security activities Government wide (including \$375 million in NSF's proposed FY 2008 budget), and international affairs. Aside from this the Administration is requesting another \$145.2 billion for the "Global War on Terror," which includes Iraq and Afghanistan. "Non-Security Funding" will rise to \$375.9 billion in the request, only a one-percent boost over this year. The President has also submitted a list of 141 programs the Administration wants eliminated or its funding reduced. Many of these programs are repeats from previous years' lists, which Congress has pretty much ignored.

The rest of the spending comes from Mandatory items such as Medicare, Medicaid, Social Security, Student Aid and other programs whose total spending depends on usage. This part of the budget, now close to 60 percent of total spending, concerns people who, with baby-boomer retirements on the horizon, have projected huge increases to the point of crowding out almost all other spending. Proposals to deal with this looming disaster have proliferated, from the President's ill-fated privatization plans for social security to calls for bipartisan "expert" commissions. So far, except for some tinkering with the payments to doctors and premiums for recipients, not much has occurred.

Below are budget figures for key agencies supporting social and behavioral science research. COSSA's complete analysis of the President's proposed FY 2008 budget will appear on March 5.

NSF BUDGET INCREASED IN FY 2007 AND FY 2008

The inclusion of NSF in the President's American Competitiveness Initiative (ACI) has made it a most-favored agency both in the JR for FY 2007 appropriations and in the President's proposed budget for FY 2008.

The JR provides the President's requested 7.7 percent increase for the Research and Related Activities account, bringing total NSF FY 2007 funding to \$5.916 billion. All the other accounts including the Education and Human Resources Directorate (EHR) are funded at the FY 2006 levels. For EHR that comes to \$796.7 million.

The FY 2008 proposal would increase NSF's budget to \$6.429 billion. This includes \$5.130 billion for Research and Related Activities. The proposed funding for the Social, Behavioral, and Economic Sciences (SBE) Directorate is \$222 million, if the House JR numbers hold SBE would receive \$213.8 million in FY 2007, the largest percentage increase of any of NSF's research directorates. Reflecting the continued calls for increased emphasis on physical sciences, engineering, and computer science, the three research directorates in these areas receive the largest increases in the proposed FY 2008 budget.

The recommendation for EHR in FY 2008 is \$750.6 million. NSF has moved the \$107 million proposed in FY 2008 for the Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Research (EPSCOR) program out of the EHR directorate into the Office of Integrative Activities in the director's office.

NIH RECEIVES \$620 MILLION INCREASE FOR FY 2007; CUT IN PROPOSED FY 2008 BUDGET

The House approved Joint Resolution (JR) provides a \$2.3 billion increase for programs funded by the Labor, Health, and Human Services and Education appropriations bill, including giving the National Institutes of Health (NIH) an increase of \$619.5 million above the FY 2006 adjusted level of \$28.3 billion. This will bring NIH's FY 2007 funding to \$28.931 billion minus a \$99 million transfer to the Global AIDS Fund. The increase, according to House Appropriations Chairman David Obey, reverses "a projected decline in new NIH research project awards and supports an additional 500 research project grants, 1,500 first time investigators, and expands funding for high risk and high impact research." The JR includes \$91 million in the Office of the Director (OD) to support new investigators in an effort to "take some of the pressure off the ICs [institutes and centers], which have been asked to maintain the level of awards to first-time investigators."

The JR appropriates \$483 million specifically to the Common Fund which subsumes the NIH Roadmap for Medical Research (see Update, [December 12, 2005](#)). This represents a departure from previous years where ICs contributed a percentage of their appropriations to the Fund. While the funding amount was not specified in the past, it will be from now on. This change eliminates the transfer, which in FY 2006 constituted approximately 0.9 percent of each ICs budget. Of the \$483 million, \$40 million is designated for a new Junior Pioneer award program. The awards will fund high-risk research with potentially high-impact returns, similar to the regular Pioneer awards (see Update, [October 10, 2005](#)). The difference between the two awards is that Junior awards will be smaller and for shorter time periods. But just like the Pioneer awards, the Junior award will receive all its funding up front. The remaining \$443 million in the Common Fund includes a \$113 million increase over the FY 2006 funding level.

For the National Children's Study (NCS), the JR provides the \$69 million, an increase of \$58 million, in funding needed to move the study forward (see Update, [May 26, 2006](#)). The Administration zeroed out the funding for the study in its budget. The \$11 million in funding included in the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (NICHD) for FY 2006 for NCS was been moved to the OD to fund the study.

Finally, the JR provides increases to several ICs intended to benefit all diseases: \$5 million for the National Library of Medicine, \$4 million for National Center for Minority Health and Health Disparities, and \$34 million for the National Center for Research Resources. It provides \$7 million in funding to implement initiatives in the NIH Reform Act of 2006 (see Update, [December 12, 2006](#)).

Not So Good New for FY 2008

In 2003, the Bush Administration presided over the completion of the five-year doubling effort of the National Institutes of Health's (NIH) budget. Since then the Administration has done an about-face. For the fifth year in a row, the President's proposed budget for the agency has failed to keep up with the rate of inflation. The President's FY 2008 budget request provides \$28.621 billion for the NIH. This sum includes a transfer of \$300 million from the NIH's budget to the Global AIDS fund. This means that the President's proposed FY 2008 budget is \$511 million or 1.7 percent below the funding level proposed in the FY 2007 JR. The [Biomedical Research and Development Price Index \(BRDPI\)](#) is projected to be 3.7 percent in FY 2007 and FY 2008. Enactment of the Administration's proposal would mean an approximate cut of 13 percent in inflation-adjusted dollars.

Whether this a return to an age-old ploy of low-balling NIH in the President's request fully expecting the Congress to provide the increase, or a long-term reining in of NIH

spending, the appropriations process will determine.

AGRICULTURE RESEARCH SPENDING IN FLUX

This year Congress will once again renew programs for agriculture and rural development as it reauthorizes programs included in the Farm legislation. In the meantime, the spending for agricultural and rural research programs undergoes some interesting transformations.

The ban on earmarks in the JR led to the elimination of the \$126.9 million in Special Grants funding in the FY 2007 spending bill. This in turn created some interesting developments. The Hatch Act formula programs went from \$177 million in FY 2006 to \$322.6 million in the JR. The expectation is that those programs usually included in the Special Grants account could get picked up under the big boost for the Hatch Act moving the funding decisions to the States and universities. For FY 2008, the Administration asks for \$164.4 million for Hatch Act programs, while at the same time requesting \$3.3 million for Special Grants. Of the \$164.4 million, \$98 million, a boost from 20 to 60 percent of the budget, would be directed to a multi-state competitive program. Whether there is a return to a more transparent Special Grants program with decisions moving back to the national level for FY 2008 remains to be seen.

The Administration is also playing games with the National Research Initiative Competitive Grants program (NRI). Having received a small increase of \$8 million in the FY 2007 JR to \$190.2 million, the President's budget request seeks \$256.5 million for the NRI in FY 2008. Once again, the Administration wants to move programs spending about \$36 million from the Integrated Activities account into the NRI. This proposed maneuver has been rejected by Congress in the past.

After receiving level funding of \$75 million in the FY 2007 JR, the Economic Research Service would get a boost of \$8 million in FY 2008. The National Agricultural Statistics Service would get a big increase to \$168 million in FY 2008, since this is the year to conduct the Census of Agriculture.

CENSUS 2010 RAMP UP CONTINUES

As noted, the JR also includes an exception for key census programs, allocating \$511.6 million for 2010 census activities. The amount reflects the increase requested by the President for FY 2007. The measure also provides \$182.5 million for other censuses and programs related to the decennial count, such as geographic support, bringing the total for the Periodic Censuses and Programs account to \$694.1 million, the amount in the Administration's request.

The Salaries and Expenses Account, which covers ongoing demographic, social, and economic statistical activities, receives from the JR the same \$195.5 million it got in FY 2006, slightly more than the President requested. The fate of the Survey of Income and Program Participation (SIPP) program is in the hands of the Bureau. The President's FY 2007 budget request included about \$9 million to complete 2006 data collection and begin a re-design of how it collects its data on income and poverty. The re-design is currently underway. House appropriators, however, added an extra \$10 million to their FY 2007 Census allocation passed last summer to continue the current survey until a new data collection system is in place.

For FY 2008, the President's budget requests \$1.23 billion in discretionary funds for the Census Bureau. Continuing to ramp up to 2010, Periodic Censuses and Programs receives \$1.027 billion, a boost of \$325 million. Of this increase, the largest component is \$281 million to continue reengineering the 2010 Decennial Census to reduce operational risk; to improve accuracy and relevance of data; to contain total costs; and to provide for the 2008 Census Dress Rehearsal. Another program addition includes \$43 million to support collecting and

processing data from the 2007 Economic Census. The Salaries and Expenses request for FY 2008 is \$202.8 million.

JAY WAITE NAMED DEPUTY DIRECTOR OF THE CENSUS BUREAU

In November 2006, the Department of Commerce announced the resignations of Census Bureau director Louis Kincannon and deputy director Hermann Habermann. Kincannon said he would stay until the appointment of a successor. Habermann left in early January 2007.

Last week Kincannon announced the appointment of Preston Jay Waite to replace Habermann as Deputy Director. Waite has been the Bureau's Associate Director in charge of preparations for the 2010 centennial, including its major re-engineering. He has been at the Bureau since 1971. Aside from his work with the Decennial Census, he has also spent over ten years in the Demographic and Economic areas, including shepherding the birth of the American Community Survey. He is a Fellow of the American Statistical Association and has written extensively in professional journals and publications. During his tenure at the Census Bureau, Waite has received numerous awards, including two gold medals and two presidential rank awards. He has a M.S. in mathematics and computer science from Utah State University. Although numerous names have surfaced in the rumor mill for Kincannon's replacement, the Administration has yet to name anyone.

ARE WE RINGING THE BELL TOO EARLY?

The Education Sector held a panel discussion on February 7 to coincide with the release of their report, *On the Clock: Rethinking the Way Schools Use Time*. Panelists included moderator Kevin Carey, Education Sector; An-Me Chung, C.S. Mott Foundation; Toks Fashola, The John Hopkins University; Chris Gabrieli, Massachusetts 2020; Rick Larios, Edison Schools; and Elena Silva, Education Sector.

Typically students in our public schools spend 6.5 hours a day in school, and have a 180-day school year. However, despite how long this may feel to students and parents, this figure is misleading since the actual amount of time spent on class instruction is much less. Students in our public schools only receive an average of about 799 instructional hours per school year. In comparison, countries whose students perform well on international tests spend a greater amount of time on instructional learning; Finland averages 861 hours, Korea 1079 hours, Netherlands 911 hours, and Japan 926 hours. Students from all of these countries scored higher than U.S. students, who ranked 24th, on the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development Programme for International Student Assessment Math Test, which tests 15-year olds in 40 different countries.

Elena Silva, of the Education Sector and author of the report, separates school time into four different categories, allocated school time, allocated class time, instructional time and academic learning time. Allocated school and class time are defined as the amount of time students are required to spend in school and in class. These times also include the amount of time spent on recess, announcements, lunch, time between classes and other non-instructional activities. Instructional time is the amount time that is specifically set aside for instruction, while academic learning time is the time students spend actually engaged in learning.

Need for Quality Time in Classrooms

Silva states the problem with school time isn't how much of it students spend in school, but how that time is spent. Her research finds that whereas students across the country may be spending the same amount of time in school, how that time is used varies greatly. Research shows that students who receive more allocated school time perform only slightly better than

students who receive less. However, more instructional time correlates with achievement and more academic learning time correlates even higher with achievement. Rick Larios of Edison School agrees, "It's really about improving the quality of the time being spent in school. How that time is being spent. We need to give students time spend on core subjects as well as enrichment programs."

According to the report minority and low-income students are less likely than their middle class counterparts to engage in educational activities outside of school, and these students would benefit from having an extended school day or academic year. Research shows that by extending the instructional and academic learning time of these students it helps improve student learning, reduces the effects of summer learning loss, and closes the achievement gap.

Gabrieli is president of Massachusetts 2020, a Boston based education policy organization that has partnered with the Massachusetts Department of Education to oversee and assist the conversion of 10 public schools to a longer school day schedule. Gabrieli asserts that teachers and principals realize they don't have enough time to get all the year's educational requirements accomplished in a 6.5 hour day and with only 180 total days. He suggests our education system needs to figure out a way to blend our school days to teach the academic basics required, as well give time to other courses. He said this approach would require more money, resources, intellectual input and debate, and greater technological assistance to help school systems break out of their rut.

Chung from the C.S. Mott Foundation which also just released a report, *A New Day for Learning* produced by the Time, Learning, and Afterschool Task Force, declared that we need to do a better job of integrating our schools into the larger society in order to promote better learning. In order to sustain extended school days and academic years, Chung said schools will need the support and collaboration of the entire community. She believes the responsibility of educating our children must not fall solely on schools, the entire community needs to be a part of the education process.

Although the panelists listed numerous advantages to extending the amount of time students spend in school they agreed there are still some obstacles. One of the major obstacles is cost. It would take millions of dollars for states to expand the school year even by a few days. Minnesota recently proposed extending its school year by just 25 days, but was forced to abandon the idea since the estimated cost of \$750 million was not financially feasible. Another obstacle to increasing the number of school days is parents, teachers and students themselves. Edison Schools originally planned for its school year to have more than the average 180 days, but due to pressure they encountered from parents and students they have now reduced their days to make their school year more inline with the norm.

"Schools encountered increased student absenteeism during the additional weeks of school. In addition teachers were unhappy with the extra weeks of school," said Larios. Parents are cited as the biggest opponent of extending the school year. They are against the extra days they feel would take away from summer, where often they have vacations or other activities planned for their children. A recent opinion poll by Phi Delta Kappa and Gallup show that the public is divided about extending school time. When asked if they favored increasing the amount of time students spend in schools, 48 percent said they were in favor and 49 percent were opposed." However, 67 percent did favor extending the school day by one hour.

All of the panelists expressed the importance of community and parental involvement in any plan to extend the amount of time our children spend in schools. They concluded that more instructional time has the tremendous potential to help our students, teachers, schools and community. And that we need to pay more attention to how time is spent in our schools.

For more information on the Education Sector and this report visit Education Sector at www.educationsector.org. For more information on the C.S. Mott Foundation and it's report go to <http://www.mott.org>.

PUBLIC SCHOOLS AND SOCIAL CONFLICT

On January 23, the Cato Institute, in conjunction with a newly released report, held a policy forum entitled "Why We Fight: How Public Schools Cause Social Conflict". Participants included Neal McCluskey, Policy Analyst, Center for Educational Freedom, Cato Institute; Charles Haynes, Senior Scholar and Director of Education Programs, Freedom Forum First Amendment Center; and Gerald Bracey, Associate, High/Scope Educational Research Foundation.

The idea that public schools can be used as a societal unifier has been advocated by Thomas Jefferson and Thomas Mann. Jefferson believed public schooling would help citizens to detect threats to a free and democratic society. Mann believed public schooling would act as an equalizer of the economic classes and would give students a common unifying experience. However, Neal McCluskey, author of the Cato Report *Why We Fight*, argues that the reality of public schools is much different. He sees public schools not as facilitators for social unity, but as sources of constant conflict. McCluskey believes the very nature of public schools make them inherently divisive and force community and political conflicts. He explains that the "public school system forces everyone to pay for a single official system that does not and cannot reflect the public's diverse and often conflicting views. The inevitable result is endless discord."

McCluskey suggests we can eliminate these political conflicts by allowing more freedom. He advocates that parents need more school choice and concludes that by allowing more freedom and choice, schools would no longer foster conflict. And instead of the false and forced unity currently engineered in our public schools, McCluskey argued, we would breed real social unity through the bonds of free and voluntary association. McCluskey also feels this approach would lead to greater educational innovation since school choice would force competition among schools for students.

In his counter argument Charles Haynes asserted that public schools are microcosms of our public life, and rather than the cause of conflict they are the battlegrounds where our societal conflicts are fought. He argued that public schooling serves a vital role in building societal unity despite the divisiveness that does exist. Haynes' concluded that it is ok that public schools spur conflict, because some degree of conflict and debate are vital to a healthy democracy.

Haynes and Bracey disagreed with McCluskey's idea that more school choice would lead to greater unity. They believe isolating kids with exposure only to peers similar to them and with similar beliefs and world views would only lead to more not less societal conflict.

For more information and a podcast of this forum visit www.cato.org.

DRUG ABUSE, RISKY DECISION MAKING AND HIV/AIDS: RESEARCH PROPOSALS WANTED

Drug abuse increases the risk of both contracting and transmitting HIV/AIDS, according to the National Institute on Drug Abuse (NIDA). While it is well known that injection drug use increases the risk of HIV through the sharing of contaminated needles, the Institute notes that drugs of abuse and addictive behaviors also may increase the risk of HIV transmission by

affecting decisions to engage in risky sexual behavior. Despite a wealth of anecdotal reports and limited empirical data, NIDA stresses there remains much to be learned about the cognitive, behavioral, emotional and situational processes that mediate interactions between drug abuse, risky decision making and HIV/AIDS and their associated neurobiological substrates.

In an effort to stimulate model driven research that will increase the understanding of how drugs of abuse or processes of addiction influence decisions about high risk sexual behavior, thereby enhancing vulnerability to acquiring or transmitting HIV, NIDA has issued a series of program announcements. The announcements, *Drug Abuse, Risky Decision Making and HIV/AIDS (PAS-07-034, PAS-07-035, and PAS-07-036)* will support research that emphasize interdisciplinary studies that incorporate approaches from psychology, economics, anthropology, sociology, decision sciences, neuroscience and computational modeling. Hypothesis driven research and modeling approaches that can guide empirical testing are encouraged. The announcements emphasize that the study of decisions to engage in risky sexual behavior must be clearly be the central focus of the proposed research.

Applicants are encouraged to draw upon recent advances in behavioral- and neuro-economics, social neuroscience and the science of judgment and decision-making in generating hypotheses. Computational models might be developed that can account for complex interactions between emotion, attention and other cognitive factors that influence decisions about risky behavior. Application of conceptual models and research paradigms from other areas of judgment and decision making research may be useful for understanding how decisions about drug use and sexual risk behavior are similar to, or different from, other kinds of complex social decisions. Study designs that can evaluate health disparities, as well as age, gender and race/ethnicity differences and/or evaluate processes and effects within a developmental context are especially encouraged.

Research questions that would be appropriate for the announcements include:

- How do emotions bias cognitive, socio-cultural and situational constraints on decision making in drug using or drug addicted individuals. How does emotional state, including the emotions induced by drugs of abuse, or withdrawal, influence decisions about sexual risk behavior?
- How do drugs of abuse affect ways in which domain specific knowledge is utilized in the decision-making process?
- How are decisions about sexual risk behavior evaluated and how does this evaluative process influence future behavior?
- What is the contribution of shifts in attention bias or narrowed focus on sexual risk decisions?
- How does drug use alter the utilization of information and emotion, or shift the contribution of conscious versus unconscious processes, in making decisions about sexual risk behavior?
- How does the chronic relapsing condition of drug abuse and addiction affect information processing skills and decision making about sexual risk behavior over time?
- What are the neurohormonal influences on risk decision making by drug abusers? Do these influences vary with drug use history?

- Do variations in decision making, cognitive processes, self-regulation of emotion, or reward valuation from early adolescence through adulthood affect high-risk sexual behaviors?

Inquiries regarding the announcements are encouraged. For more information contact Minda Lynch in the Division of Basic Neuroscience and Behavior Research (telephone: 301.435.1322 or email: mlynch1@nida.nih.gov or see <http://grants.nih.gov/grants/guide/pa-files/PAS-07-324.html>).

LUXEMBOURG INCOME STUDY SUMMER 2007 WORKSHOP

The Luxembourg Income Study (LIS) Summer Workshop is a one-week workshop designed to introduce researchers in the social sciences to comparative research in income distribution, employment and social policy using the LIS database. The 2007 workshop will be held from June 24 to June 30, 2007 (with departure on July 1). Applications from researchers with varying levels of knowledge and experience are welcome.

The Luxembourg Income Study has made comparable over 160 large microdata sets that contain comprehensive measures of income, employment and household characteristics for 30 industrialized countries (Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Luxembourg, Mexico, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Romania, Russia, the Slovak Republic, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Taiwan, the United Kingdom and the United States).

Download the application (<http://www.lisproject.org/workshop/2007application.pdf>) and return it by April 2, 2007. The language of instruction is English. By the end of the workshop, attendees will be fully trained to use the database independently. Attendees will also be introduced to the new Luxembourg Wealth Study (<http://www.lisproject.org/lws.htm>).

CONSORTIUM OF SOCIAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATIONS COSSA

Executive Director: Howard J. Silver, Ph.D.
Deputy Director for Health Policy: Angela L. Sharpe
Associate Director for Public Affairs: Pamela L. Pressley
Assistant Director for Government Affairs: La Tosha C. Lewis
President: Susan Cutter

The Consortium of Social Science Associations (COSSA) is an advocacy organization promoting attention to and federal support for the social and behavioral sciences.

UPDATE is published 22 times per year. ISSN 0749-4394. Address all inquiries to COSSA at newsletters@cossa.org

1522 K Street, NW, Suite 836
Washington, D.C. 20005
Phone: (202) 842-3525
Fax: (202) 842-2788

GOVERNING MEMBERS

American Association for Public Opinion Research
American Economic Association
American Educational Research Association
American Historical Association
American Political Science Association
American Psychological Association
American Society of Criminology
American Sociological Association
American Statistical Association
Association of American Geographers
Association of American Law Schools
Law and Society Association
Linguistic Society of America
Midwest Political Science Association
National Communication Association
Rural Sociological Society
Society for Research in Child Development

COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

Arizona State University
Brown University
University of California, Berkeley
University of California, Davis
University of California, Irvine
University of California, Los Angeles
University of California, San Diego
University of California, Santa Barbara
Carnegie Mellon University
University of Chicago
Clark University
Columbia University
Cornell University
Duke University
George Mason University
George Washington University
University of Georgia
Harvard University
Howard University
University of Illinois
Indiana University
University of Iowa
Iowa University
John Jay College of Criminal Justice, CUNY
Johns Hopkins University
Kansas State University
University of Kentucky
University of Maryland
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs,
Syracuse University
University of Michigan
Michigan State University
University of Minnesota
New York University
University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill
Northwestern University
Ohio State University
University of Oklahoma
University of Pennsylvania
Pennsylvania State University
Princeton University
Purdue University
Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey
University of South Carolina
Stanford University
State University of New York, Stony Brook
University of Tennessee
University of Texas, Austin
Texas A & M University
Tulane University
Vanderbilt University
University of Virginia
University of Washington
Washington University in St. Louis
West Virginia University
University of Wisconsin, Madison
University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee
Yale University

MEMBERSHIP ORGANIZATIONS

American Agricultural Economics Association
American Association for Agricultural Education
Association for Asian Studies
Association for Public Policy Analysis and Mgmt.
Association of Research Libraries
Council on Social Work Education
Eastern Sociological Society
International Communication Association
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
Society for Research on Adolescence
Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues
Society for the Scientific Study of Sexuality
Sociologists for Women in Society
Southern Political Science Association
Southern Sociological Society
Southwestern Social Science Association

CENTERS AND INSTITUTES

American Academy of Political and Social Science
American Council of Learned Societies
American Institutes for Research
Brookings Institution
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
Population Reference Bureau
Social Science Research Council

