CONGRESS MOVES TO COMPLETE FY 2010 APPROPRIATIONS PROCESS

As has happened numerous times in recent years, no matter which party is in control, Congress has had to resort to compiling left-over spending bills in an Omnibus package to complete the appropriations process. The current Continuing Resolution (CR) covering many departments and agencies runs out on December 18.

On December 13 the Senate, after earlier passage in the House on December 10, sent to the President legislation that included six FY 2010 spending bills. The Omnibus included the appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, Labor, Education, Health and Human Services (HHS), Transportation, Housing and Urban Development (HUD), Treasury, and State, as well as the National Science Foundation, and Military Construction needs.

The FY 2010 appropriations bill for the Department of Defense remains, as it will act as the vehicle for another Omnibus that will include non-spending legislation that Congress hopes to pass before the first session comes to a close, such as a debt limit increase, tax extenders, expiring Patriot Act provisions, and other bills. In the meantime, the session continues with the Senate trying to enact its version of Healthcare Reform before leaving for the year.
The Omnibus bill provided the National Science Foundation (NSF) with $6.926 billion, an increase of $436 million, or 6.7 percent, over the FY 2009 enacted amount. The conference report accompanying the bill indicated that Congress remains concerned about the impact of the $3 billion NSF received in the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA). The conferees adopt the House language calling on the Administration to propose at least a seven percent increase in the FY 2011 request for NSF “in order to sustain the planned doubling of the Foundation’s budget.”

For NSF’s Research and Related Activities account, which funds the research directorates including the one for Social, Behavioral and Economic Sciences (SBE), the Omnibus allocated $5.618 billion, an increase of $435 million or 8.4 percent over the FY 2009 appropriation. However, the allocation is $115 million below the President’s request. Since the conference report calls for the full funding of NSF’s interdisciplinary initiatives, they will get most of the R&RA boost, likely leaving little increase for core programs within the Foundation. The conferees also supported awarding 2,000 graduate research fellowships across all of NSF, a significant increase from FY 2009.

The Education and Human Resources Directorate (EHR) received $873.8 million, an increase of $27.5 million, or 3.3 percent over the FY 2009 appropriation. The conferees also redirected the requested levels for EHR programs. The Division of Research and Evaluation on Education in Science and Engineering would get a $2.5 million boost over the President’s request for a FY 2010 budget of $232.4 million. The conference report also notes that “K-12 students need a better foundation in geographic literacy, and direct NSF to work with external partners with experience in geographic education to improve geography teaching, training, and research in our nation’s schools.”

For HHS, the Omnibus bill provides $603.7 billion, $34.3 billion (6 percent) more than the FY 2009 funding level. Within the funds for the Office of the Secretary, the conference agreement designates $900 million for the Institute of Medicine to conduct a study on the mental health workforce. The conferees also direct the Secretary to establish an Office of Adolescent Health, as proposed by the Senate. The agreement includes “sufficient funds for this purpose,” but does not identify a specific amount. The Senate proposed $2 million for this office. The House did not propose a similar provision.

The agreement provides $110 million for a new teenage pregnancy prevention initiative. The House proposed $110 million for this initiative under the Administration for Children and Families and the Senate proposed $100 million under the Office of the Secretary. The report notes that the conferees intend that the Office of Adolescent Health shall coordinate its efforts with the Administration for Children and Families, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, and other appropriate HHS offices and operating divisions. The Secretary is required to submit a report no later than 60 days after enactment of the legislation to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations detailing the implementation status of the new office and the new pregnancy prevention initiative.

The conferees included bill language providing that not less than $75 million is for programs that replicate elements of teenage pregnancy prevention programs proven effective through rigorous evaluation. The conferees intend that a wide range of evidence-based programs should be eligible for these funds. In addition, bill language provides that not less than $25 million “shall be for research and demonstration grants to develop, replicate, refine, and test additional models and innovative strategies for preventing teenage pregnancy; and that the remaining amounts may be used for training and technical assistance, evaluation, outreach, and additional program support. The conferees intend that programs funded under this initiative will stress the value of abstinence and provide age-appropriate information to youth that is scientifically and medically accurate.” Finally, the agreement provides $4.45 million within Public Health Service Act program evaluation funding to carry out evaluations (including longitudinal evaluations) of teenage pregnancy prevention approaches. It is the intent of the conferees that the Office of Adolescent Health shall be responsible for implementing and administering the pregnancy prevention program, as proposed by the Senate.

For the National Institutes of Health (NIH) the conference agreement includes $31 billion for FY 2010, same as the President’s request and a 1.3 percent increase over the FY 2009 regular appropriation. In addition, NIH received $10 billion in ARRA funds in FY 2009. The Omnibus also provides up to $193.9 million for continuation of the National Children's Study (NCS). For research training stipends, the agreement includes funding for a one-percent increase in stipends. A bioethics initiative administered through the institutes and centers is provided $5 million as proposed by the House.

The conference agreement includes a program level of $397.1 million for the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ), a $25 million increase over the FY 2009 funding level. The $25 million increase is intended for a new medical liability demonstration program initiated by the President in his health reform address to the Congress. Within the total for AHRQ's Research on Health Costs, Quality and Outcomes, the conference agreement includes $21 million for Patient-Centered Health Research. Of the funding provided, $12.5 million is to cover the continuation costs of current research grants and $8.5 million is for the Developing Evidence to Inform Decisions about Effectiveness (DEcIDE) Network. The DEcIDE Network is designed to conduct accelerated practical studies about the outcomes, comparative clinical effectiveness, safety, and appropriateness of health care items and services. The agreement
notes that as proposed by the House, “the conferees do not intend for the patient-centered health research funding to be used to mandate coverage, reimbursement, or other policies for any public or private payer. The funding shall be used to conduct or support research to evaluate and compare the clinical outcomes, effectiveness, risk, and benefits of two or more medical treatments and services that address a particular medical condition.” Further, the conferees recognize that a “one-size-fits all” approach to patient treatment is not the most medically appropriate solution to treating various conditions.”

Within the total for AHRQ’s Research on Health Costs, Quality and Outcomes, the conference agreement includes $15.9 million for the Prevention and Care Management. It also includes $27.7 million for Health Information Technology. For crosscutting activities related to quality, effectiveness, and efficiency research the conference agreement includes $176.7 million. As proposed by the Senate, the agreement includes $23.6 million to fund investigator-initiated research to develop a more balanced research agenda, supporting all aspects of health care research outlined in AHRQ’s statutory mission. The House included similar language, but not a specific dollar amount. For Patient Safety, the agreement provides $90.6 million. In addition, within the Patient Safety total, the conference agreement includes $25 million for healthcare-associated infections prevention activities as proposed by the House.

For the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), the conference agreement includes $6.39 billion in discretionary appropriations for Disease Control, Research, and Training at the CDC instead of $6.31 billion as proposed by the House and $6.73 billion proposed by the Senate. In addition, $352.4 million is made available under section 241 of the Public Health Service (PHS) Act. The National Center for Health Statistics received $138.7 million, an increase of almost $14 million over FY 2009.

The Omnibus provided the Census Bureau with a FY 2010 operating budget of $7.324.7 billion. Of that total, $259 million is for the Salaries and Expenses account, and $7.065.7 billion is for the Periodic Censuses account, which includes the 2010 Census and the American Community Survey (ACS). Within the $7,065.7 billion, $214.6 million is for non-decennial periodic census programs.

The conference report reiterates language in the House and Senate reports regarding the preparations for the 2010 Census pertaining to paid media, reporting of milestones, outreach and partnership obligations, and other languages aside from English and Spanish (see Update June 29, 2009). The conferees also direct the Bureau to report to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations within 90 days of enactment of this Act, “describing the steps it will take to ensure the availability and accuracy of small population groups data from the ACS and decennial census, and for reporting aggregate data reflecting all citizens of the United States, including Puerto Rico and other offshore jurisdictions.”

The Omnibus bill provided $97.3 million for the Economics and Statistics Administration, of which the Bureau of Economic Analysis (BEA) receives $93.5 million. The Congress provided BEA $1.5 million to develop new estimation models for financial services statistics in order to more accurately reflect the critical changes that are occurring in the financial sector of the U.S. economy; and $2 million to improve, accelerate, and expand county-level economic statistics, but rejected the request for additional funds to allow BEA to rebuild its statistics on foreign direct investment.

The National Institute of Justice (NIJ) received $48 million in for its base budget. NIJ will also receive $5 million from the Byrne Justice Assistance Grants and $3 million from the Office of Violence Against Women. Within NIJ’s base funding $5 million is for forensics and DNA research. The conferees also direct NIJ to provide the appropriations committees a spending plan. The Omnibus provided the Bureau of Justice Statistics $60 million requested by the President to provide a sufficient increase to begin the revitalization of the National Crime Victimization Survey. In addition, the conferees accepted the President’s request for a one percent set-aside of funds from the Office of Justice Programs for research and statistics.

The Omnibus spending bill provided $48 million to the Office of Policy Development and Research (PD&R) at HUD. With the transfer of the University Programs formerly in this office to the Community Development Block Grant program, OPDR received a $16 million increase over its FY 2009 budget for research, data collection, analysis, and dissemination. In addition, the bill included the Transformation Initiative’s one percent set-aside of the HUD budget for research, statistics, training and technical assistance, and upgrading computer equipment.

The legislation appropriated the following amounts for these education programs in FY 2010: Javits Fellowships $9.7 million same as last year; Thurgood Marshall Legal Opportunity Scholarships $3 million, same as last year; Graduate Assistance in Areas of National Need, $31 million, same as last year. There was an increase for International Education and Foreign Language Programs from $118.9 million in FY 2009 to $125.9 million in FY 2010.
The Institute of Education Sciences (IES) received $659 million for FY 2010. Of that total, $200.2 million is for Research, Development and Dissemination, an increase of $33 million over FY 2009. Two million dollars of that funding is for a new research and development center on adult learning and literacy. The National Center for Education Statistics was allocated $108.5 million, a $10 million increase over FY 2009. National Assessments (including the Governing Board) got $138.8 million, the same as in FY 2009. The FY 2010 appropriation for Statewide Data Systems was decreased by $8.8 million to $58.3 million. This does not include the $250 million in ARRA funds for this program. The conferees admonished IES for not adhering to a congressional limitation on spending for the What Works Clearinghouse without notification to the appropriations committees. The conferees also “believe that IES should make a greater effort to communicate clearly its plans for and use of taxpayer resources,” requesting a detailed spending plan within 30 days of enactment of the spending bill.

The Omnibus spending bill gave the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) $611.4 million for FY 2010, an increase of $14.3 million over FY 2009. The bill contains language directing BLS to maintain the collection of data for the women worker series in the Current Employment Survey.

HOUSE SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE LEADERS TO RETIRE AT THE END OF THE 111TH CONGRESS

Reps. Bart Gordon (D-TN) and Brian Baird (D-WA) have announced they will not run for re-election in 2010. Gordon is the current Chairman of the House Science and Technology (S&T) Committee. Baird is the Chairman of the Committee’s Energy and Environment Subcommittee.

In the previous Congress Baird, who is a Ph.D. psychologist, chaired the Research and Science Education Subcommittee and held three hearings on social/behavioral science contributions to public policy. He led the defense of National Science Foundation grants under attack on the House floor in 2007 (see Update, May 14, 2007). Earlier this year, Baird introduced legislation to establish an office of social and behavioral research at the Department of Energy (see Update, July 27, 2009). Although the bill emerged from the Science and Technology Committee it has not come to the House floor. Baird has served as the representative from Southwest Washington State since 1999.

Gordon, who is from middle Tennessee, led the House effort to enact the America COMPETES Act, which included a pledge to double funding for the National Science Foundation. He has been Chairman of the Science and Technology Committee since 2007 and has been in the Congress since 1985. As he put it, “When I was elected, I was the youngest member of the Tennessee congressional delegation; now, I’m one of the oldest.”

Rep. Jerry Costello (D-IL) has indicated his interest in replacing Gordon as head of the S&T Committee, if the Democrats maintain control of the House after the 2010 elections.

POLITICAL SCIENTIST AMY GUTMANN, PRESIDENT OF PENN, TO LEAD OBAMA’S BIOETHICS COMMISSION

On November 24, President Obama signed Executive Order 13521 creating a new Presidential Commission for the Study of Bioethical Issues. He appointed University of Pennsylvania President and Political Scientist Amy Gutmann as the Commission’s Chair.

The Commission’s membership will consist of an expert panel composed of not more than 13 members appointed by the President, drawn from the fields of bioethics, science, medicine, technology, engineering, law, philosophy, theology, or other areas of the humanities or social sciences, at least one and not more than three of whom may be bioethicists or scientists drawn from the executive branch, as designated by the President.

The Commission will advise the President on bioethical issues that may emerge from advances in biomedicine and related areas of science and technology. The Commission will work with the goal of identifying and promoting policies and practices that ensure scientific research, health care delivery, and technological innovation are conducted in an ethically responsible manner.

To achieve this goal the Commission shall: 1) Identify and examine specific bioethical, legal, and social issues related to the potential impacts of advances in biomedical and behavioral research, healthcare delivery, or other areas of science and technology; 2) Recommend any legal, regulatory, or policy actions it deems appropriate to address these
issues; and 3) Critically examine diverse perspectives and explore possibilities for useful international collaboration on these issues.

In addition to her career as a distinguished political scientist, Gutmann is a scholar of ethics and public policy. She is also the Christopher H. Browne Distinguished Professor of Political Science in the School of Arts and Sciences at Penn and holds secondary appointments in communications, education, and philosophy. Prior to her appointment as the University of Pennsylvania’s president in 2004, she served as Provost at Princeton University, where she was also the Laurance S. Rockefeller University Professor of Politics. At Princeton, she was the founding Director of the University Center for Human Values - a leading multi-disciplinary center that fosters greater research and discourse on ethics and human values.

Gutmann has authored and edited 15 books and has published more than 100 articles, essays, and book chapters. She is a founding member of the Association of Practical and Professional Ethics, and serves on the Board of Directors of the Carnegie Corporation of New York, the Vanguard Corporation, and the Board of Trustees of the National Constitution Center. She received her B.A. magna cum laude from Harvard-Radcliffe College, M.Sc. from the London School of Economics, and Ph.D. in political science from Harvard University.

James W. Wagner, current President of Emory University, will serve as the Commission’s Co-Chair. Wagner previously served as Provost, University Vice President, and Interim President of Case Western Reserve University. Prior to that, he was Dean and Professor of Materials Science at the Case School of Engineering from 1998 to 2000. His academic career began at The Johns Hopkins University’s Whiting School of Engineering as Professor of Materials Science and Engineering with a secondary appointment in Biomedical Engineering. He holds a B.A. in electrical engineering from the University of Delaware, an M.A. in clinical engineering from The Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine, and a Ph.D. in materials science and engineering from The Johns Hopkins University Whiting School of Engineering.

The President, in announcing the Commission declared: “As our nation invests in science and innovation and pursues advances in biomedical research and health care, it’s imperative that we do so in a responsible manner. This new Commission will develop its recommendations through practical and policy-related analyses. I am confident that Amy and Jim will use their decades of experience in both ethics and science to guide the new Commission in this work, and I look forward to listening to their recommendations in the coming months and years.”

ELINOR OSTROM AND OLIVER WILLIAMSON RECEIVE NOBEL PRIZES AND PARTICIPATE IN SESSION AT SWEDISH EMBASSY

The announcement in October that Elinor Ostrom, Professor of Political Science and Public and Environmental Affairs at Indiana University, and Oliver Williamson, Professor Emeritus of Business, Economics and Law at the University of California at Berkeley, would share the 2009 Nobel Prize in Economic Sciences, had them busy at a series of events that culminated in the awarding of the prize in Stockholm on December 10.

One of those events preceding their trip to Stockholm was an appearance with some of the other American Nobel winners at the Swedish Embassy in the United States on December 1, 2009. Appearing with Physiology and Medicine winners Elizabeth Blackburn, Carol Greider, and Jack Szostak, Physics Winner Charles Kao, and Chemistry Winner Thomas Steitz, Ostrom and Williamson discussed their research and their careers as scientists. They would all go to meet the winner of the Nobel Peace Prize following the session. The program was moderated by AAAS Chief Executive Officer Alan Leshner.

Ostrom discussed her research on common pool resources and how common property can be successfully managed by user associations. She noted her use of game theory, laboratory experiments, field experiments, and her interactions with scientists in ecology, biology, and chemistry, as she conducted her research on fish stocks, pastures, wood, lakes, and groundwater basins. Resource users, she concluded, frequently develop sophisticated mechanisms for decision-making and rule enforcement, without interventions of governments or other “official” overseers.

Williamson talked about his research on what is called transaction cost economics where business firms serve as alternative governance structures which differ in their approaches to resolving conflicts of interest, especially when market competition is limited. He noted the importance of credible commitments in these transactions and the need to develop mutual benefits to both parties and society.
Leshner pointed out all the speakers noted that “complexity is good.” Williamson argued that in dealing with complex problems it is good to decompose them into simpler parts. “The complexity can come later,” he remarked. Start with simple models, empirically test them, let the data speak, and then move on to more complex procedures, he observed.

There was a lot of discussion about getting young people interested in science during the session. Ostrom said we should not “preach at young people,” but get them “participating” in science. She also noted that “doing science” has changed with the Internet, allowing more international collaboration and multi-site, multi-author activities. Although all the Nobel winners indicated the importance of interdisciplinary science, they all agreed that building interdisciplinary teams to conduct research requires scientists that have, as Ostrom noted, “disciplinary depth.”


Oliver Williamson’s lecture on The Economics of Governance can be viewed at: http://nobelprize.org/nobel_prizes/economics/laureates/2009/williamson-lecture.html.

OSTP SEEKS ADVICE ON PUBLIC ACCESS TO FEDERALLY FUNDED RESEARCH

The White House Office of Science and Technology Policy (OSTP) is seeking input from the scientific community “regarding enhancing public access to archived publications resulting from research funded by Federal science and technology agencies.” The deadline to submit comments is January 7, 2010.

The Federal Register notice (Volume 74 Number 235, December 9, 2009) notes that President Obama’s Transparency and Open Government initiative called for an “unprecedented level of openness in government.” As part of that initiative, the White House wants to focus on approaches that would enhance the public’s access to scholarly publications resulting from Federally funded research. The White House also suggests that increasing public access to these publications may enhance the return on federal investment in research by making the results timelier, easier, and less costly for use by commercial and noncommercial scientists.

Creating an easily searchable permanent electronic archive of scholarly publications would also have the potential, according to OSTP, to allow cross-referencing, continuous long-term access, and retrieval of information, whose initial value may be theoretical, but may eventually have important applications. OSTP also suggests that another benefit that would occur is improving cross-government coordination of funding. Finally, such access would help promote the diffusion of knowledge to educators, students, clinicians, farmers, engineers, and practitioners.

The invitation to comment seeks answers to a number of questions. Most prominently, how would such a public access policy change the development and dissemination of peer-reviewed papers arising from federally supported research for authors, publishers, libraries, universities, and the federal government? Others questions revolve around the process of making the publications available and “usable,” the time delay from publication, the version of the paper that would become available, who actually uses the publications, and how to measure whether expanded access contributes to increased return on federal investment in science.


NIH LAUNCHES PROGRAM TO DEVELOP INNOVATIVE APPROACHES TO COMBAT OBESITY

On December 10, the National Institutes of Health (NIH) announced that it is launching a $37 million program designed to use findings from basic research on human behavior to develop more effective interventions to reduce obesity. The program, Translating Basic Behavioral and Social Science Discoveries into Interventions to Reduce Obesity, will fund interdisciplinary teams of researchers at seven research sites. Investigators will conduct experimental research, formative research to increase understanding of populations in the studies, small studies known as proof of concept trials, and pilot and feasibility studies to identify promising new avenues for encouraging behaviors that prevent or treat obesity.
The program is led by NIH’s Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute (NHLBI), in partnership with Diabetes and Digestive and Kidney Diseases (NIDDK), Cancer (NCI), Child Health and Human Development (NICHD), and the Office of Behavioral and Social Sciences Research (OBSSR).

“These grants are intended to develop new and innovative ways to tackle this important problem. This approach differs from previous large clinical trials of behavioral interventions to reduce obesity by placing new emphasis on applying findings from basic behavioral and social sciences to improve behavioral strategies,” said NIH director Francis Collins. “Obesity is a significant public health challenge raising an individual’s risk for type 2 diabetes, heart disease, hypertension, stroke, certain cancers, osteoarthritis, and other conditions,” he added.

The research focuses on diverse populations at high risk of being overweight or obese, including Latino and African-American adults, African-American adolescents, low-income populations, pregnant women, and women in the menopausal transition. The interventions under development include creative new approaches to promote awareness of specific eating behaviors, decrease the desire for high-calorie foods, reduce stress-related eating, increase motivation to adhere to weight loss strategies, engage an individual’s social networks and communities to encourage physical activity, and improve sleep patterns. Brain scans will also be used to understand brain mechanisms in obesity that might guide the development of new interventions.

The research projects, principal investigators, study sites, and the NIH sponsors include:

**SCALE: Small Changes and Lasting Effects** - This study will develop and refine a mindful eating intervention aimed at producing small, sustainable changes in eating behavior in overweight or obese African-American and Latino adults with a goal of achieving at least a seven percent weight reduction in each participant. Mary E. Charlson, Weill Medical College of Cornell University, New York City, sponsored by the NHLBI.

**Translating Habituation Research to Interventions for Pediatric Obesity** - This study will translate basic research on the reduced response to food after repeated exposure over time to identify and test strategies for reducing the intake of high-calorie foods while increasing the amount of fruits and vegetables that children consume. Leonard H. Epstein, State University of New York at Buffalo, sponsored by the NIDDK.

**Interventionist Procedures for Adherence to Weight Loss Recommendations in Black Adolescents** - This study will develop and refine a home and community-based intervention using findings from basic behavioral research on human motivation to improve adherence to weight loss strategies in African-American adolescents. Sylvie Naar-King and Kai-Lin Catherine Jen, Wayne State University, Detroit, Mich., sponsored by the NHLBI, co-funded by the NICHD.

**Developing an Intervention to Prevent Visceral Fat in Premenopausal Women** - This study will develop a multi-level intervention targeting the individual, her social network, and the community to increase physical activity and reduce chronic stress and depression in order to reduce unhealthy patterns of weight gain in women in the menopausal transition. This project focuses on reducing visceral fat because this is the type of fat most strongly correlated with health risks. Lynda H. Powell, Rush University Medical Center, Chicago, sponsored by the NHLBI.

**Increasing Sleep Duration: A Novel Approach to Weight Control** - This study will translate basic research on sleep duration into a unique method to reduce obesity and obesity-related conditions in young and middle-aged overweight or obese adults. Rena R. Wing, Miriam Hospital, Providence, R.I., sponsored by the NCI.

**Novel Interventions to Reduce Stress-induced Non-homeostatic Eating** - This study will develop intervention strategies to reduce stress-induced eating in lower-income pregnant women, focusing on the reward and stress response systems that may influence eating behaviors and lead to unhealthy weight gain during pregnancy. Elissa S. Epel, Barbara A. Laraia, and, Nancy E. Adler, University of California, San Francisco, sponsored by the NHLBI.

**Habitual and Neurocognitive Processes in Adolescent Obesity Prevention** - This study will develop intervention strategies to improve nutrition behaviors in adolescents based on basic behavioral research on the formation of habits, self-regulation of eating behaviors, and the influence of neurocognitive processes on dietary behavior. Kim Daniel Reynolds, Claremont Graduate University, Calif., sponsored by the NHLBI, co-funded by the NICHD.

A Resource and Coordination Unit (RCU), led by David Cella of Northwestern University, Chicago, and funded by the NIH’s OBSSR, will facilitate collaboration across the studies. As part of this program, the RCU will also organize an OBSSR-funded conference in 2010 addressing methods in behavioral intervention development.
REPORT RELEASED ON LOW PERFORMING SCHOOLS AND THEIR RESTRUCTURING EFFORTS

The Brookings Institution’s Center on Education Policy (CEP) released its new report Improving Low Performing Schools: Lessons from Five Years of Studying School Restructuring Under No Child Left Behind. The report summarizes the findings from a five-year investigation of 23 school districts and 48 schools in California, Georgia, Maryland, New York, and Ohio comprising.

Caitlin Scott, CEP Consultant and author of the report, noted that in the 2006-2007 school year 2,302 Title I schools were in restructuring, and by the 2008-2009 school year that number had more than doubled to 5,017. The report found that several of the schools undergoing restructuring that were examined had some things in common. Schools in the study that managed to successfully leave restructuring had three traits: these schools used multiple and coordinated measures instead of relying on just one type of reform; their reform efforts evolved over the course of restructuring, as their situation changed so did their approaches; and finally these schools used data to help inform their reforms and assess their progress.

The report makes several recommendations. Scott believes the federal government should raise or waive the five-percent cap on the amount of Title I improvement funds states are allowed to reserve for school improvement. Also, states should be given increased flexibility in how those funds are used. Additionally, the report suggests that instead of cookie-cutter reform, schools and districts should tailor their restructuring efforts to individual school needs. Realizing that struggling schools continue to need assistance even after emerging from the restructuring process, the report recommends that local, state and federal support continue for several years after schools exit restructuring to help sustain the progress achieved.

Judy Wurtzel Deputy Assistant Secretary of Planning, Evaluation and Policy Development at the US Department of Education, commented that more research is necessary to determine what methods are effective in turning around these low performing schools. She said that the Department is more concerned about the quality and sustainability of schools exiting restructuring, rather than just on the number of schools. “We want to get these schools turned around but need to ensure we do it right,” said Wurtzel.

To read the full report go to: http://www.cep-dc.org/document/docWindow.cfm?fuseaction=document.viewDocument&documentid=300&documentFormatId=4437

MOVING BEYOND HIGH SCHOOL TO COLLEGE PROFICIENCY

On December 3, the Center for American Progress and The College Summit released their white paper The Promise of Proficiency: How College Proficiency Information Can Help High Schools Drive Student Success written by J.B. Schramm and E. Kinney Zalesne.

Over 90 million Americans have little or no college education. Martha Kanter, Undersecretary of the Department of Education, commented that the United States is now lagging behind other nations in terms of college graduation rates and the percentage of the population with at least a bachelor degree. Having a college degree has become increasingly important to obtaining a good paying job and living a middle class life style. Full time workers with college degrees earn 74 percent more than high school graduates. Thirty of the fastest growing employment fields will require job seekers to have at least a bachelor degree. College degrees are helpful not only to the individual, but they are also important to the economic health of the communities in which they live. According to a CEOs for Cities report, for every ten percent increase in the fraction of a city’s population that has completed college, regional wages at every educational level rise by eight percent.

While having a college degree has become increasingly important not only for an individual but also for the economic health of the U.S., many American high schools are not up to the challenge of preparing students for the academic rigor of college. Kanter said that it was time for the conversation to turn away from whose fault it is that students are not prepared, and focus more on what are we going to do to get students ready for college.

Schramm, Founder and Chief Executive Officer of College Summit, said high schools can no longer serve as the final destination for students. High schools must see themselves as preparing students for the next step, whether that is college or the workplace. He pointed to three things the federal government needs to do to help high schools and students. First, continue to support the creation of state longitudinal data systems that would also include measuring high school graduates performance in their first year of college. Second, increase the dissemination of data and help
train educators on how to interpret and use that data effectively. And lastly, maintain support and reward high schools that raise their student achievement rates and increase college proficiency.

Emma Vadehra, Deputy Assistant Secretary for the Office of Planning, Evaluation and Policy Development at the Department of Education, agreed that states need to develop data systems and stressed that states need to do more to make sure that the data is accessible and publically shared with their stakeholders including parents.

Of course no discussion on schools can take place without mentioning the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), also known as No Child Left Behind. Bethany Little, Chief Education Counsel for the Senate Committee on Health Education Labor and Pensions, said that the committee is focused on working on ESEA next year with an increased emphasis on outcomes rather than just test scores. She said a way to measure outcomes in high schools is to gauge how many high school students not only go to college, but succeed once they are there.


MAMAS' REPORT ON LACK OF FATHERS IN THEIR CHILDREN’S LIVES

On December 1, the Center on Children and Families at the Brookings Institution sponsored an event by the National Fatherhood Initiative to accompany the release of their new report, Mama Says: A National Survey of Mothers’ Attitudes on Fathering.

Ninety-three percent of the women in the survey agreed with the statement that there is a “father absence crisis in America”, and 67 percent strongly agreed with the statement. The numbers reflect the fact that fathers or rather the act of fathering has become practically nonexistent in a lot of communities. Currently, two out of three black children don’t live with their biological father compared with only one in four of white children. And almost seven in ten births among black women are out of wedlock, the comparable ratio for white women is four in ten.

One of the more surprising results in the Mama Says report is that despite the finding that there are a lack of men involved in their children’s lives, over half of these same mothers responded that they believe the role of fathers can be replaced by mothers and nearly two-thirds say that fathers are replaceable by other male father figures. However, the researchers discovered that married women regardless of race were four times more likely to be satisfied with dads’ performance than women who were not married.

The researchers also found that most of the black-white differences among respondents in the survey could be explained by the fact that a much smaller percentage, 40 percent, of black fathers were living with the mother of their children, compared with 70 percent of white fathers. Black mothers reported lower satisfaction with the fathers of their children than white mothers.

Citing that many mothers reported that work-family balance played a critical role in helping men act as good fathers, the report suggested some policy implications. The federal government could do more to support families, the report urged, such as creating policies that would address work-family balance by making the workplace more family friendly for mothers as well as fathers.

To read the entire report go to www.fatherhood.org/mamasays .

GSS CALLS FOR PROPOSALS TO ADD QUESTIONS TO THE 2012 SURVEY

The General Social Survey (GSS) project expects to include some user-designed, project-funded items or topical modules when it collects data in its 2012 survey, and invites proposals for such items or modules from users. Funding to support the costs of data collection and data processing need not accompany the submitted proposals responding to this call. They will be judged with their scientific merit as a primary consideration. The deadline for submissions is April 2, 2010.

The GSS is a nationally representative survey of non-institutionalized adults in the United States, conducted primarily via face-to-face interviews. A National Science Foundation (NSF) grant provides foundational support for the GSS, and for inclusion of items submitted in response to this call; other sources provide supplementary support, typically for the inclusion of topical modules. GSS data are collected every two years, and made available to the research community and the public as soon as possible after data collection is complete. Until 2004, the GSS was designed as a repeated cross-sectional survey. Beginning in 2006, a panel component was added to the GSS design. Through the use
of appropriate sampling weights, each biennial GSS will provide nationally representative estimates of distributions of survey items measuring a wide variety of social and political attitudes, opinions, and behaviors of U.S. adults. For additional information about the GSS and its study design, please consult the official NORC/GSS website at http://www.norc.org/GSS+Website/.

Submitted proposals may advocate inclusion of supplementary GSS content that varies in length, from as little as a single survey question to as much as a topical module of interrelated questions that might require five minutes of interview time. The proposal should articulate the scientific objectives and the specific research issues that the question(s) seek to address. Ideally, proposals will include the specific wording of survey items, documentation of their past use and performance in other surveys, and evidence bearing on the quality of data (validity, reliability, item non-response, etc.) they elicit. If the proposed question(s) have proven fruitful in past published work, or that their inclusion would contribute to better understanding in key social science domains, will strengthen the proposal. In some cases, however, users may suggest a general topic area and examples of the topics and types of items that are of interest. The GSS is also interested in items that have synergies with existing GSS content, or that promise to be of interest to a large number of GSS users.

Proposals may suggest that items be added to the 2012 GSS as a one-time topical module administered to a nationally representative cross-section of US adults, as most GSS topical modules have been. Note, however, that the 2012 GSS will collect baseline data for a three-wave panel study (with anticipated follow-up interviews in the 2014 and 2016 GSSs), so GSS will entertain proposals for adding repeated content. Investigators proposing panel content should address the value of having data on within-individual change on the proposed items. Because such proposals would involve interview time on three successive GSSs, it is anticipated that successful proposals for repeated/panel content will be shorter (i.e., will involve fewer survey items) than those for one-time inclusion of items. Moreover, proposers should be aware that NSF funding for the GSS project currently extends only through the 2012 GSS, so that any proposal involving repeated content would be accepted pending renewal funding of the project beyond 2012.

Generally, questions on the GSS are fixed choice survey items that are asked in a face-to-face context. Other formats are also possible (e.g., self-administered items, open-ended items, card sort tasks, or stimulus materials provided via audio or video) but such variations often increase time, complexity and cost (coding costs are substantial for open-ended items, for example). Hence, items with such formats must serve an important scientific purpose to justify the additional effort required; proposals to add such items should address this consideration.

Proposals should be submitted to and further information can be obtained from Tom W. Smith, the Principal Investigator and Director of the GSS at NORC: smitht@norc.uchicago.edu or 773-256-6288.

DELL HYMES, COSSA’S FIRST PRESIDENT, DIES AT 82.

We are sad to report that Dell Hymes, Commonwealth Professor of Anthropology Emeritus at the University of Virginia, and the first President of the Consortium of Social Science Associations (COSSA) from 1982-84, passed away on November 13 at the age of 82.

Hymes, a distinguished anthropologist, linguist, and folklorist, then at the University of Pennsylvania, represented the American Anthropological Association on the initial COSSA Board of Directors. COSSA was formed in 1981 as a response to the severe budgets cuts in federally supported social and behavioral research in the first budget of President Ronald Reagan. After COSSA’s incorporation in 1982, Hymes was elected by the Board as the organization’s first president.

His career spanned many disciplines. According to the New York Times, Hymes called himself an “ethnographer of communication.” He was honored with election to the presidencies of the American Anthropological Association, the Linguistic Society of America, and the American Folklore Society. He was also the inaugural editor of the journal Language in Society. Hymes also taught at Harvard and the University of California, Berkeley. At the University of Pennsylvania he served as the Dean of the Graduate School of Education. He moved to the University of Virginia in 1987, where he taught until 1998.

After his presidency, Hymes remained a strong supporter of COSSA’s activities and attended the Consortium’s 20th Anniversary Celebration in 2001.
IIASA SUMMER FELLOWSHIPS AVAILABLE

Each summer, the International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis (IIASA), located near Vienna, Austria, hosts a selected group of graduate students, primarily doctoral, from around the world in its Young Scientists Summer Program (YSSP). These students work closely with IIASA’s senior scientists on projects within the Institute’s three theme areas.

IIASA is an international institution, supported by the U.S. and 16 other governments, engaged in scientific research aimed at providing policy insight on issues of regional and global importance in the following areas:

**Energy and Technology**
- Energy
- New Technologies
- Dynamic Systems
- Integrated Modeling Environment

**Natural Resources and Environment**
- Land Use and Agriculture
- Forestry
- Evolution and Ecology
- Atmospheric Pollution & Economic Development
- Greenhouse Gas Initiative

**Population and Society**
- World Population
- Risk and Vulnerability
- International Negotiation
- Population and Climate Change
- Health and Global Change Initiative

Detailed information about each program is on the IIASA Website: [http://www.iiasa.ac.at/](http://www.iiasa.ac.at/)

The application deadline is January 18, 2010. The dates for the program are June 1 to August 27, 2010. Funding is available to cover travel to IIASA and a modest living allowance.

An on-line application form, along with more information, is at [http://www.iiasa.ac.at/yssp/register/](http://www.iiasa.ac.at/yssp/register/). General Questions: Tanja Huber, YSSP Coordinator ysspsupport@iiasa.ac.at. The U.S. contact is: Margaret Goud Collins, Program Director for the U.S. Committee for IIASA National Academy of Sciences mcollins@nas.edu.

**APPLICATIONS WANTED FOR RESEARCH ON SCHOOL POLICIES RELATED TO OBESITY**

Childhood obesity is a serious public health problem with both imminent and long-term detrimental health effects. Obese youth are at increased risk during their life course for developing many chronic diseases, including cancer at multiple sites (e.g., cancer of the esophagus, pancreas, gallbladder, colorectum, postmenopausal breast, endometrium, and kidney), cardiovascular disease, and diabetes.

The school setting (elementary, middle, high school) provides an ideal context for childhood obesity-prevention strategies. American youth consume approximately one-third of their energy intake while at school, and are expected to expend about half of their energy at school. Despite numerous recommendations for environmental- and policy-level strategies to combat obesity, the focus of most obesity-prevention strategies in the school context has been at the individual level. To date such individually-based intervention strategies have resulted in relatively modest changes in behavior. Given the high cost of such interventions, they have limited opportunities to significantly impact obesity at the population level. School policy strategies are increasingly proposed for addressing the childhood obesity epidemic; however, there is a desperate need to build the scientific knowledge base to inform policy development in this rapidly emerging field.

While policy-based approaches to combat obesity in schools exist, knowledge is lacking in key areas concerning the optimal policies, key implementation strategies for such policies, and the impact of these policies on a number of
outcomes (e.g., behaviors, weight outcomes, and school achievement and revenues). Accordingly, the National Institutes of Health’s Cancer Institute (NCI), Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute (NHLBI), Child Health and Human Development Institute (NICHD), Office of Behavioral and Social Sciences Research (OBSSR), and the Centers of Disease Control and Prevention’s (CDC) Center for Chronic Disease Prevention and Health Promotion are seeking grant applications designed to: (1) foster multidisciplinary research that will evaluate how policies (federal, state and school district levels) can influence school physical activity and nutrition environments, youths’ obesogenic behaviors (e.g., nutrition and physical activity behaviors), and weight outcomes; (2) understand how schools are implementing these policies and examine multi-level influences on adoption and implementation at various levels (e.g., federal, state, school district, and school); and (3) understand the synergistic or counteractive effect of school nutrition and physical activity policies on the home and community environment and body weight.

Enactment of a policy does not guarantee adoption or proper implementation. Few studies to date have examined the policy adoption and implementation process. The organizational structure of schools is complex and decisions that govern the school physical activity and nutrition environment are affected by multiple factors. Externally, schools have requirements and constraints imposed by federal and state agencies, and locally they respond to district requirements as well as accountability to taxpayers and parents’ concerns. There is a need to understand predictors of implementation while considering the complexity of influences on the school environment.

The specific research objectives of the announcement are to understand how school-related policies impact the school and home environment, promote positive nutrition and physical activity behaviors, and decrease childhood obesity. Other school outcomes, such as academic achievement and school revenues, may be included as covariates and are welcome as secondary outcomes. Applications that focus on reducing health disparities as well as those focused on minority populations are particularly encouraged.

Specific research areas of interest include, but are not limited to, the following areas:

- What effect does school physical activity and nutrition policies, enacted at various levels, have on: youths’ obesogenic behaviors (physical activity and nutrition behaviors) inside and outside of school; youths’ weight; cancer, cardiovascular and other chronic disease risk; and school outcomes (e.g., academic achievements and school revenues)?

- Under which conditions (e.g. social climate), settings (e.g. public vs. private), and for whom (e.g., racial/ethnic and/or socioeconomic groups) are school policy strategies more likely to be effective in changing obesogenic behaviors, chronic disease risk factors or weight outcomes?

- What is the best way to measure the aggregate effect of multiple policies on the school environment as well as youths’ obesogenic behaviors and weight outcomes? Can single/individual policies have any noticeable effect on obesogenic behaviors, weight outcomes or risk from cancer, cardiovascular and other chronic disease? Do multiple policies (enacted at various levels) have a cumulative, synergistic, or counteractive effect on youths’ obesogenic behaviors, weight outcomes, and chronic disease risk factors?

- Do home and community environments influence the efficacy or effectiveness of school-based policies aimed at improving the nutrition and physical activity environment of schools?

- To what extent do factors within (e.g., organizational climate, resources, infrastructure, competing priorities) and outside (e.g., federal, state, and school district, taxpayers and parents socio-cultural influences) the school environment influence the development, adoption and implementation of healthier policies?

- What factors impede or facilitate the adoption and implementation of policies within the school setting? Under which conditions (e.g. social climate) and settings (e.g. public vs. private) are schools more likely to implement physical activity and nutrition policies enacted at various levels or develop policies that create healthier school environments? How do these factors interact and what can be done to optimize their influence?

- How does the enactment of school policies at the state versus the district levels compare in their influence on the school environment? How much variability within policy provisions exists across state, school district, and school levels?

- To what extent can current school obesity-related policy classification systems (such as the NCI tracking system be used to track state and local (school district and school) policies as well as be used to evaluate implementation of policies in the school setting? What policies should be tracked and how does one validate the efficacy of such classification systems?
What is the best way to test the effects of school policy changes on youth diet, physical activity and risk factors for cancer (e.g., obesity, hormones) and cardiovascular disease (e.g., blood pressure, blood lipids)?

What is the best way to test the effects of obesity related school policy changes and their impact on home environment changes (e.g., reduction in TV and media usage) and health behaviors (e.g., diet, physical activity) of youth and families?

For more information or to apply see [http://grants1.nih.gov/grants/guide/pa-files/PA-10-052.html](http://grants1.nih.gov/grants/guide/pa-files/PA-10-052.html).

**NIH INSTITUTES SEEK PROPOSALS TO ADDRESS HIV IN THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM**

The vast majority of prison inmates are released back into the community. While individuals infected with HIV may receive adequate treatment while incarcerated, for a variety of reasons, they often fail to maintain treatment upon release to the community. In addition, the immediate post-release period is often characterized by heightened HIV risk behaviors so a lapse in treatment and viral load rebound may be associated with increased risk of HIV transmission.

Researchers and public health officials have recognized that the criminal justice system provides a unique opportunity for HIV intervention, and therefore, it is a critical target for seek, test, and treat initiatives. Criminal justice involvement may provide a unique opportunity to address HIV among those who might not otherwise receive HIV testing or treatment or HIV risk reduction counseling, which can improve the health not just of the individual but potentially of the community as a whole.

For a variety of reasons, access to HIV testing and treatment varies across criminal justice systems. Applicable laws, policies, and resources may differ and HIV treatment may be perceived as a health issue rather than a public safety or security issue. Relationships between different institutions within the criminal justice system tend to be fragmented (e.g. prison staff may not communicate regularly with community based probation/parole officers), and communication between the criminal justice and public health systems (including the drug abuse and mental health treatment system) is often weak. The system of costs and reimbursements may be a barrier to coordination of criminal justice and public health entities for delivering and maintaining HIV treatment. Incarcerated individuals known to be infected with HIV may receive adequate treatment while in prison or jail, but fail to maintain treatment upon release to the community. Variation in local resources and relationships among criminal justice and public health systems provide opportunities to develop and compare different strategies for improving a systems-wide, multi-agency approach to delivering HIV care to criminal justice populations.

The National Institute on Drug Abuse (NIDA), National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH), and the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases (NIAID) are seeking grant proposals designed to develop and empirically test interventions to effectively implement the seek, test, and treat model by developing novel systems-, organizational-, and individual-level approaches for two objectives: (1) to expand access to HIV testing for individuals in the criminal justice system, and when indicated (2) to improve the provision and maintenance of highly active antiretroviral therapy (HAART) for criminal justice-involved HIV seropositive individuals, with special emphasis on reliable maintenance of treatment following community reentry following incarceration in jail or prison.

According to the funding opportunity announcement, applications should assess potential problems/barriers that may impede implementation. Because of the breadth of potential interventions, multi principle investigators applications and/or multisite studies are encouraged. The highest priority is being designated for applications that address the full model, (i.e., combine engaging hard to reach groups in testing, linkage to care, and assurance of continuation of care in an integrated manner for specific populations and settings are of highest priority).

Examples of research topics include, but are not limited to the following:

- Targeted interventions intended to improve participation in HIV testing and enhance engagement and retention in HIV care among high risk populations such as illicit drug users, mentally ill, women, African Americans, and other minorities.

- Modeling studies that use outcome data to inform public health practice and configurations of services for criminal justice-involved populations. Key outcome measures would include HIV testing and re-testing, linkage to care, viral suppression, health outcomes including drug use and mental health.
Strategies to engage individuals in the criminal justice system in frequent HIV testing in order to identify seropositive individuals early.

Organizational-level and systems-level strategies to identify and address barriers to coordination of criminal justice and public health entities to effectively maintain treatment for HIV-positive individuals during and after community reentry.

Studies of systemic interventions to impact organizational structure, climate, culture, and processes to enable dissemination and implementation of seek, test, and treat initiatives for HIV in the criminal justice setting.

Strategies to link HIV seropositive individuals to community-based HIV care and sustain HAART treatment following the release from jail or prison.

Novel strategies to enhance retention and adherence to HAART among criminal justice populations with special emphasis on high risk groups including illicit drug users, mentally ill, women, African Americans, and other minorities. Because impaired neurocognitive function may decrease retention and adherence, studies may address the impact of neurocognitive deficits (both those associated with HIV infection and those due other causes, e.g., traumatic brain injury) on retention and adherence to treatments for drug abuse/mental health, HIV disease, and comorbid conditions.

Impact of increased HIV testing and HAART treatment on reducing viral load in infected criminal justice-involved populations.

Interventions to ameliorate individual, program, and system barriers to effective clinical management and delivery of care for HIV/AIDS and co-morbid conditions in criminal justice settings.

Models of impact (including cost effectiveness) for seek, test, and treat with criminal justice populations on community health (e.g. community viral load, HIV infection rates).

Letters of intent are due on March 2, 2010 and the applications are due on April 1, 2010.

For further information contact: Akiva Liberman, libermana@nida.nih.gov or Lynda Erinoff, le30q@nida.gov.

The full solicitation can be found at: http://grants.nih.gov/grants/guide/rfa-files/RFA-DA-10-017.html

PROPOSALS SOUGHT FOR RESEARCH ON INTEGRITY IN COLLABORATIVE RESEARCH

The National Institutes of Health (NIH) -- National Center for Research Resources (NCRR), Fogarty International Center (FIC), and the National Institute of Biomedical Imaging and Bioengineering (NIBIB) -- the Office of Research Integrity (ORI), and the Office for Human Research Protections (OHRP) are seeking research applications designed to study research integrity as it relates to collaborative interactions and/or activities. The purpose of this exploratory/development grant program is to investigate areas of collaborative research that have little published data. The sponsoring agencies are particularly interested in studies focused on integrity in collaborative research that will provide clear evidence (rates of occurrence and impacts) of problem areas in community standards, self-regulation, practice norms, and non-adherence to accepted codes of conduct.

Applications must address the societal, organizational, group, or individual factors that affect integrity in collaborative research, both positively and negatively. In addition, applications must have relevance to health sciences research including, for example, those biomedical, behavioral health sciences, or health services research areas having particular positive or negative collaborative research integrity issues. Applicants must address problems or issues that have relevance to the specific interests of ORI or NIH Institutes and Centers.

According to the solicitation, collaborations greatly expand the possibilities in research. Interdisciplinary collaborations are encouraged across health-related investigations; however norms and conventions differ among fields, disciplines, cultures, and countries. These differences present unique challenges in maintaining integrity in collaborative research. Published research data are needed in the following significant areas:
standards that guide responsible conduct in collaborative research, how they are established, and the extent to which the collaborating researchers routinely adhere to these standards

- effectiveness of professional self-regulation in collaborative research

- the factors in collaborative research that influence students, researchers and research institutions to adhere to or deviate from their norms of integrity in research and how these factors can be reinforced or modified to promote responsible practices

- the economic, policy and intellectual impacts of collaborative research behaviors that fail to adhere to rules, regulations, guidelines, and commonly accepted professional codes or norms

Relevant collaborative research perspectives and health-related disciplines include: anthropology, applied philosophy, biomedical informatics, business, economics, education, information studies, law, organizational studies, health services, political science, psychology, public health, sociology, and survey and evaluation research, plus the physical, biomedical, and clinical sciences.

The NCRR is particularly interested in research on issues that would impact on clinical and translational collaborative research. FIC is interested in applications that deal with research integrity issues in low- and middle-income countries as identified in the World Bank classification system.

The areas of special interest to the sponsoring agencies include: factors that enhance or undermine integrity in collaborative research, standards for responsible conduct, self-regulation, and economic, policy, and scientific impacts.


EDITOR’S NOTE: HAPPY HOLIDAYS!

This is the last edition of the COSSA Washington Update for 2009. We will return on January 11, 2010. All of us at COSSA wish our friends and readers a Joyous Holiday Season and Best Wishes for the New Year and New Decade! As the first decade of the 21st Century comes to a close, we hope the new one will bring peace and prosperity, a cleaner planet, improved health and education, and better understanding of human and societal behavior through support for social and behavioral science research!
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