

CONSORTIUM of SOCIAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATIONS

1755 MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE, N.W., SUITE 300, WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036 • (202) 234-5703

MEMORANDUM: February 11, 1982

TO: COSSA Members, Affiliates, Contributors, and Friends

FROM: Roberta Balstad Miller, Executive Director 

RE: Legislative Report, February 11, 1982

Enclosed is a first cut on the Reagan administration's FY 1983 budget proposals for social science research. In addition to budgets in the four agencies COSSA has been monitoring (NSF, NIMH, NEH, and NIE), we are reporting on research budgets in the Departments of Labor, Agriculture, and Defense. More complete information on these and other research budgets will be available in future issues of COSSA's Legislative Report.

COSSA has been concerned about the exclusion of social science research from the tax credits for research and development expenditures provided in last year's tax legislation. A report on possible amendment of this provision of the tax code is enclosed.

One of the understandable but unfortunate results of the budget cuts last year is that the volume of proposals submitted to federal agencies has dropped considerably. We are all aware that this decline in the submission of proposals is due to the perception that research funds will be unavailable, a perception that is not, in many cases, inaccurate. However, the drop in proposal submissions also works against increasing social science research budgets. It is always more difficult to argue for increased funding in a research program when there appears to be little need or interest in the program within the research community. Please contact your members about this problem and urge them to continue to submit research proposals to federal research programs. For additional details, see the enclosed article from the Chronicle of Higher Education (see Attachment 4).

CONSORTIUM of SOCIAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATIONS

1755 MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE, N.W., SUITE 300, WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036 • (202) 234-5703

LEGISLATIVE REPORT

February 12, 1982

NSF

The FY 1983 budget for the National Science Foundation is \$76.6 million over the budget for FY 1982. This represents a 7.7 percent increase for the Foundation in FY 1983. Research in the social and behavioral sciences, however, is only scheduled for an overall increase of 1.9 percent. (For additional details, see the enclosed chart, Attachment 1, of NSF funding for the social and behavioral sciences from 1980 to 1983.)

The House Subcommittee on Science, Research, and Technology will hold authorization hearings for NSF on February 17, 18, and 23. The hearings will concentrate on Foundation support for the social and behavioral scientists on February 23. Testimony will be given by a panel of social scientists composed of William Baumol (Princeton University and New York University), Philip Converse (University of Michigan), and Charles Kiestler (Carnegie-Mellon University). If any organization would like to submit testimony on NSF funding for social and behavioral science research for the Congressional Record, contact the COSSA office (202/234-5703).

NIMH

Research funding at the National Institute for Mental Health is slated for a slight increase over FY 1982 (see below). No definitive figures are available at this time for research training and clinical training budgets because of a reorganization of NIMH programs currently taking place.

	Actual <u>1981</u>	Actual <u>1982</u>	Proposed <u>1983</u>
Total Research	\$171*	\$137	\$147
Extramural Research	\$101	\$ 94	\$ 99

* in millions

NIE

The budget for the National Institute of Education is approximately the same for FY 1983 as it was for FY 1982. This is 28 percent less than the NIE budget for FY 1980.

<u>Actual</u> <u>1980</u>	<u>Actual</u> <u>1981</u>	<u>Actual</u> <u>1982</u>	<u>Proposed</u> <u>1983</u>
\$74.1*	\$65.6	\$53.4	\$53.65

NEH

As indicated in several news stories before the budget was officially released, the administration is proposing a budget of \$96 million for the National Endowment for the Humanities in FY 1983. This is 26 percent less than the NEH budget for FY 1982 and 37 percent less than the budget for FY 1981.

<u>Actual</u> <u>1891</u>	<u>Actual</u> <u>1982</u>	<u>Proposed</u> <u>1983</u>
\$151.3*	\$130.6	\$96.0

The most recent report of the National Humanities Alliance is enclosed (Attachment 3).

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Research administrators in the Department of Defense suggest that social and behavioral science research will not share fully in the increased budgets for defense this year. Representatives of both Army and Air Force research programs report that social and behavioral science research has been cut by the Congress in the past and may well be cut again this year. More information will be available in future issues of COSSA's Legislative Report.

* in millions

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Overall budget authority for research in the Department of Labor was \$100.6 million in FY 1981, \$29.7 million in FY 1982, and \$9.6 million in FY 1983. In large part, this decline reflects the fact that the authorization for CETA appropriations expires at the end of FY 1982. Remaining CETA functions are to be transferred to the states through a block grant. Other parts of the Department of Labor budget of particular interest to social scientists are as follows:

Planning, Evaluation, and Research:

<u>Actual</u> <u>1981</u>	<u>Estimated</u> <u>1982</u>	<u>Estimated</u> <u>1983</u>
\$5.4*	\$3.8	\$5.0

Bureau of Labor Statistics. For information on the FY 1983 budget for the Bureau of Labor Statistics, see the enclosed excerpt from the Budget of the United States Government (see Attachment 2).

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Overall, the budget for research and development in the Department of Agriculture will rise \$31 million in FY 1983. The following parts of this budget are of particular interest to social scientists:

Economic Research Service. For FY 1983, a budget of \$40.5 million has been proposed, an increase of \$1.2 million over last year's budget.

Agricultural Research Service. The administration recommends that no less than \$10.5 million be appropriated for marketing research. It is also continuing funding for program evaluations and impact analysis of science and education programs, although detailed budget numbers have not yet been made public.

Extension Service. Within the Extension Service, the budget for home economics research is \$79.4 million.

National Agricultural Library. In FY 1982, the Library had a budget of \$8.2 million. This is scheduled to be increased to \$9 million in FY 1983.

Statistical Reporting Service. The budget of \$51.6 million in FY 1982 is to be increased to \$53.6 million in FY 1983.

* in millions

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE (continued)

World Agricultural Outlook Board. The FY 1983 budget is \$1.5 million, an increase of \$1.1 million over the FY 1982 budget.

Agricultural Marketing Service. This budget will decrease from \$36.4 million in FY 1982 to \$31.3 million in FY 1983.

TAX CREDITS FOR SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH

Under the tax act passed by Congress in the last session, 25% of qualifying research and development expenditures over a three year base line may be claimed as a tax credit. The purpose of this credit was to encourage private investment in research and development. At the time the legislation was passed, COSSA reported that social science research was specifically excluded from expenditures qualifying for the new research and development tax credit. As it stands, this exclusion is an economic disincentive for private sector investment in social science research.

COSSA is currently working on this issue with the staff of Congressman Stan Lundine (D., N.Y.), who organized the Science and Technology Committee hearings on human factors in productivity last September. Mr. Lundine is proposing that the I.R.S. Code of 1954 be amended to include expenditures for social science research among those expenditures qualifying for the research and development tax credit. For further information, contact the COSSA office (202/234-5703) or Mary Ann Richardson in Mr. Lundine's office (202/225-3161).

Additional items enclosed:

1. 1982 Calendar for the 97th Congress -- Second Session (Attachment 5)
2. N.Y. Times article on basic research budgets (Attachment 6)
3. N.Y. Times article on Census Bureau budget cuts (Attachment 7)
4. Wall Street Journal article on private business support of research (Attachment 8)

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

Social and Behavioral Sciences

Level of Funding by Program
(in million \$)

BIOLOGICAL, BEHAVIORAL, AND SOCIAL SCIENCES	<u>Actual 1980</u>	<u>Actual 1981</u>	<u>Actual 1982</u>	<u>Proposed 1983</u>	<u>% of 1980</u>
<u>Behavioral and Neural Sciences (in part)</u>					
Cognitive Science					
Memory and Cognitive Processes	2.6	2.4	2.2	2.3	-12%
Social and Developmental Psychology	3.3	2.6	1.5	1.6	-52%
Applied Psychology	1.4	1.1	-0-	-0-	-100%
Linguistics	2.7	2.2	2.1	2.2	-19%
Anthropology	6.6	6.0	5.5	5.6	-15%
Subtotal	16.6	14.3	11.3	11.7	-30%
<u>Social and Economic Sciences Division</u>					
Economics and Geography					
Economics	12.2	9.4	6.3	6.4	-48%
Geography	1.6	1.2	0.7	0.7	-56%
Social Measurement and Analysis					
Sociology	3.9	3.0	2.2	2.2	-44%

	<u>Actual 1980</u>	<u>Actual 1981</u>	<u>Actual 1982</u>	<u>Proposed 1983</u>	<u>% of 1980</u>
Social Measurement and Analysis (continued)					
Measurement Methods and Data Resources	5.0	3.9	2.9	3.0	-40%
History and Philosophy of Science	1.5	1.1	0.9	0.9	-40%
Political and Policy Sciences					
Political Science	3.6	2.9	2.1	2.1	-42%
Law & Social Sciences	0.9	0.9	1.1	1.1	+22%
Regulation and Policy Analysis	2.6	2.7	0.9	0.8	-69%
Decision and Management Science		(0.4)	0.5	0.7	
Subtotal	31.3	25.5	17.6	17.9	-43%
Total, social and behavioral sciences in Biological, Behavioral, and Social Sciences	47.9	39.8	28.9	29.6	-38%
Total, Biological, Behavioral and Social Sciences	185.7	185.6	176.0	186.7	+0.5%

BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS

Federal Funds

General and special funds:

SALARIES AND EXPENSES*

*See Part III for additional information.

For necessary expenses for the Bureau of Labor Statistics, including advances or reimbursements to State, Federal, and local agencies and their employees for services rendered, \$120,143,000. (29 U.S.C. 2, 7, 181.)

Note.—The appropriation for this account for 1982 had not been enacted at the time this budget was prepared. The 1982 amounts shown below are based upon a continuing resolution (Public Law 97-92) in effect through March 31, 1982.

Program and Financing (in thousands of dollars)

Identification code	1981 actual	1982 est.	1983 est.
Identification code 16-0200-0-1-505			
Program by activities:			
Direct program:			
1. Labor force statistics.....	38,862	34,782	39,967
2. Prices and cost of living.....	38,224	38,616	44,117
3. Wages and industrial relations.....	14,523	12,891	14,819
4. Productivity and technology.....	3,526	3,398	4,036
5. Economic growth and employment projections.....	2,553	2,346	2,758
6. Executive direction and staff serv- ices.....	14,131	11,913	14,446
Total direct program.....	111,819	103,946	120,143
Reimbursable program.....	11,332	8,697	9,242
Total program costs, funded.....	123,151	112,643	129,385
Change in selected resources (undelivered orders).....	-1,829		
10.00 Total obligations.....	121,323	112,643	129,385
Financing:			
Offsetting collections from:			
11.00 Federal funds.....	-10,601	-7,494	-7,966
14.00 Non-Federal sources.....	-833	-1,203	-1,276
25.00 Unobligated balance lapsing.....	1,193		
39.00 Budget authority.....	111,081	103,946	120,143
Budget authority:			
40.00 Appropriation.....	106,324	103,946	120,143
40.01 Appropriation rescinded (Public Law 97- 12).....	-160		
42.00 Transferred from other accounts.....	4,917		
43.00 Appropriation (adjusted).....	111,081	103,946	120,143
Relation of obligations to outlays:			
71.00 Obligations incurred, net.....	109,888	103,946	120,143
72.40 Obligated balance, start of year.....	11,106	12,657	13,615

General and special funds—Continued

SALARIES AND EXPENSES—Continued

Program and Financing (in thousands of dollars)—Continued

Identification code	1981 actual	1982 est.	1983 est.
16-0200-0-1-505			
74.00 Obligated balance, end of year.....	-12,657	-13,615	-15,182
77.00 Adjustments in expired accounts.....	119		
90.00 Outlays.....	108,456	102,988	118,576

1. *Labor force statistics.*—Monthly estimates are made of the labor force, employment, and unemployment for the Nation, States, and local areas. Studies are made of selected characteristics of the labor force. Monthly data are prepared and published on employment, hours of work, earnings, and labor turnover by industry for the United States, each State, and selected sub-State areas. Quarterly data are prepared and published on insured employment, wages, and contributions by industry for the Nation, all States, and many sub-State areas. Annual data are prepared on occupational employment by industry for the United States and 49 States. A major revision of the establishment employment and earnings survey began in 1982 and will be continued in 1983. Data on labor turnover were discontinued in 1982.

WORKLOAD STATISTICS (MAJOR ITEMS)

Labor force statistics:	1981 actual	1982 estimate	1983 estimate
National unemployment and labor force estimates (monthly, quarterly, and annual series).....	93,805	93,805	93,805
Insured employment and wages (monthly series).....	586,593	586,593	586,593
Employment, hours, and earnings (monthly series).....	23,470	23,470	23,470
Monthly employment and unemployment estimates for States and local areas.....	6,300	5,700	5,700
Labor turnover series.....	11,184		
Data development and evaluation projects.....	111	113	110

2. *Prices and cost of living.*—The Consumer Price Index and the Producer Price Index are compiled and published monthly. Revision of the Producer Price Index will continue in 1983. Development of a rent sample for a rental equivalence measure of owner-occupied housing costs in the Consumer Price Index was undertaken in 1982 and will be continued in 1983. Development and publication of export and import price indexes will continue. Special analytical studies of price changes are undertaken and family budget studies are prepared and published. Work on family budgets has been reduced to minimal levels.

WORKLOAD STATISTICS (MAJOR ITEMS)

Prices and cost of living:	1981 actual	1982 estimate	1983 estimate
Consumer prices:			
(a) Outlet contacts (monthly).....	23,000	20,900	22,800
(b) Price quotations collected/processed (monthly).....	125,000	100,500	106,400
(c) Indexes published (monthly).....	5,418	5,418	5,418
(d) Outlet initiations (annually).....	8,500	5,500	6,100
(e) Rent/rental equivalence price quotations (monthly).....	3,200	7,000	7,000
Producer prices:			
(a) Commodity indexes.....	2,800	3,400	5,000
(b) Mining and manufacturing.....	99	171	245

International price program: major U.S. exporting and importing companies interviewed for price information: ¹

Export price indexes.....	65	74	74
Import price indexes.....	65	78	78

¹ Percent of value of imports or exports covered by indexes

3. *Wages and industrial relations.*—Data on wages and salaries are collected and analyzed by occupation for major labor markets and industries. Monthly information is compiled on major work stoppages and wage developments. Several smaller wage surveys were discontinued in 1981 and 1982.

WORKLOAD STATISTICS (MAJOR ITEMS)

Wages and industrial relations:	1981 actual	1982 estimate	1983 estimate
Occupational wages: establishments reporting annually.....	29,027	25,500	25,500
Current wage developments: collective bargaining units studied.....	2,700	¹ 2,700	¹ 2,700
Labor management agreements: number of contracts.....	4,900	4,900	4,900
Work stoppages: employers and unions reporting.....	11,000	(¹)	(¹)
Employment cost index: establishments reporting quarterly.....	3,400	3,800	3,800
Level of benefits: summary plans analyzed and coded.....	5,900	5,900	5,900

¹ As minor events are phased out of the work stoppage program, reports on major work stoppages will be reported in the Current Wage Development program.

4. *Productivity and technology.*—Labor, capital, and multi-factor productivity and costs are measured for major sectors of the United States economy and for many industries. Sources of productivity change such as capital formation, energy costs, cyclical movements, and inter-industry shifts are studied. Studies are conducted on automation and other technological changes. Analyses and international comparisons are made of prices, wages, employment, unemployment, and unit-labor costs. Research is conducted on the effects of international trade on U.S. employment.

WORKLOAD STATISTICS (MAJOR ITEMS)

Productivity and technology:	1981 actual	1982 estimate	1983 estimate
Major studies.....	11	11	12
Articles.....	18	19	18
Special reports.....	31	35	35
Series maintained.....	98,940	163,940	230,300

5. *Economic growth and employment projections.*—Medium-range economic projections (5–15 years) of the United States are prepared, including the level and structure of economic growth and a projection of employment by industry and occupation. Special economic and social studies are undertaken and special reports are prepared for the Commissioner, the Secretary, the Council of Economic Advisers, other Government agencies, and users outside the Government. Projections are prepared of employment requirements and job openings by occupation that include, where available, data on labor supply by occupation. Detailed studies of the outlook for specific occupations are published.

WORKLOAD STATISTICS (MAJOR ITEMS)

Economic growth and employment projections:	1981 actual	1982 estimate	1983 estimate
Projections for 150 industries (biennial).....	80	80	80
Special economic and industry analyses.....	5	5	5
National Industry-Occupation Matrices.....	5	5	5
Occupational Outlook Quarterly.....	4	4	4

Occupational outlook publications, articles, or studies (biennial).....	125	100	100
Analytical occupational reports.....	7	1	1

6. *Executive direction and staff services.*—Provides leadership in developing plans and policies for the Bureau's economic, statistical, and management programs. Statistical and data processing systems are operated and maintained. Provides for a Bureau-wide management information system. Research and report activities are coordinated; publications and news releases are planned and edited; and a central inquiry service is maintained.

Object Classification (in thousands of dollars)

Identification code 16-0200-0-1-505	1981 actual	1982 est.	1983 est.
Direct obligations:			
Personnel compensation:			
11.1 Full-time permanent.....	43,673	40,948	44,845
11.3 Other than full-time permanent.....	2,756	2,669	2,908
11.5 Other personnel compensation.....	466	478	716
11.9 Total personnel compensation.....	46,895	44,095	48,469
12.1 Personnel benefits: Civilian.....	4,478	4,082	4,367
13.0 Benefits for former personnel.....		61	
21.0 Travel and transportation of persons.....	2,496	2,844	2,874
22.0 Transportation of things.....	16	163	163
23.1 Standard level user charges.....	3,505	5,257	6,135
23.2 Communications, utilities, and other rent....	3,561	1,933	3,598
24.0 Printing and reproduction.....	1,504	1,375	1,608
25.0 Other services.....	48,344	43,226	51,899
26.0 Supplies and materials.....	529	499	619
31.0 Equipment.....	485	411	411
42.0 Insurance claims and indemnities.....	6		
93.9 Total direct costs, funded.....	111,819	103,946	120,143
94.0 Change in selected resources (undelivered orders).....	-1,931		
99.0 Subtotal, direct obligations.....	109,888	103,946	120,143
Reimbursable obligations:			
Personnel compensation:			
11.1 Full-time permanent.....	6,512	4,822	4,875
11.3 Other than full-time permanent.....	43	19	19
11.5 Other personnel compensation.....	102		14
11.9 Total personnel compensation.....	6,657	4,841	4,908
12.1 Personnel benefits: Civilian.....	638	436	436
21.0 Travel and transportation of persons.....	523	418	477
23.1 Standard level user charges.....	580	645	774
23.2 Communications, utilities, and other rent....	189	126	147
24.0 Printing and reproduction.....	234	142	151
25.0 Other services.....	2,454	2,008	2,263
26.0 Supplies and materials.....	52	59	64
31.0 Equipment.....	4	22	22
42.0 Insurance claims and indemnities.....	1		
93.9 Total reimbursable costs, funded.....	11,332	8,697	9,242
94.0 Change in selected resources (undelivered orders).....	102		
99.0 Subtotal, reimbursable obligations.....	11,434	8,697	9,242
99.9 Total obligations.....	121,323	112,643	129,385

Personnel Summary

Direct:			
Total number of full-time permanent positions.....	1,945	1,790	1,790
Total compensable workyears:			
Full-time equivalent employment.....	2,069	1,871	1,909
Full-time equivalent of overtime and holiday hours.....	12	4	4
Average ES salary.....	\$49,871	\$57,969	\$57,969
Average GS grade.....	9.27	9.38	9.38
Average GS salary.....	\$24,241	\$26,547	\$26,547

Average salary of ungraded positions.....	\$14,310	\$14,997	\$15,046
Reimbursable:			
Total number of full-time permanent positions.....	357	225	225
Total compensable workyears:			
Full-time equivalent employment.....	220	206	206
Full-time equivalent of overtime and holiday hours.....	0	0	0
Average GS grade.....	9.71	9.77	9.77
Average GS salary.....	\$22,364	\$23,802	\$23,802

Intragovernmental funds:

CONSOLIDATED WORKING FUND

Program and Financing (in thousands of dollars)

Identification code 16-3902-0-4-505	1981 actual	1982 est.	1983 est.
Program by activities:			
1. Special economic and statistical studies.....	207		
2. Refunds.....	427		
Total program costs, funded.....	634		
Change in selected resources (undelivered orders).....	-187		
10.00 Total obligations (object class 25.0).....	447		
Financing:			
21.98 Unobligated balance available, start of year: Fund balance.....	-938		
25.00 Unobligated balance lapsing.....	491		
39.00 Budget authority.....			
Relation of obligations to outlays:			
71.00 Obligations incurred, net.....	447		
72.98 Obligated balance, start of year: Fund balance.....	-235		
77.00 Adjustments in expired accounts.....	-63		
90.00 Outlays.....	149		

Trust Funds

SPECIAL STATISTICAL WORK

Program and Financing (in thousands of dollars)

Identification code 16-8675-0-7-505	1981 actual	1982 est.	1983 est.
Program by activities:			
10.00 Total program costs, funded—obligations (object class 25.0).....	22		
Financing:			
21.40 Unobligated balance available, start of year.....	-22		
39.00 Budget authority.....			
Relation of obligations to outlays:			
71.00 Obligations incurred, net.....	22		
90.00 Outlays.....	22		

FEB 12 1982

11 February 1982

To: National Humanities Alliance

From: Moira Egan *MEG*

Re: 1983 NEH Budget Request

The recently announced budget request of the NEH for 1983 reveals that the agency's new Chairman is not inclined to make major changes this early in his tenure, but has ordered priorities which reflect both his own predilections and the goals and rhetoric of the Reagan administration. The only funding areas which do not suffer significant cuts in this \$96 million budget are those which match dollars raised in the private sector. The 26% overall reduction is felt chiefly in the agency's program areas, where the Divisions with grants aimed toward the general public are cut the most severely. Enclosed is a chart showing funding at the NEH in 1981 and 1982, with the 1983 request.

Definite funds Although the agency's budget is being cut by 26%, the agency's programs which make outright grants are scheduled to experience a 35% reduction in 1983. This is bad news for individual scholars, for curriculum development projects, for small historical societies and museums, and for all others who find it difficult or impossible to raise private funds to support their work. Every Division is cut from 1982 levels, but the severity of this cut varies in accord with Mr. Bennett's priorities. While the Research and Education Divisions are reduced in absolute dollars, both have grown in the share of definite funds they command. The Division of Public Programs is cut most severely, both in absolute dollars and in percentage loss; Special Programs is faced with a similar reduction. The increased percentage for Education is no doubt a direct result of Mr. Bennett's strong interest in improving the teaching of the humanities in the schools. The shift away from Public Programs toward Research is not surprising in light of reduced resources and the the criticism the conservative press often levelled at the Endowment's work with public television and with organizations outside of academe.

Treasury Funds The increase in Treasury funds requiring a one to one private match represents, in the words of the NEH budget summary, the agency's commitment to "increase, wherever possible, the

role of corporations, foundations, other non-Federal organizations and agencies, and individual in supporting the humanities." This is, of course, part of an administration-wide effort. The agency has said that many matching grants will be made in combination with outright grants, enabling grantees to establish a track record before they need to raise private funds. In the past, the chief users of Treasury funds have been major research projects and state humanities councils.

Challenge Grants Money allocated to the Challenge Grants Program will allow the agency to meet current commitments and to once again accept applications in this area. Approximately \$7.8 million will be available for new grants, a reduction from the \$9-10 million available in years prior to 1982. The new deadline has been announced for September 1; institutions interested in applying should contact the program's staff as soon as possible. Only institutions that have not previously held Challenge Grants will be eligible.

Administration The portion of NEH funds going to administration was for years at a relatively low 7-8%. It is unfortunate, but perhaps unavoidable, that administrative costs do not decrease at the same rate as program costs. Although the number of staff at the NEH has dropped in the past year, other costs remain stable or increase, especially costs associated with the agency's upcoming move to the Old Post Office Building.

The 1983 budget request contains good news only for those with ready access to private funds. The scholars, teachers, museum directors and other citizens who look to the NEH for critical support will once again have to go to the Congress in an attempt to have funding restored. The Alliance will supply in future memoranda more extensive information on the 1983 budget for NEH and other agencies related to the humanities.

***Notice: On March 1 the Alliance will move into space graciously donated by the American Association of Museums. Our new address will be:

National Humanities Alliance
1055 Thomas Jefferson Street, N.W., Suite 428
Washington, D.C. 20007

Program Funding
thousands

Summary -- All Programs

<u>Program</u>	<u>FY 1981</u> <u>Actual</u>	<u>FY 1982</u> <u>Approp.</u>	<u>FY 1983</u> <u>Request</u>	
Education	16,781 16	14,301 16	10,700	19.1 ^{0%}
Fellowships and seminars	15,785 15	13,405 15	9,200	15.6
Research	18,067 17	15,705 17	13,000	22
Public	21,431 20	18,009 20	8,300	14
Special	9,687 10	7,953 10	4,100	7
State	23,948 22	20,329 22	13,200	22.5
<u>Planning and Assessment</u> <u>Studies</u>	<u>823 (w/special)</u>	<u>730 (w/special)</u>	<u>500</u>	.8
Total Definite	\$106,522 70	\$90,432 70	\$59,000	61.4 ^{0%}
Treasury Funds	9,500 6	8,064 6	9,200	9.6
<u>Challenge Grants</u>	<u>24,000 16</u>	<u>20,736 16</u>	<u>15,600</u>	16.2
Total Program	\$140,022	\$119,232	\$83,800	
<u>Administration</u>	<u>11,277 8</u>	<u>11,328 8</u>	<u>12,200</u>	12.5
Grand Total	\$151,299	\$130,560	\$96,000	

NOTE: Detail may not add to total due to rounding.

THE CHRONICLE OF HIGHER EDUCATION

February 3, 1982

'Chilling Effect' of Budget Cuts Brings Fewer Requests for Government Grants

By CHERYL M. FIELDS

WASHINGTON

The number of researchers applying to some government agencies for grants has dropped so sharply that program officials may have trouble justifying increased budgets in future years, say several federal administrators and college lobbyists.

Discouraged by President Reagan's proposals last year for deep cuts in the budgets of several agencies that support university research, many researchers simply decided there would be no money available and it would be a waste of time to apply, the sources say.

However, they add, while some agencies have had their budgets reduced, in

many cases Congress did not cut as deeply as the President recommended, so the prospects for getting grants are not as dim as they could have been.

The Case of NSF

A case in point is the National Science Foundation, where Congress refused to cut as much as Mr. Reagan requested from appropriations for research in behavioral and social sciences.

The two divisions that administer those programs got a total of \$10.6-million more than Mr. Reagan originally proposed for them, said Richard T. Louttit, director of the Division of Behavioral and Neural Sciences at the N.S.F.

"This still leaves us well behind where we were a year ago," he said, "but the fact is that N.S.F. is supporting research in social and behavioral science."

"The potential long-term damage is in the message that individual scientists got. They heard that there was going to be very little money, so they simply made their individual decisions not to bother with proposals," he said. "If everybody does that, there won't be any proposals, and then there won't be any programs to support such research."

Otto N. Larsen, director of the foundation's Division of Social and Economic Sciences, said his area would get \$17.6-

Fewer Apply for Federal Funds *Continued from Page 15*

million for the current fiscal year, about half the amount Congress appropriated in fiscal 1981, but up from the \$10.1-million that the President proposed last March for fiscal 1982.

"We normally get about 1,200 proposals a year," he said. "I would estimate, and this is just an estimate, that we might get 800 proposals this year. It is clear the proposal load is down."

"It takes time and effort to submit proposals, and if you think the probability of success is low, there is a chilling effect."

That his division wound up with more money than the President originally requested, Mr. Larsen said, was due to "representations made by the social-science community as to the merits and utility of its research. There was a midcourse correction by Congress and the Administration."

No Applications in Education

One area of the foundation that is not accepting grant applications is the Directorate for Science and Engineering Education, which got only \$20.9-million for fiscal 1982, compared with \$70.7-million last year.

Jane T. Stutsman, a special assistant in the directorate, said \$15-million of this year's funds will go for graduate and minority fellowships. The \$5.9-million remaining will be used to help researchers finish multi-year grants and to start a new commission to study improvements in science education.

"So there's really nothing people can apply for except fellowships," she said.

But for programs that do have funds, another observer commented, "Writing a proposal that does not get funded is a bad use of time for the individual, but a good use of time from the viewpoint of the field as a whole. If the university community wants to claim that there is good research that isn't being funded because of low appropriations, it must be able to point to people who have good ideas who are not getting money."

Said Julia Jacobson of the Association for Affiliated College and Uni-

versity Offices here, which includes institutions ranging from Sweet Briar College to Tulane University and the University of Southern California, "There is no question that it could have an impact on budgets in the future if few people apply for grants now. The Administration and Congress will say, 'You don't need that money.'"

Ms. Jacobson noted that a newsletter the association sent out recently reported that the science foundation over all had experienced a 25-per-cent drop in grant applications in the current fiscal year; the National Institutes of Mental Health, a 66-per-cent drop; the education division of the National Endowment of the Humanities, a 25-per-cent drop; and the division of fellowships, a 16-per-cent drop.

The research division of the humanities endowment has experienced a drop of about 10 per cent in applications, said its director, Harold Cannon. "The campus grapevine or scuttlebutt has contributed to this," he said, noting that during visits to campuses he had talked to researchers who said they had been planning to apply to the endowment and changed their plans when they heard no money was available.

"One faculty member told me he had a linguistics proposal all ready, but didn't mail it because another faculty member said there was no money," Mr. Cannon said.

Although President Reagan originally wanted to cut appropriations for the endowment by about 50 per cent, to \$85-million, Congress wound up appropriating \$130.5-million for fiscal 1982, down from about \$151-million in fiscal 1981.

At the National Institute of Mental Health, Frank J. Sullivan, director of the Office of Extramural Project Review, said the number of proposals for social-science research and research on social problems was down, while proposals for clinical research, neuroscience research, epidemiology, and service-systems research were "holding their own, if not increasing."

The agency's research budget has been cut, but another important factor is that the Reagan Administration announced last March that N.I.M.H. would end support for "social" research.

Agency officials have interpreted that to mean that studies supported by the institute must have a strong tie to specific mental-health problems, not just social concerns such as divorce, child abuse, or rape.

At the National Institute for Education, a spokesman said that because of budget cuts and heavy continuing commitments to educational laboratories and centers, officials expected to award no new grants in the current fiscal year.

One-Third More Applications

Researchers have given new attention to military-research agencies, since the Defense Department is one of the few federal agencies whose budget is growing substantially. Ms. Jacobson said the Office of Naval Research, the Air Force Office of Scientific Research, and the Army Research Institute had all reported that they received about one-third more applications for grants this year than last.

Another agency, the \$13.5-million Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education, reported receiving about 2,230 preliminary proposals for grants, an overall increase of 500, Ms. Jacobson said. President Reagan requested only a small cut in funds for that program this year, so researchers know its still "alive," she said.

Nan S. Wells, director of government affairs at Princeton University, said that efforts had been made on her campus to keep faculty members up to date on the budget situation in Washington to avoid misunderstanding about the amounts of money available.

"We sent out a memo late in November outlining what was happening with appropriations. We tried to let faculty members know that there were funds available and encouraged them to apply."

Research Fares Well, but Aid for Students Is Cut

By ROBERT REINHOLD

Special to The New York Times

WASHINGTON, Feb. 6 — Scientific research at universities and elsewhere generally fares reasonably well in President Reagan's proposed budget for the 1983 fiscal year. At the same time the President would cut sharply funds for grants and loans to college students.

Over all, Government spending for basic research would increase to \$5.574 billion from \$5.337 billion, a rise of 5 percent. While that will probably not cover the bite of inflation in the cost of laboratory equipment and chemicals, widespread fears in the academic community of deep cuts in many programs were not realized. Still, many scientists will not endorse the President's emphasis on bolstering research in physics, engineering and other fields with potential military and industrial applications.

While the science budget will bring at least a muted sigh of relief on college campuses, the education budget will not. For example, the President would tighten rules governing the so-called Pell grants to college students, cutting the program by about one-third. About 600,000 loans to graduate students would be eliminated.

While comparatively generous, the proposed science budget does not imply easy times for American science. The budget for the National Science Foundation, a major supporter of basic research, would rise by 7.7 percent, to \$1.07 billion in 1983. But even with that, its budget would have risen by only 10 percent over all since 1980, far less than it was reduced by inflation.

Small Increase for N.I.H.

The National Institutes of Health, the Government's single largest supporter of fundamental research, would receive \$3.75 billion, an increase of only 3 percent, which would result in a reduction of the number of research grants to 15,141 from 15,175 in 1982 and 16,480 in 1981.

This is deceptive, however, because Presidents traditionally ask much less for the institutes than they really want, knowing that Congress, which greatly favors the agency, will add considerably.

Outlays for Basic Research By Major Departments and Agencies

Figures are rounded, in millions of dollars, for each fiscal year. Data for 1981 are actual; all others are estimates.

Department or agency	1981	1982	1983
Health and Human Services (primarily National Institutes of Health)	\$1,944	\$1,978	\$2,034
National Science Foundation	830	972	861
Defense—military functions	554	616	712
Commerce (primarily Energy Research and Technology Administration)	614	670	759
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	538	675	661
Agriculture	302	337	364
Interior	79	73	69
Smithsonian Institution	41	44	51
Veterans Administration	15	13	14
Education	18	18	22
Environmental Protection Agency	12	12	10
All other*	29	29	28
TOTAL	4,975	5,337	5,574

*Includes Departments of Justice, Transportation, Treasury and Labor, the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Corps of Engineers, the Federal Trade Commission, the Library of Congress and the Agency for International Development.

Source: Office of Management and Budget

The Administration appears to have called a cease-fire in its war on social science. Last year it asked Congress to all but eliminate National Science Foundation support of social science and economics. Congress restored much of the cut, appropriating \$17 million, and now Mr. Reagan is asking for a tiny increase, 1.1 percent, for those programs.

As expected, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration budget includes a hefty increase for the space shuttle program, to which it is committed for military and industrial purposes. Surprisingly it would salvage much of the planetary and deep space science studies, which the Office of Management and Budget had wanted to kill.

Saved are the Galileo satellite to ex-

plore Jupiter, the space telescope to orbit the earth by 1985 and the gamma ray observatory to study distant objects in space.

The budget contemplates a major shift in energy research as a result of the proposed dismantling of the Energy Department. A new Energy Research and Technology Administration would be set up as part of the Commerce Department and support for nuclear energy research cut by \$109 million, to \$1.5 billion.

Funding for study of conventional nuclear reactors, so called light-water reactors, is cut from \$117 million to \$33 million. But money is maintained for study of magnetic fusion, a promising power source for the future. Also, the

Administration would more than double, to \$254 million, support for the controversial breeder reactor demonstration at Oak Ridge, Tenn., a favorite of the Senate majority leader, Howard H. Baker Jr., Republican of Tennessee.

In higher education aid, the budget would cut spending for student aid by \$836 million. The Pell grants, awarded on the basis of need, would be reduced by dropping the maximum grant by \$70 to \$1,600. In addition, the so-called campus-based aid programs — made up of national direct student loans, college work-study and supplemental educational opportunity grants — would be trimmed by eliminating the supplemental grants and adding no more capital funds to the loan program. Still, there would be enough money for 690,000 loans.

In addition, the Administration would curb the guaranteed loan program by imposing much tighter rules. The program would still offer 2.8 million loans to students and 1.4 million "auxiliary" loans to parents and professional students. But the "origination fee" — the amount that must be paid to get the loans from banks and other lending institutions — would rise to 10 from 8 percent, graduate and professional students would be required to borrow only from the less-subsidized auxiliary program and the insurance premium paid to the Government by lending institutions would be increased.



NEW YORK TIMES (4/10/82)

By JOHN HERBERS

DURING the last decade demographic information has become increasingly essential for doing business in the United States — to investors who want to know whether to put their money into baby food or wheelchairs; to corporations deciding in which region and locality to build their plants, to marketing companies that must know where to direct advertising and to many others.

But as that data has become more valuable, the chief supplier of it — the United States Census Bureau — has come under the same budget restraints as agencies supplying social services, public works, education and research.

As a result, findings of the 1980 census are much slower emerging from the bureau than were those of the 1970 census, and some services that were promised prior to the decennial head count have been canceled.

In 1976 Congress, noting that changes now occur more rapidly than in the past, enacted a law to provide an additional census at mid-decade beginning in 1985 — one not so elaborate as that falling at the beginning of each 10-year period, but one that would supply enough detailed information about population changes and characteristics to tide the census users over until the next full head count.

James A. Paris of Urban Decisions Systems Inc. of Los Angeles, pointed out, for example, that development companies in Orange County, Calif., are still having to use information from the 1970 census in an area that has grown so fast that some communities are now vastly different from what they were then — in incomes, education, living styles and other ways. That information from the 1980 count will not be available on the county level until at least some time next year.

The Census Bureau has announced, however, that the 1985 census will not be conducted even though the law is still on the books. Congress under the Carter Administra-

But budgetary restraints are damming the flow of demographic information.

tion did not provide enough planning money. And the Reagan Administration in its flurry of budget cuts did not seek any funding for the mandated new census.

The bureau, meantime, has been struggling to publish, with its reduced staff and less funds, some of the most important findings of the 1980 count — the characteristics of the population on a regional, state, city and community basis.

Some commercial users have pointed out the irony of an Administration dedicated to revitalizing business while cutting deeply into research needed for that purpose. Bruce K. Chapman, the new director of the bureau, denies that any basic service has been curtailed by the cuts. And others contend that commercial interests should bear more of the cost.

Officials in several large enterprises that supply demographic information to a range of businesses said detailed census figures were vital, for example, to McDonald's in deciding where to put its hamburger stands and to the Chase Manhattan Bank in determining the need for new branches. And one of the largest new users of the census is the cable television industry.

Department stores, package goods companies, shop-

ping center developers and real estate companies all have increased their use of census data.

One of the services canceled because of budget cuts was 1980 data by zip codes. Commercial users that needed that — mainly large national companies that do business by mail, such as Sears, Roebuck and magazines — were forced to form their own consortium to compile the information from the bureau's computer tapes.

Most of what the bureau provides is used heavily by commercial users, various levels of government, educational institutions and private citizens. Because of that, no one has yet figured out any better way of assessing costs than having tax dollars pay for most services.

How much damage are the cuts, and even deeper reductions projected for the future, likely to inflict on business? The answers vary, but there is agreement that the delays being experienced can be costly to many users.

For example, earlier this year the population division of the bureau released figures of the number of persons per household by counties earlier than it had planned because broadcasters who needed the information to determine their markets were pressing for it daily.

Because the number per household had dropped sharply since 1970 — from 3.11 to 2.76 nationally — and estimates made during the decade were in doubt — the industry's planning and marketing was said to be at stake.

Other information just as vital — incomes, employment, age distribution — still has not been compiled for counties and communities. For some marketing needs, said Edward I. Star, president of Marketing Statistics of New York, the delay has been "calamitous."

And the effects are uneven through the economy. Donald C. Wood, vice president and general manager of the information services division of Donnelley Marketing, Stamford, Conn., said his company had such a large demographic staff that it could provide clients with estimates that he expected to be close to the Census Bureau's figures. But the vast majority of businesses are still waiting for the census figures to give them the information they need to make sound decisions.

James Grunshaw

Facing Cuts in Federal Grants, Big Schools Try to Get Research Work From Business

By SUSAN CAREY

Staff Reporter of THE WALL STREET JOURNAL

They aren't taking out ads to announce it, but a number of the nation's universities are offering science for sale, and hoping business shows up with checkbook in hand.

At Pittsburgh's Carnegie-Mellon University, faculty expertise in engineering and computer science has been packaged into what is called the Robotics Institute. Offering research on the automated factory, the institute now draws \$5 million a year from the likes of Westinghouse Electric Corp. and Digital Equipment Corp., and more corporate clients are on the way.

The University of Rochester is drawing up lists of companies with business lines that might profit from the school's prowess in genetics and laser research. Those that look like hot prospects are contacted by Rochester administrators. And, not to be outdone, Cornell University has hired Peat, Marwick Mitchell & Co. to study ways the Ithaca, N.Y., school can best market its research know-how.

Getting Aggressive

This is a sharp departure for academia. In the past, most universities relied on close ties between their science faculty and corporate-research staffs to bring in contracts and grants from private industry. Now, faced with the prospect of cuts in government-funded research at a time of rising operating costs, university administrators are beginning to aggressively seek corporate research and development work.

Paul Miller of the Committee for Corporate Support of Private Universities Inc. says the more progressive schools tout their faculty research in direct mailings to companies, hire administrators who know their way around the industrial-research community, appear at trade meetings and invite company scientists to campus. "Reputation has a lot to do with it," Mr. Miller concedes.

"There's no question but what many of the schools, particularly their administrations, are kind of abnormally interested in getting some money from patents or licensing," says Lewis Branscomb, chief scientist for International Business Machines Corp. and chairman of the National Science Board.

A Small Share

There aren't any precise figures on the amount of company-funded research undertaken on campuses. But Laurence Berlowitz, coauthor of a new study for the National Science Board on university-industry research partnerships, estimates that 3% to 5% of the university research effort—which totaled \$6 billion in 1980—comes from either research contracts or outright grants by industry. The bulk of the rest—\$4 billion two years ago—comes from the federal government.

Some of this government support, however, is likely to be withdrawn in the wake of Reagan administration budget cuts, and there is little chance industry can make it up. Mr. Berlowitz says businesses' share of campus research probably won't rise to more than 7% or 8%. But it will grow, he adds.

Not all schools share in the corporate largess. "Clearly, the action is at the leading research universities, maybe 20 or 25, where the bulk of basic research is performed," says David Johnson, Cornell's director of corporate relations. "Cornell historically hasn't gone out and tried to encourage this. That is changing."

Not all schools share in the corporate largess. "Clearly, the action is at the leading research universities, maybe 20 or 25, where the bulk of basic research is performed," says a Cornell University official.

Contract arrangements typically call for a company to fund research in a certain area in return for rights to make and sell any new products that result. For universities, the projects provide extra funds that buy equipment, pay competitive salaries and help keep academic standings up. They also offer what IBM's Mr. Branscomb calls the chance to give faculty "real-life industrial experience."

Companies that award R&D business to schools benefit too, particularly if the research involves areas outside their own expertise. Du Pont Co., for instance, recently turned to university labs to speed up its biological-products research, awarding \$6 million to Harvard's medical school for research in molecular genetics.

"There's a lack of highly trained personnel (at Du Pont) that can do the special manipulations" required in such projects, explains Howard Simmons, director of Du Pont's central R&D department, "so we're doing more than we've done in the past in interacting with universities through contracts. . . . But as soon as students fill industrial labs, we'll be less reliant on the universities."

The trend isn't without controversy. Some critics contend that because it is

aimed at producing business profit, business-funded research threatens the freedom of university scientists to pursue knowledge for its own sake.

Friction also can arise over issues such as who gets patent and licensing rights to discoveries and when research results may be published in scientific journals.

Vanderbilt University once canceled a corporate-research contract because it sharply restricted what findings the school could publish. "From time to time, companies want to have more control over publication of the research than we are prepared to let them have," explains Robert Appleson, Vanderbilt's director of sponsored research. Censorship of research data for proprietary reasons "can be appropriate," he adds, "but there has to be a limit to it."

Some companies are sensitive to the problem, allowing a portion of their research funds to be set aside for unrestricted scientific inquiry. "Some research will simply contribute to knowledge, some will result in products," says Sam Fuller, Digital Equipment's technical director for engineering. "We look at the balance."

Stiff Competition

Nonetheless, it is mostly the universities that are seeking out the companies, and the competition has gotten stiff. "The problem is, everyone is besieging the private sector," says Donald Hess, Rochester University's vice president for campus affairs. While his school's effort to organize its search for corporate research funding promises to bring in additional contracts, Mr. Hess adds, the university still "encourages faculty members to drum up work."

Carnegie-Mellon is among the most successful at landing corporate business. This year, \$9 million of its \$42 million research budget, which includes funds for CMU's prestigious Mellon Institute, came from industry. Six years ago, business contributed \$4 million to the \$17 million research budget. "We're in a position other people are trying to emulate," says Daniel Berg, CMU provost. "We've done this for a long time, but we've put some new twists on it."

Its Robotics Institute, organized nearly three years ago on the premise that corporate interest in improving productivity would mesh with CMU's computer-science and engineering research, is a case in point. Today, some 15 companies are institute supporters, enabling CMU to attract new faculty and top-ranked students in the field.

The result: "We have the leading researchers in robotics and a very well equipped faculty," says Mr. Berg. "The work is leading edge." As long as we can give (corporate sponsors) value in the short range, we can work on goals for the year 2020."