

CONSORTIUM of SOCIAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATIONS

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

MEMORANDUM: February 19, 1982

TO: COSSA Members, Affiliates, Contributors, and Friends

FROM: Roberta Balstad Miller, Executive Director

RE: COSSA Legislative Report

An issue of continuing interest to social and behavioral scientists is the representation of their disciplines on the National Science Board. Science Indicators, 1980 reports that 34% of all doctoral level scientists are social and behavioral scientists, yet they are represented by only 2 out of 24 members of the National Science Board. Not only does this mean that the Board is intellectually unrepresentative of the scientific community as a whole, but it also puts the Board at a disadvantage in dealing with the many issues regarding the social and behavioral sciences that come before it. This is doubly unfortunate at a time when the social and behavioral sciences are under budgetary scrutiny, as they were in 1981. The Consortium of Social Science Associations has written to E. Pendleton James, Assistant to the President for Presidential Personnel, George Keyworth, White House Science Advisor, and Nelson D. Pewitt, Assistant Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy, to urge that they recommend that President Reagan appoint additional social and behavioral scientists to the National Science Board. Any organization that wishes to add a voice to this request should contact COSSA for additional information.

COSSA is exploring a number of legislative initiatives in order to take advantage of the interest in social science stimulated by the House Committee on Science and Technology's recent hearings on human resources and productivity. We encourage you to send suggestions in this area to Philip Speser at the COSSA office.

Included in this mailing is an announcement from the Council of Professional Associations on Federal Statistics (COPAFS) regarding congressional hearings on the impact of budget reductions on the quality of federal statistics (see attachment 1).

CONSORTIUM OF SOCIAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATIONS

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

COSSA LEGISLATIVE REPORT

February 19, 1982

National Science Foundation

House authorization hearings for the NSF FY 1983 budget will begin on February 23, 1981. (Hearings originally scheduled for February 17 and 18 were postponed until next week.) The February 23 hearings will focus on budgets for instrumentation and for social and behavioral science research. The ranking minority member of the subcommittee, Representative Margaret Heckler (R., Mass.), said, "I ... want to make sure the social and behavioral sciences are sharing equally in any expansion of NSF program activities."

A chart permitting comparison of NSF funding levels from 1980 to 1983 for Mathematical and Physical Sciences, Astronomic, Atmospheric, Earth and Ocean Sciences, and the social and behavioral science programs in Biological, Behavioral and Social Sciences is enclosed (attachment 3). Despite the restorations of research funds at the end of December, the social and behavioral science research budgets proposed for FY 1983 are still considerably below FY 1980 levels. It should be noted that because the chart does not take inflation into account, the decline in research support is even greater than indicated on the chart.

National Endowment for the Humanities

Of the \$96.0 million FY 1983 appropriations request for NEH, \$59.0 million is slated for program money. Elsewhere in NEH, \$9.2 million is slated for the Treasury matching grants program for specific projects in the humanities, and \$15.6 million will go into the NEH's Challenge Grants program. This program provides \$1 of federal funds for each \$3 of private sector funding attracted from new sources by participating institutions. In the past, the leverage provided by this program has exceeded the 1/3 ratio. \$12.2 million is targeted in the FY 1983 request for NEH administration.

NEH (continued)

The House Subcommittee on Post-secondary Education will be holding hearings on NEH on March 4 in Washington and on March 5 at New York University in New York City. The hearings will focus on the impact of the Reagan budget on humanities research. The Washington hearings will include testimony from Jacob Nyenhuis, the new chairman of the Federation of State Humanities Councils, a representative from the Virginia Council on the Humanities, the President of St. Olaf's College in Minnesota, and another NEH grantee. The New York hearings will include John Cantanzarti, Executive Director of the Robert Morse Papers, Queens College, a youth grant recipient, and Daniel Callahan, Director of the Hastings Center.

It is likely that the House will provide additional funding for NEH during its mid-March mark-up on the authorizing legislation.

The Office of Presidential Personnel has forwarded nine names to the Senate for membership on the National Council on the Humanities. The individuals are:

Walter Berns	Resident Scholar, American Enterprise Institute
Gertrude Himmelfarb	Distinguished Professor of History, Graduate School, CUNY
Rita Ricardo Campbell	Senior Fellow, Hoover Institute on War, Revolution, and Peace
George Carey	Professor of Government, Georgetown University
Peter Stanlis	Distinguished Professor of Humanities, Rockford College, ILL
Ellis Sandoz	Professor of Political Science, Louisiana State University
Lawrence Chickering	Executive Director, Institute for Contemporary Studies, CAL
J. Clayborn LaForce	Professor of Economics and Dean, Graduate School of Management, UCLA
Jeffrey Hart	Professor of English, Dartmouth College

National Institute of Mental Health

The budget for NIMH, like the budgets of other ADAMHA institutes, shows a slight increase in research funding in FY 1983 and an elimination of funding for clinical training. In principle, some support for these services will be available in block grants to the states. Research training in NIMH has a slightly lower budget in FY 1983 than it had in FY 1982. Figures in the three institute budgets recently provided to COSSA are as follows:

ADAMHA	Cont. Res. FY 1982	Proposed FY 1983
Mental Health		
Research	130.9 *	146.3
Research Training	15.4	14.3
Clinical Training	45.4	-0-
Alcohol		
Research	20.8	32.9
Clinical Training	3.4	-0-
Drug Abuse		
Research	39.6	44.5
Clinical Training	5.5	-0-

Hearings on the NIMH budget will be held by the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor, HHS, and Education on March 1 and by the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee of the same name on March 3. Agency representatives will be testifying. COSSA has requested permission to testify at later public hearings on this budget.

One of the reported concerns of the House Subcommittee staff is that priority scores given social science research by NIMH review panels are always higher (and therefore of lower priority) than priority scores given research projects in the neurosciences. Although the scale used to assign ratings is the same, reviewers in the neurosciences continually rate proposals more favorably than do reviewers in the social sciences, where conventional peer reviews lead to more critical ratings. The high scores generally given social science projects promote unfavorable comparisons between these projects and the lower scored (and thus higher priority) research projects in the neurosciences.

* in millions

National Institute of Education and

National Center for Education Statistics

As reported last week, the FY 1983 budget request for the National Institute of Education is \$53.6 million, a 0.5% increase over the NIE budget as determined by the Continuing Resolution for FY 1982. This very slight increase represents a decline of -28% from the original FY 1981 budget for NIE. The same pattern of a slight increase in FY 1983 following (and solidifying) a considerably larger decrease from earlier levels can be seen in the budget level for the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES):

<u>Original 1981</u>	<u>Final 1981</u>	<u>Cont. Res. 1982</u>	<u>Proposed 1983</u>
10.0	9.0	8.6	8.8

The Continuing Resolution, which encompasses both NIE and NCES, expires on March 31. Any contacts with Congressmen about these budgets should address both the Continuing Resolution and the FY 1983 budget. COSSA has joined with 15 other organizations under the leadership of the American Education Research Association to improve the budget picture for NIE. COSSA has, in addition, met with OMB officials on the issue of maintaining federal support for education research despite a transfer of other education functions to the states.

The Reagan administration has announced plans to abolish the Department of Education and replace it with a Foundation for Education Assistance (FEA). There appears to be little interest in the new Foundation in Congress and the Administration may wait until after the 1982 elections to push for the change. According to David H. Florio of AERA, the proposed FEA will administer 38 programs, including block grants; student financial aid; research, statistics, and related information services; compensatory education; and civil rights reviews, investigations, and negotiation of voluntary compliance agreements. The budget proposed for FEA for FY 1983 (which combines the budgets of ED, NIE, NCES, and FIPSE) is \$8.8 billion. This is -32% of the sum of the combined budgets of these programs for FY 1981. The functions of NIE and NCES will be absorbed in FEA and will be line items in the FEA budget.

National Archives and Records Service

The House Subcommittee on government information and individual rights, under the chairmanship of Glenn English, will hold oversight hearings on the effect of recent budget cuts on the operations of the archives. These hearings will be held on March 2 and March 4, 1982. Among those who will be testifying are Barbara Tuchman and Alex Haley. In cooperation with the American Historical Association and the Organization of American Historians, COSSA is planning to organize a luncheon for members of the committee and members of the press following the testimony on March 2.

Other issues affecting the archives, such as reorganization of the archives and transfer of the supervisory jurisdiction from the General Services Administration, will be discussed in greater detail in future issues of the COSSA Legislative Report.

International Communication Agency

Within ICA, the budget for Educational and Cultural Affairs (ECA), which includes funding for the Fulbright program, IREX, and other scholarly exchanges, is scheduled for a slight increase in FY 1983. Funding for ECA under the Continuing Resolution in FY 1982 is \$100 million and for FY 1983, \$100.6 million. Yet the actual increase in spending for ECA is somewhat larger than these figures indicate. Although the budget was larger, spending for FY 1982 will be only \$88.6 million; as a result, the \$100.6 million budget proposed for FY 1983 includes some carry-over funding from FY 1982 and some new funding.

Funding for academic exchanges is budgeted at \$56.3 for FY 1983. This figure represents an increase of 13.3% over the FY 1982 level of \$49.7 million. There is, in addition, an increase of \$1.1 million in ICA's funding for private sector programs, which are budgeted at \$7.4 million in FY 1983. included in these programs are bilateral exchange agreements under contract to such organizations as the Committee on Scholarly Communications with the People's Republic of China. According to Becky Owens of the American Council on Education, " The level of funding requested for Education and Cultural Affairs should afford sufficient latitude to operate the Fulbright Exchange Program at a reasonable level in all of the 120 countries in which it operates. However, since funding for the Exchange Program has decreased by 60% in constant dollars over the last fifteen (15) years, the FY 1983 request does not represent a real dollar increase."

Keyworth Appoints Advisory Council

Presidential Science Advisor George A. Keyworth has announced his appointments for the White House Science Council, his own modest version of the President's Science Advisory Committee which existed between 1957 and 1977. Keyworth will chair the Council. The other members are the following:

Edward Frieman	Vice-president, Science Applications, Inc., La Jolla, CA
Harold M. Agnew	President, General Atomic Co.
John Bardeen	Emeritus professor of electrical engineering, University of Illinois
D. Allan Bromley	Professor of physics, Yale University and chairman, A.A.A.S.
George A. Cowan	Laboratory senior fellow, Los Alamos National Laboratory
Edward E. David	President, Exxon Research and Engineering Company
Donald S. Fredrickson	Fellow in resident, NAS
Paul E. Gray	President, MIT
Robert O. Hunter, Jr.	President, Western Research Company
Arthur K. Kerman	Director, Center for Theoretical Physics, MIT
David Packard	Chairman of the board, Hewlett-Packard Co.
Edward Teller	Senior research fellow, Hoover Institution, Stanford University

Lt. Col. Thomas H. Johnson, a physicist on leave from the Science Research Laboratory at West Point, will coordinate the work of the Council. There are no social scientists on the Council.

Dr. Keyworth has also announced that he will form a second panel of about 100 scientists to serve as occasional consultants to the Office of Science and Technology Policy.

USERS OF FEDERAL STATISTICS TO TESTIFY
AT MARCH 16 CONGRESSIONAL HEARINGS

The Council of Professional Associations on Federal Statistics (COPAFS) has been asked by the Honorable Robert Garcia, Chairman of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, Subcommittee on Census and Population, to organize hearings on the impact of recent budget reductions on the utility and quality of Federal statistics. The Subcommittee, which has legislative and oversight jurisdiction for the Federal statistical system, has expressed particular interest in hearing from individuals who can describe the uses they make of Federal statistics and problems which they anticipate as a consequence of reduced resources for Federal statistical programs.

The hearings before the Subcommittee will take place on Tuesday, March 16 (Room 304, Cannon House Office Building) beginning at 9:30 a.m. A number of witnesses recommended by COPAFS' member associations will testify at that time. The hearing record will be supplemented with written statements from users who do not testify in person. If you wish to provide a statement, or want further information on the hearings, please contact the COPAFS office at (202) 783-5808.

The Washington Post

Tuesday, February 16, 1982

Killing the Messenger

AS THE HARSHER effects of the administration's budget reductions become evident, it is likely that corrections will be made—some already have. But there is no way to remedy one type of loss that is already occurring—loss of valuable data that measure the country's social and economic progress and the effect of government policy upon it.

Government data have an enormous market. They are used not only by policy-makers in the administration and Congress, but by businesses and individuals throughout the country who need to know what's happening to prices, unemployment, income, population trends and community development.

The administration's budget cuts and administrative shakeups have caused enormous disruption in even the most venerable government statistical agencies. Both the Census Bureau and the Bureau of Labor Statistics are canceling surveys, eliminating publications and delaying needed improvements in such basic statistics as the consumer price index and local area unemployment counts. Highly trained staffs are in turmoil as junior workers are laid off and more senior people are transferred or downgraded.

Similar disruption is occurring throughout all the many agencies that collect and analyze economic and program-related data. Some of this information feeds directly into widely used series like the CPI, which measures prices, and the national income accounts, which measure, along with a hundred other

things, the rate of economic growth, a central figure in the policy debate.

Other sources are important indicators in themselves. The Department of Health and Human Services, for example, has long been the major source of information on the characteristics of recipients of government benefits—information that was widely used by OMB director David Stockman in planning and justifying many of his budget proposals.

HHS now plans to cancel several important surveys. Among them is the only continuing source of information—gathered by the University of Michigan for almost 15 years—about the changes in income, work and family makeup from year to year. Also canceled are the biennial AFDC survey—the only state-by-state source of information about families on welfare—and a carefully designed survey that would have provided the first complete information on how many people benefit from different government programs and how serious poverty in this country really is.

Some surveys being canceled will not be widely mourned. But when important data sources start disappearing—and examples of refusals to fund or publish research that might contradict established policy keep surfacing—suspicion begins to dawn. If the administration's policies work as well as it anticipates, it should welcome thorough analysis of their impact. And if the policies don't work, then the public should know about it.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION
 Level of Funding for Selected
 Directorates and Programs
 1980 - 1983 (proposed)
 (in million \$)

	Actual 1980	Actual 1981	Actual 1982	Proposed 1983	% Change 1980 - 1983
RESEARCH AND RELATED ACTIVITIES	893.1	946.7	969.7	1,055.6	+18%
I Mathematical and Physical Sciences	227.0	256.5	272.9	298.7	+32%
II Astronomic, Atmospheric, Earth and Ocean Sciences	218.1	236.3	240.0	259.7	+19%
III Biological, Behavioral and Social Sciences	185.7	185.6	176.0	186.7	+0.5%
A. Physiology, Cellular & Molecular Biology	72.1	78.2	79.4	85.2	+18%
B. Behavioral and Neural Sciences (in part)					
1. Cognitive Science					
Memory and Cognitive Processes	2.6	2.4	2.2	2.3	-12%
Social and Develop- mental Psychology	3.3	2.6	1.5	1.6	-52%
(Applied Psychology)	1.4	1.1	**	**	
Linguistics	2.7	2.2	2.1	2.2	-19%
2. Anthropology	6.6	6.0	5.5	5.6	-15%
Subtotal	16.6	14.3	11.3	11.7	-30%
C. Social and Economic Science Division					
1. Economics and Geography					

February 17, 1982

Plan to Demote Education Dept. Calls for Abolition of 23 Programs

WASHINGTON

President Reagan's plan for demoting the Department of Education to a government foundation, detailed for the first time in the Administration's budget proposals for fiscal 1983, calls for the elimination of 23 education programs, many of which provide aid to colleges and universities.

Although the proposed Foundation for Education Assistance would retain responsibility for most major higher-education programs, including student aid, other activities now conducted by the Education Department—including support for international education—would be transferred to other agencies.

The plan to abolish the Education Department, which must be approved by Congress, is sure to meet strong resistance on Capitol Hill.

"It's going to be tough. There is considerable opposition," conceded Education Secretary Terrel H. Bell. "But I'm getting encouraging expressions of support. I think we're going to be successful."

Limited Federal Role

Presided over by a director to be appointed by the President, the proposed education foundation would reflect the Reagan Administration's view that the federal government should play a more limited role in education than it has in recent years.

"The primary responsibility for education belongs to parents, states, and localities," the Administration's budget documents said. "A Cabinet-level Department of Education symbolizes the pre-emption of appropriate state and local activities."

The foundation would have a budget of \$8.8-billion in fiscal 1983, compared with the \$13-billion expected to

be appropriated for the Education Department this year. It would have a staff of 4,800 employees, compared with the 6,200 in the department in fiscal 1981. And the foundation's authority to regulate colleges and schools would be limited to what is legally required or necessary," Administration documents said.

Secretary Bell contended that the Administration's interest in reducing the scope of federal regulation of educational institutions "does not mean that we want to abandon our commitment to equal opportunity."

33 of 1,100 to Transfer

Some civil-rights advocates fear, however, that the reorganization plan would weaken the effectiveness of federal laws barring discrimination in education.

The Administration has proposed transferring to the Justice Department all responsibility for initiating formal administrative hearings or for filing lawsuits against colleges or schools that violate civil-rights laws. Only about 33 of the nearly 1,100 positions in the Education Department's Office for Civil Rights would be involved in the transfer, however. The foundation would retain all of the Education Department's responsibilities short of legal action in federal court or before an administrative-law judge—including the conducting of compliance reviews and the investigation of discrimination complaints.

Administration documents said the Justice Department would take legal action to enforce civil-rights laws only in cases where the foundation's efforts to achieve voluntary compliance failed.

William C. Clohan, Jr., Under Secretary of Education, said the foundation proposal would bring "very little change" in the civil-rights responsibilities of the Education Department, which already has the option of referring cases to the Justice Department for enforcement.

Some civil-rights advocates criticized the plan, however, saying the separation of litigation and investigative activities would breed confusion and delays.

Grants, Loans, and Statistics

The foundation would operate programs that the Reagan Administration regards as within the purview of the federal government—including grants and loans to college students and aid to black colleges.

It would continue supporting education research and the gathering of statistics because, Secretary Bell said, "it would be neither cost-efficient nor feasible for each of our 16,000 school districts to undertake projects to solve similar problems."

As part of its proposal to establish the foundation, the Administration called for the complete elimination of several programs that it said had "achieved their objectives or which are more appropriately the responsibilities of states, local governments, or private institutions":

- ▶ State Student Incentive Grants.
- ▶ All grants to libraries.
- ▶ Graduate fellowships that sup-

port primarily women and members of minority groups, including disadvantaged students preparing to go to law school.

▶ Grants to institutions that enroll veterans.

▶ Aid to land-grant colleges.

▶ Cooperative-education grants.

▶ Aid to states for continuing education.

Twenty-eight of the department's 149 programs would be transferred to other federal agencies—including grants for international education, which would be administered by the International Communication Agency. There, Administration documents said, international-education programs could be coordinated with other similar programs already run by the I.C.A.

That proposal was criticized in a statement by the Department of Education Coalition, which includes more than 150 education groups and was formed to oppose the abolition of the department.

Claiming that the I.C.A. had pursued the goal of "vigorously promoting American values and policy objectives," the coalition said:

"While this goal may be appropriate for the Voice of America and U. S. information activities, it will warp the education programs and open them up to charges that they are merely propaganda programs."

In other proposed transfers:

▶ Federal loans and other subsidies for campus construction projects would be administered by the Treasury Department. The Administration wants no new projects to be financed under those programs and, according to the budget documents, Treasury officials would be "better able to manage" the collection or foreclosure of loans that have already been made.

▶ Rehabilitation programs for the disabled would be transferred to the Department of Health and Human Services.

▶ Programs for Indian education would be taken over by the Interior Department.

▶ The Minority Institutions Science Improvement program would be sent back to the National Science Foundation, where it was administered before the Education Department was established in 1980.

The Department of Education Coalition predicted that the science-improvement program would "wither away" at the N.S.F., citing the Administration's efforts to eliminate the agency's budget for science education.

The Administration also proposed abolishing 11 federal education boards and commissions, including advisory panels on adult education, education research, and international education.

—JANET HOOK