

COSSA WASHINGTON UPDATE

Volume XIII, Number 15

August 8, 1994

WHITE HOUSE OUTLINES VISION FOR POST-COLD WAR SUPPORT OF SCIENCE *HS*

Defining a post-Cold War rationale for science, the Clinton-Gore administration's new report, *Science in the National Interest*, places federal support for research in a broader context than traditional national security needs. Vice President Al Gore released the report at an August 3 press conference, and termed the document the "administration's vision for science." The White House statement was hailed at a congressional hearing the following day, and has also drawn strong praise from the scientific community.

Based in part on two days of input from science policy leaders at the Forum on Science (see *Update*, February 14), the report aims to do for science policy in the post-Cold War era what Vannevar Bush's *Science: The Endless Frontier* provided for the post-World War II era -- a strong rationale for federal support for basic or fundamental science. M.R.C. Greenwood, Associate Director for Science at the Office of Science and Technology Policy (OSTP), directed the effort to produce the report. Coinciding with the release of the report, OSTP announced the creation of the President's Committee of Advisors on Science and Technology, whose members include psychologist Judith Rodin, President of the University of Pennsylvania (see box on page 3).

As many have noted since the end of the Cold War, support for science must move beyond the national defense rationale to support science. The administration declares: "We must reexamine and reshape our science policy both to sustain America's preeminence in science and to facilitate the role of science in the broader national interest." The national interest is now defined as health, prosperity through technological innovation, national security, environmental responsibility, and improved quality of life.

(continued on page two)

INSTITUTE OF MEDICINE STUDY ON AIDS AND BEHAVIOR RELEASED *SP*

The Committee on Substance Abuse and Mental Health Issues in AIDS Research of the Institute of Medicine recently released its congressionally-mandated study of the AIDS programs of the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism (NIAAA), the National Institute on Drug Abuse (NIDA), and the National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH). (See the April 18 *Update* for a description of issues the committee addresses.)

The report, *AIDS and Behavior: An Integrated Approach*, was endorsed unanimously by a fourteen member panel representing expertise in clinical medicine, epidemiology, neurology, neuroscience, nursing, operations research, psychiatry, psychology, public advocacy, public health, and sociology. H. Keith H. Brodie, president Emeritus and James B. Duke Professor of Psychiatry and Professor of Law, Duke University, chaired the committee. Judy Auerbach, former COSSA Associate Director for Government Relations, directed the study.

As evidenced by the title of the report, a principal conclusion of the study is that behavioral and social factors are integral to AIDS prevention efforts. The panel found that "Despite extensive efforts to develop effective treatments as well as a

(continued on page six)

INSIDE UPDATE...

- ◆ Clinton Names Three SBE Scientists to National Science Board
- ◆ FY 1995 Appropriations Update
- ◆ GAO Study Backs Peer Review, But Suggests Reforms
- ◆ NIH Seeks New Director for OBSSR
- ◆ Democratization Research Report Available
- ◆ Columbia University Rejoins COSSA
- ◆ Sources of Research Support: U.S. Department of Education

WHITE HOUSE SCIENCE REPORT

(continued from page one)

Brown Praises Emphasis on Fundamental Science

At the hearing before the House Science Subcommittee, Rep. George Brown (D-CA), Chairman of the full House Science, Space and Technology Committee, noted that the highlight of the report "is that it leaves no doubt about the critical role which fundamental research must play in achieving a more prosperous economy and better quality of life for all citizens" (*emphasis his*).

OSTP Director John Gibbons outlined the report at both the press conference and the Science Subcommittee. "Science in the National Interest speaks to the need for science to be responsive to national goals while also retaining commitment to the core values that have enabled our scientific community to achieve so much," he said.

In the effort to sustain America's world leadership in science, mathematics, and engineering (one of the three goals of a February 1993 administration document *Technology for America's Economic Growth*) the report declares five goals:

- 1) to maintain leadership across all frontiers of knowledge;
- 2) to enhance connections between fundamental research and national goals;
- 3) to stimulate partnerships that promote investment in fundamental science and engineering and the effective use of physical, human and financial resources;

CONSORTIUM OF SOCIAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATIONS

Executive Director:	Howard J. Silver
Government Affairs:	Susan Persons
Public Affairs:	Michael Buckley
Administrative Officer:	Karen Carrion

President: William Julius Wilson

The Consortium of Social Science Associations represents more than 185,000 American scientists across the full range of the social and behavioral sciences, functioning as a bridge between the research world and the Washington community. Update is published fortnightly. Individual subscriptions are available from COSSA for \$60; institutional subscriptions, \$120, overseas mail, \$120. ISSN 0749-4394. Address all inquiries to COSSA, 1522 K Street, NW, Suite 836, Washington, D.C. 20005. Phone: (202) 842-3525, Fax: (202) 842-2788

4) to produce the finest scientists and engineers for the twenty-first century; and

5) to raise the scientific and technological literacy of all Americans.

Achieving the Nation's Science Goals

To achieve these goals, Gibbons pledged that the administration would:

- ◆ In the short-term: leverage existing resources; emphasize peer-reviewed, competitively awarded research in fundamental science; R&D conducted at colleges and universities, and human resources development.
- ◆ Work with Congress to find mechanisms for long-term, multi-year authorization and budgeting commitments for large projects.
- ◆ Develop a human resources policy for sustaining excellence and promoting diversity in the science and technology workforce. Encourage full participation of all Americans in scientific investment and its awards.
- ◆ Utilize the National Science and Technology Council (NSTC) to foster, prioritize, and coordinate major cross-agency fundamental research and education initiatives coupled to national goals.
- ◆ Work with the private sector to revitalize university infrastructure, including elimination of the cap on tax-free bonds and the development of a long range multi-agency merit-reviewed facilities program.
- ◆ Emphasize using the federal research enterprise for enriching the full educational curriculum at all levels.
- ◆ Encourage scientists to use their research experiences in support of public understanding of science.

In his presentations, Gibbons noted that the administration's vision for science exists within an environment where deficit reduction is a major factor. Chairman Brown pointed out that the report's stated goal of achieving parity with Japan and Germany in their support for research and development would require an increase of 68 percent in the U.S. R&D budget in the next four years. According to the report, Japan and Germany currently spend 3 percent of GDP on R&D, while the U.S. is at 2.6 percent. Support for basic

research, what the report calls the "venture capital of our national enterprise" is only 0.27 percent of the U.S. GDP.

The SBE Sciences in the Vision

Where are the social, behavioral and economic sciences in this new vision? The Vice President, as he did at the Forum in January, mentioned that we must not forget about the contributions of social science research to national goals, citing criminal justice research as an example. The report includes examples of scientific achievements and a section on "human dimensions" that discusses decision research.

There are other references to the SBE sciences throughout the report, as OSTP sought to include them in the definition of "science." Specifically cited are health prevention research and human dimensions of global environmental change research.

Just as the White House report sought to place federal support for science in a post-Cold War context, the report itself must be placed in a context. The White House outlined a positive, visionary, role for basic research, but did so in a week where policymakers also had their eyes on health care, election year politics, zero-sum spending decisions, and Whitewater hearings to name just a few. It is in this competitive and often chaotic climate that reports sometimes get lost on shelves forever.

CLINTON NAMES THREE SBE SCIENTISTS TO NATIONAL SCIENCE BOARD *HS*

On August 2, President Clinton nominated six distinguished scientists to fill vacancies on the National Science Board (NSB), the policy making oversight panel for the National Science Foundation. Three of the six come from the social, behavioral and economic (SBE) science community. The appointments will triple the number of SBE scientists on the 25 member panel. Economist W. Glenn Campbell, former head of the Hoover Institution, whose term ended in May, was the only SBE scientist on the board the past four years. These appointments also add considerable gender and racial diversity to the NSB.

Those nominated are:

Robert M. Solow, Institute Professor at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Winner of

THE PRESIDENT'S COMMITTEE OF ADVISORS ON SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

Chairs

John H. Gibbons, Asst. to the President for Science and Technology

John A. Young, Former President and CEO, Hewlett-Packard

Members

Norman R. Augustine, Chairman and CEO, Martin Marietta Corporation

Francisco J. Ayala, Professor of Biological Science, Professor of Philosophy, University of California, Irvine

Murray Gell-Mann, Professor, Santa Fe Institute, Professor of Theoretical Physics, California Institute of Technology

David A. Hamburg, President, Carnegie Corp. of New York

John P. Holdren, Professor of Energy, University of California, Berkeley

Diana MacArthur, Chair and CEO, Dynamac Corporation

Shirley M. Malcom, Head, Directorate for Education and Human Resources Programs, American Association for the Advancement of Science

Mario J. Molina, Professor of Environmental Sciences, Massachusetts Institute of Technology

Peter H. Raven, Director, Missouri Botanical Garden, Professor of Botany, Washington University, St. Louis

Sally K. Ride, Director, California Space Institute, Professor of Physics, University of California, San Diego

Charles A. Sanders, Chairman and CEO, Glaxo, Inc.

Phillip A. Sharp, Professor of Biology, Massachusetts Institute of Technology

David E. Shaw, CEO, D.E. Shaw and Co.

Charles M. Vest, President, Mass. Institute of Technology

Virginia V. Weldon, Senior Vice President for Public Policy, Monsanto Company

Lilian Shiao- Yen Wu
Member, Research Staff, Thomas J. Watson Research Center, IBM

the Nobel Prize in Economic Sciences in 1987, Solow currently serves on the NSF's SBE Directorate Advisory Committee. He was a member of the Council of Economic Advisers in the Kennedy Administration and has worked with the Clinton CEA as an unofficial adviser on NAFTA and other issues.

REPORT EXAMINES RESEARCH ON DEMOCRATIZATION

A National Science Foundation working group charged with assessing the state of research on democracy has recently released a report, *Democratization: A Strategic Plan for Global Research on the Transformation and Consolidation of Democracies*, that strongly endorses the development of a major NSF initiative to expand the base of knowledge on this topic. To obtain a copy of the report, contact COSSA at (202) 842-3525.

Claudia Mitchell-Kernan is currently Dean and Vice Chancellor for Graduate Programs at UCLA. An anthropologist, she has directed the Center for Afro-American Studies at UCLA. In addition to her duties as Dean, Kernan also holds a joint appointment in the departments of Anthropology and Psychiatry. Her research has focused on socio-linguistics and Caribbean cultures.

Diana S. Natalicio is the President of the University of Texas at El Paso. A Ph.D. in linguistics, she is also Professor of Languages and Linguistics. She has published many books, monographs and articles in the field of applied linguistics. She is currently vice-chair of the American Association of Higher Education and a member of NSF's advisory committee for its Education and Human Resources Directorate. She was appointed by President Bush to the Commission on Educational Excellence for Hispanic Americans.

Also nominated for the NSB were: **Warren Washington**, director of the Climate and Global Dynamics Division at the National Center for Atmospheric Research; **Eve Menger**, director of Technology Administration for Corning, Inc, and formerly Professor of Chemistry at the University of California; and **John A. White**, Dean of the Engineering at Georgia Tech and former head of NSF's engineering directorate.

The nominations require approval by the Senate, something considered by observers as likely to be routine and occurring in the coming months. Two vacancies remain to be filled.

FY 1995 APPROPRIATIONS UPDATE:

NSF Funding Approved by Senate *H/S*

By a vote of 89-9 the Senate passed the VA, HUD, Independent Agencies appropriations bill on August 4. The bill includes \$3.4 billion for the National Science Foundation (NSF). No changes were made on the Senate floor to the NSF appropriation reported out of committee (see *Update*, July 25). The bill now moves to a House-Senate conference committee to reconcile the Senate's \$3.4 billion for NSF with the House's \$3.1 billion.

DOD University Research and NSEP Rescued by Senate Committee *NS/MD*

The Senate Defense appropriations subcommittee, chaired by Sen. Daniel Inouye (D-HI), restored much of the \$900 million cut rendered by the House for university research supported by the Department of Defense (DOD). The Senate committee cut only \$79 million from the administration's requested level of \$1.8 billion during its markup on July 25. The Senate bill faces floor debate and eventually a House-Senate conference to decide between the different numbers. There is also a question of how much flexibility the DOD will have in reducing the research allocation.

The Senate Subcommittee revived the National Security Education Program (NSEP) by granting it authority to spend \$8.5 million for the program, which supports international exchanges and area studies out of a trust fund of \$150 million. The House stripped NSEP of funding for FY 95. (see *Update*, July 11) The administration had requested \$14.3 million, and while the Senate subcommittee decreased both the request and the current appropriation of \$10 million, approval by the full Senate will keep NSEP alive as the issue moves to a joint House-Senate conference committee.

GAO STUDY BACKS PEER REVIEW BUT SUGGESTS REFORMS *HS*

Like Churchill's comment about democracy being the worst form of government except for all the rest, peer review has been attacked as inefficient, unfair, and ineffective in producing the best research. Yet, a better method to replace the system of selecting recipients of federal research funding has not been devised.

At the request of Sen. John Glenn (D-OH), chairman of the Government Affairs Committee, the General Accounting Office (GAO) has produced another of its periodic studies of the peer review system. This time GAO focused on the National Science Foundation (NSF), National Institutes of Health (NIH), and the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH).

Overall, the GAO finds that "the peer review processes appear to be working reasonably well and are generally supported by peer reviewers." However, it suggests that the agencies need to take a number of corrective measures to make the system work better.

Focusing on the selection of peer reviewers, the GAO rebutted the assertion of some critics, who believe that reviewers were more likely to come from elite institutions than were the applicants. (The list used to rank the institutions was the 1982 report of the National Academy of Sciences, *An Assessment of Research-Doctorate Programs in the United States*.) There appeared to be few differences in region of origin of the reviewers. The report did note that some programs under-utilized women as mail reviewers.

GAO did find a tradeoff between expertise and personal knowledge of the applicant. NSF reviewers showed the most relevant expertise, but were also more likely to know the applicant, but the report said this was not true for NIH.

Examining factors related to scoring proposals, the GAO discovered that variables such as the reviewer's proximity of scholarly interest or knowledge of the literature and the applicant's region, academic rank, or even employing department's prestige did not affect scores at any of the agencies. However, scores were better for men than women at all three agencies, and for whites than minorities at NSF, the only agency to have data on the race of applicants.

Reviewers Unwritten Rules

In the study, it appeared that the applicant's previous publication track record, an unwritten rule used by reviewers, did influence scores. In addition, at both NSF and NEH applicants known to reviewers received higher scores. GAO suggested explanations for these phenomena: 1) experienced, well known white male scholars write better proposals than others; 2) these scholars know the rules and norms for proposal writing better; or 3)

COLUMBIA REJOINS COSSA

COSSA is pleased to announce that Columbia University has rejoined the Consortium as a Contributor. We look forward to again working with the university on issues of common concern.

some bias in the scoring of proposals exists at these agencies.

At the three agencies, there were varying factors related to final funding decisions. At NIH, the review panel's score was the only factor significantly related to whether the grant received funding. At NSF getting a good score appeared more important for little-known researchers, especially those requesting significant amounts of money. At NEH, the odds of funding decreased sharply for proposals with worse scores and higher requested amounts.

Recommendations for all three agencies included: 1) utilize outreach efforts to attract younger reviewers; 2) increase the monitoring of discrimination in scoring, including tests comparing blind to conventional reviews; 3) employ a scoring system in which proposals are rated separately on a number of criteria as well as overall; and 4) where feasible, formalize, or at least inform applicants of the importance of, any unwritten decision rules used by reviewers.

According to the report, NIH should make greater use of subpanels. NIH and NEH should more fully integrate the work of mail reviewers into the panel process, improve evaluation and oversight by retaining data on scores given by individual panelists, and collect data on the race and gender of applicants. NSF should increase the use of panels where possible and more closely monitor the inclusion of women and minorities among external reviewers. Both NSF and NEH should increase efforts to calibrate ratings among reviewers.

As is the custom with GAO reports, the agencies were given the opportunity to respond to the recommendations. NSF strongly disagreed with GAO's conclusion about success rates for women and minorities in obtaining NSF grants and, along with NEH, balked at collecting data on the race and gender of reviewers.

AIDS AND BEHAVIOR REPORT

(continued from page one)

vaccine for HIV/AIDS, a fully effective treatment, cure, vaccine, or other medical intervention appears to be years away. In conjunction with such developments, efforts to prevent the transmission of HIV through the cessation of behaviors that contribute to it must be expanded. This requires a commitment to understanding and intervening in human behavior."

One challenge to comprehending human behavior, according to Mindy Thompson Fullilove, a member of the panel, is "understanding what gets in the way of acting rationally--how do we understand irrationality?" She expressed the need to lessen the burden on the individual. In a briefing statement she said, "While a great deal of attention has been paid to AIDS prevention strategies that help an individual make behavioral changes, very little attention has been paid to strategies that help groups or communities change. People were studied as individuals, but not as members of couples, families, groups, and communities. It is undeniable that these larger units in which people exist control much individual behavior." Consequently, one recommendation of the report is "to examine social and structural factors (such as class, race/ethnicity, gender relations, and community) that increase risk for AIDS, affect progression of disease, and provide points of intervention. This might require research that takes as a unit of analysis the social context and relationship (e.g., dyads, families, communities) in which HIV occurs as opposed to the individual at risk of or who has HIV."

At a public briefing to release the report, Fullilove also discussed the need to understand the depth and breadth of the AIDS epidemic, especially the link between high risk and low risk communities. "We don't know the extent of risk for all people in the U.S. For example, gay men sleep with women, IV drug users have drug free partners, bisexual men sleep with heterosexual women...." The idea that AIDS is a disease of isolated subpopulations, "feeds into our nation's denial of the problem."

The committee stopped short of advocating increased funds for research. "Although more money is always desirable, we are very aware of the changing environment...we recognize the fiscal constraints," stated panel member Richard Price, Professor and Head of the Department of Neurology, University of Minnesota. "We hope this

EDITOR'S NOTE

With Congress expected to adjourn later this month until after Labor Day, this will be the final issue of *Update* for the month of August. We will resume publication with the September 12 issue.

study will be helpful to those setting AIDS research agendas, providing ammunition to focus on neglected areas of research."

Following a twenty-month examination of AIDS research conducted at the three institutes, the panel offered, among others, the following recommendations:

- ◆ a national survey to determine the prevalence and correlates of HIV risk-taking behavior;
- ◆ development or improvement of woman-controlled prevention methods, including female condoms and microbicides, and examine the social and behavioral issues related to their use;
- ◆ studies of high-risk settings, such as "shooting galleries and crack houses," that may contribute to the spread of the epidemic in urban locales;
- ◆ research on AIDS risk behavior change among the seriously mentally ill and others with mental disabilities;
- ◆ research that better integrates theories of gender and culture with models of behavior change;
- ◆ studies on how people with AIDS and their caregivers maintain positive coping strategies in the face of the disease;
- ◆ the Public Health Service coordinate interagency efforts to monitor and respond to concurrent epidemics (such as drug use, violence, and infectious diseases) that will alter the course of the HIV epidemic;
- ◆ basic and applied research on the maintenance of behavior change, including the prevention of relapse;
- ◆ research on the utilization of health resources by people with AIDS; and

♦ research on the role of social, cultural, and structural factors in HIV/AIDS transmission, prevention, and intervention.

The final, bound report will be available at the end of the summer. Copies are available from the National Academy Press, 2101 Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20418. The cost of the report is \$39.95, plus shipping charges. Telephone: (202) 334-3313 or 1-800-624-6242

This is not the first report on AIDS and behavior. Previous reports from the National Academy of Sciences have made similar cases for expanding research in this area. Let us hope the message is getting through.

NIH SEEKS NEW DIRECTOR FOR OBSSR *SP*

As previously reported in the July 25 Update, the National Institutes of Health is currently accepting applications for the position of Associate Director for Behavioral and Social Sciences Research, Office of the Director. The candidate filling this position will also serve as Director of the new Office of Behavioral and Social Science Research (OBSSR). Applications must be postmarked no later than October 17, 1994.

According to the NIH personnel office, the Director of the OBSSR will be responsible for "1) providing advice and counsel to the NIH Director; 2) providing leadership and direction in the development, refinement, and implementation of a trans-NIH plan to increase the scope and support of behavioral and social sciences research; 3) developing initiatives designed to stimulate the behavioral and social sciences arena and integrate a biobehavioral perspective across the research areas of the NIH; 4) establishing and maintaining organizational linkages on NIH behavioral and social science issues across the DHHS, other Federal agencies, academic institutions and health organizations to ensure research findings are disseminated to the public; and 5) establishing and overseeing a program advisory committee on behavioral and social sciences."

The position may be filled through 1) a Civil Service appointment in the Senior Executive Service (SES), 2) a leave of absence from a university or state or local government agency to serve on an Intergovernmental Personnel Act (IPA) assignment, or 3) an appointment to serve as a Special Expert.

For further information regarding qualifications and application procedures, contact NIH, Office of the Director Personnel Office at (301) 496-2400.

SOURCES OF RESEARCH SUPPORT: DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION *KC*

COSSA provides this information as a service and encourages readers to contact the agency for further information or application materials. Additional application guidelines and restrictions may apply.

International Research and Studies Program

The purpose of this program is to provide grants to conduct research and studies to improve and strengthen instruction in modern foreign languages, area studies, and other international fields to provide full understanding of the places in which the foreign languages are commonly used.

Priorities:

♦ Studies and surveys to determine needs for increased or improved instruction in foreign language, area studies, or other international fields, including the demand for foreign language, area, and international specialists in government, education, and the private sector.

♦ Studies and surveys to assess the use of graduates of programs supported under title VI of the Higher Education Act, as amended, by governmental educational, and private sector organizations; and other studies assessing the outcomes and effectiveness of programs supported under title VI.

For Applications and Information Contact: Jose L. Martinez, (202) 732-6072.

Applications Available: September 2, 1994; **Application Deadline:** November 4, 1994

Estimated Range of awards: \$30,000 - 140,000 each, for approximately 15 awards.

MEMBERS

American Anthropological Association
American Economic Association
American Historical Association
American Political Science Association

American Psychological Association
American Society of Criminology
American Sociological Association
American Statistical Association

Association of American Geographers
Association of American Law Schools
Law and Society Association
Linguistic Society of America

AFFILIATES

American Agricultural Economics Association
American Assembly of Collegiate Schools of Business
American Association for Public Opinion Research
American Council on Consumer Interests
American Educational Research Association
Association for Asian Studies
Association for Public Policy
Analysis and Management
Association of Research Libraries
Eastern Sociological Society

History of Science Society
International Studies Association
Midwest Sociological Society
National Council on Family Relations
North American Regional Science Council
North Central Sociological Association
Operations Research Society of America
Population Association of America
Rural Sociological Society
Society for Research on Adolescence

Society for Research in Child Development
Society for the Advancement of
Socio-Economics
Society for the Scientific Study of Religion
Society for the Scientific Study of Sex
Southern Sociological Society
Southwestern Social Science Association
Speech Communication Association
The Institute for Management Sciences

CONTRIBUTORS

American Council of Learned Societies
American University
University of Arizona
Arizona State University
Brookings Institution
University of California, Berkeley
University of California, Los Angeles
University of California, San Diego
University of California, Santa Barbara
Carnegie-Mellon University
Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences
University of Chicago
Clark University
University of Colorado
Columbia University
Cornell Institute for Social and Economic Research
Cornell University
Criminal Justice Center, Sam Houston State University
Duke University
Emory University
University of Georgia
Harvard University

University of Illinois
Indiana University
Institute for Social Research, University of
Michigan
Institute for Women's Policy Research
University of Iowa
Johns Hopkins University
Kansas State University
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public
Affairs, Syracuse University
University of Michigan
Michigan State University
University of Minnesota
National Bureau of Economic Research
National Opinion Research Center
University of Nebraska
Nelson Rockefeller Institute of Government
New York University
University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill
North Carolina State University

Northwestern University
Ohio State University
University of Oregon
Pennsylvania State University
University of Pittsburgh
Princeton University
Purdue University
University of Rhode Island
Social Science Research Council
University of Southern California
State University of New York, Stony Brook
Temple University
University of Tennessee
University of Texas, Austin
Texas A & M University
Tulane University
University of Washington
University of Wisconsin, Madison
University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee
Yale University

Consortium of Social Science Associations

1522 K Street, NW, Suite 836, Washington, DC 20005
