

**NSF PROPOSES NEW REVIEW PROCESS: IMPACT ON SOCIETY NOW IMPORTANT** *KS*

The National Science Foundation has proposed changing the criteria for its review of nearly 30,000 proposals that it receives seeking funding for scientific research and education projects. The new criteria have been promulgated by a Merit Review Task Force. NSF now seeks comment from the science community on the recommendations. The National Science Board will discuss the responses at its Spring meeting. Final action and implementation of the new criteria will come, most likely in the Fall of 1997. Comments are due by January 31, 1997. The full explanation of the criteria can be found at <http://www.nsf.gov>.

The Task Force's recommendations stem from an attempt to bring the 15-year-old criteria into line with the 1994 NSF strategic plan. The Task Force was also charged with simplifying and clarifying the rules for the reviewers. The new criteria ask reviewers to consider two broad questions:

1) What is the intellectual merit and quality of the proposed activity? and 2) What are the broader impacts of the proposed activity?

The old rules asked reviewers to evaluate proposals based on: 1) research performance and competence; 2) intrinsic merit of the research; 3) utility or relevance of the research; and 4) effect of the research on the infrastructure of science and engineering. NSF claims that these old criteria do not encompass such non-research areas as education, and do not align with the strategic plan, particularly its emphasis on knowledge in service to society. In addition, it found that the criteria were not applied uniformly, with reviewers finding it difficult to evaluate utility and impact on infrastructure.

Within each of the two broad new assessment rules, NSF provides "suggested questions," that may be considered by reviewers. Under the "Intellectual Merit and Quality" criteria are these further questions: 1) What is the likelihood that the project will significantly advance the knowledge base within

and/or across different fields? 2) Does the proposed activity suggest and explore new lines of inquiry? 3) To what degree does the proposer's documented expertise and record of achievement increase the probability of success? 4) Is the project conceptually well designed? 5) Is the plan for organizing and managing the project credible and well received? 6) Is there sufficient access to resources?

For the "Broader Impacts of the Proposed Activity" criteria, reviewers could consider the following in assessing the proposal: 1) How well does the activity advance discovery and understanding while concurrently promoting teaching, training, and learning? 2) Will it create/enhance facilities, instrumentation, information bases, networks, partnerships, and/or other infrastructure? 3) How well does the activity broaden the diversity of participants? 4) Does the activity enhance scientific and technological literacy? 4) What is the potential impact on meeting societal needs?

*(continued on next page)*

**EDITOR'S NOTE**

*This is a special year-end double issue of Update. Coinciding with the fifteenth anniversary of COSSA, we feature a special section offering a fifteen-year budgetary perspective for agencies supporting social and behavioral science.*

*The next issue of Update will appear in mid-January. Happy Holidays!*

**Also Inside Update...**

- ▶ Panel Says Price Index Overstates Inflation
- ▶ Election Dust Settles: Close Races Final, Committee Heads Chosen
- ▶ Wilson Lauds Federal Role in Crime Research
- ▶ NIMH Prevention Research Report Released
- ▶ Sources of Research Support: National Science Foundation

At the press conference announcing the recommendations, NSF Director Neal Lane emphasized that these questions are both non-inclusive and non-exhaustive and will not apply to every proposal. There is also no predetermined weighting of the two criteria.

Yet, as NSF faces potential no-or-very-small growth budgets, an emphasis on the broader impacts criteria seems politic. This second criterion clearly focuses on integrating research and education, boosting partnerships, infrastructure, diversity, scientific literacy, and perhaps most importantly, societal needs. As NSF fights for its share of a non-growth budget, attention to these areas could certainly win it points with decision-makers and appropriators. The National Science Board recognized that NSF must make science serve society in promulgating the new strategic plan. The proposed new review criteria seeks to extend that notion to NSF's most important function, assessing and funding science and education projects.

## PANEL SAYS PRICE INDEX OVERESTIMATES INFLATION <sup>MB</sup>

An independent panel of five leading economists has concluded that the Consumer Price Index (CPI) is overstated by approximately 1.1 percent and called for Congress and the President to work toward a more accurate measure. The study has sweeping

implications; at a minimum it challenges assertions of economic change over the last several decades, and if implemented, the panel's recommendation would scale back growth of federal benefits such as Social Security.

The report is the product of a five-member panel, the Advisory Commission to Study the Consumer Price Index, chaired by Michael Boskin, former Chairman of the Council on Economic Advisers under President Bush and now Professor of Economics and Senior Fellow at the Hoover Institution, Stanford University. The panel was commissioned in 1995 by the Senate Finance Committee.

By following the prices of a "market basket" of items that is thought to reflect a typical consumer, the CPI measures inflation and is the basis for a large number of public and private sector decisions. The CPI has come under attack in recent years for overestimating the amount of inflation in the U.S. economy, though there is disagreement on the magnitude of miscalculation. Revising the measure so that it rises more slowly would, on one hand, reduce the budget deficit, however it would also raise political red flags through reigning in the growth of federal benefits, particularly Social Security.

The study found several types of bias in the CPI: substitution, quality change, and new product. It noted that the "flexible and dynamic" nature of an economy where new products and technologies are being introduced rapidly makes constructing an accurate cost of living index difficult.

### Advice to the Economic Profession

Addressing economists and statisticians, the Boskin commission said: "These professions should treat training in data collection, data analysis, and interpretation more seriously and give it more space and attention in the standard curriculum. There should be more emphasis on measurement and sampling issues in the training of economists and statisticians. Effort should also be put into improving the ties between professionals in government and their academic and business colleagues. The academic world needs to be cognizant of the important work done by its colleagues in government who provide them with much of the "raw material" for their subsequent analyses and show more appreciation of

#### CONSORTIUM OF SOCIAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATIONS

Executive Director:	Howard J. Silver
Public Affairs:	Michael Buckley
Government Affairs:	Angela L. Sharpe
Administrative Officer:	Karen Carrion

President:	Charles Schultze
------------	------------------

The Consortium of Social Science Associations (COSSA), an advocacy organization for federal support for the social and behavioral sciences, was founded in 1981 and stands alone in Washington in representing the full range of social and behavioral scientists. *Update* is published 22 times per year. Individual subscriptions are available from COSSA for \$65; institutional subscriptions, \$130, overseas mail, \$130. 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.

their efforts and understanding of the constraints under which they are laboring.”

Among the panel's other recommendations:

- ▶ Enactment of legislation allowing the Departments of Commerce and Labor to share data to more accurately and efficiently collect economic statistics;
- ▶ Creation by Congress of a permanent, rotating independent commission of experts to review progress in improving economic statistics;
- ▶ Establishment of an advisory panel to bring “outside information, expertise, and research results” to BLS. The report suggested several organizations who could take leadership roles: the American Economic Association, the National Bureau of Economic Research, and the National Academy of Sciences.

In addition to Boskin, the panel included: Ellen Dulberger, Director of Marketing Strategy, IBM Personal Computer Company; Robert J. Gordon, Chairman, Department of Economics, Northwestern University; Zvi Griliches, Professor of Economics, Harvard University; and Dale Jorgenson, Chairman, Department of Economics, Harvard University. With the exception of Dulberger, the National Science Foundation has supported many of the research efforts of the panel members.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS), the agency with responsibility for the CPI, acknowledges that the current CPI is misleading, but by a smaller extent than the 1.1 percent cited by the Boskin panel. BLS is in the middle of a six-year program of CPI technological and methodological improvement.

The panel's recommendations are non-binding, and both the administration and congressional leaders have kept an arm's distance from endorsing them. There appears to be a consensus that something should be done, however the political dynamics of altering federal benefit programs such as Social Security loom large over the newly-issued report. In the heated, protracted debates that are likely to occur in the coming years over the budget deficit and the size and scope of entitlements, revisions to the CPI are likely to be on the agenda. What remains to be seen is

whether the accurate and independent collection of federal economic statistics will remain intact as policy makers grapple with issues of federal spending.

## **ELECTION DUST SETTLES: CLOSE RACES FINAL; COMMITTEE HEADS CHOSEN**

With the runoffs in Texas over, the final lineup for the House of Representatives in the 105th Congress will be 227 Republicans, 207 Democrats and 1 Independent. This may change if President Clinton chooses House members for positions in the administration's second-term lineup. The leaders of both parties were easily reelected. Rep. Newt Gingrich (R-GA), returns as Speaker. Texas Republicans Richard Armey and Tom DeLay will once again be Majority Leader and Majority Whip. On the Democratic side, Rep. Richard Gephardt (D-MO) and Rep. David Bonior (D-MI), return as Minority Leader and Whip.

Psychologist Bruce Baird of Washington, ahead after election night, wound up losing to incumbent Linda Smith (R-WA). Rep. George Brown (D-CA) survived another tight race and will resume his role as chief Democratic spokesperson for science. Political scientist David Price (D-NC) returns to the House after a two-year hiatus and resumes his seat on the appropriations committee. Rep. James Sensenbrenner (R-WI) will take over as chairman of the House Science Committee. Rep. Ernest Istook (R-OK) was denied a House appropriations subcommittee chairmanship, as he was passed over in favor of Rep. James Kolbe (R-AZ) as head of the Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government Subcommittee. Rep. Henry Waxman (R-CA), a strong supporter of the National Institutes of Health, gives up his position as ranking Democrat on the Health and Environment Subcommittee to become Ranking Democrat on the House Government Reform Committee, where he will square off with the new chairman Rep. Dan Burton (R-IN).

In the Senate, the partisan division will be 55 Republicans and 45 Democrats. Sen Trent Lott (R-MS) will lead the enlarged Republican Majority, with Sen. Don Nickles (R-OK) as his key deputy. Sen. Tom Daschle (D-SD) begins his second Congress as Minority Leader with Sen. Wendell Ford (D-KY) as

the Democratic Whip. Sen. Ted Stevens (R-AK) becomes chair of the Senate Appropriations Committee. Three members of the appropriations committee shifted to the Senate Finance Committee, Sens. Connie Mack (R-FL), James Jeffords (R-VT), and Bob Kerrey (D-NE). New members of appropriations are: Sens. Larry Craig (R-ID), Lauch Faircloth (R-NC), Kay Bailey Hutchison (R-TX), Byron Dorgan (D-ND), and Barbara Boxer (D-CA). Jeffords will chair the Labor and Human Resources Committee. Sen. John McCain (R-AZ) will take over the Commerce, Science and Transportation committee, while Sen. Fred Thompson will head the Governmental Affairs Committee.

## **WILSON LAUDS FEDERAL ROLE IN CRIME RESEARCH** NB

When James Q. Wilson was asked to give a speech on what -- if anything -- should the federal government do about crime, he had one answer: research.

Wilson, a political scientist and leading expert on crime and criminal justice policy, is a Professor of Management at UCLA, and was brought to Washington by the National Institute of Justice (NIJ) to answer this question before a gathering of over 250 crime policy leaders and practitioners. With Wilson's December 10 address, NIJ launched a series of breakfast seminars to foster policy questions in the area of crime and criminal justice.

According to Wilson, "Practically, Washington must pretend it can do a lot about crime. Practically it can do very little . . . this small tail will not shake this very large dog." While Congress in recent years has dramatically expanded the number of crimes made into federal offenses, a large and centralized national police force would give few people any comfort, he said. "Most offenders commit crimes in or near their back yards, creating local and not national problems," he commented. While legislation has begun to place 100,000 new police officers on the streets, Wilson said that this well-needed effort will not be truly effective because every state and congressional district wants a share. Crime is so disproportionately concentrated in the fourteen largest cities that "these places could use all one hundred thousand officers by themselves. Yet many of the officers go to small towns."

Beyond international and interstate crimes, for Washington "the key role ought to be to do the one thing local authorities cannot and will not do on their own. That is to design and test new crime control strategies." Beyond financial constraints he said that cities and states will not do this for, if a program is shown to work, they would be providing a free good to other jurisdictions, and if it were to be found ineffective, it would be an embarrassment. Saying "no good idea will be adequately tested by someone who has a patent on it," Wilson said that practitioners lack the objectivity, technical skills and longtime horizon. The inability of cities and states to support research and development also extends, with a few exceptions, to private foundations, he said, commenting that "foundations support causes, not evaluations."

"When I speak of a federal R&D effort . . . I am not talking about pure or academic research. There is a need for that, too, but it often does get funded by federal research entities such as the National Science Foundation and the various national institutes of health. I am speaking of the real-world testing of ideas."

### **Comparison to Health Research**

"While I am committed to a federal demonstration role, I am aware of how hard it will be to get meaningful results. People sometimes compare the low level of funding for crime or violence research with the high level of funding of such funding for cancer, stroke, or AIDS. But this is not simply the result of unequal interest groups besieging Congress. Doctors, in fact, tend to do better work than criminologists. And for good reason: the doctors are more likely to learn useful things and put them into practice than are the criminal justice researchers. Health research often leads down many blind alleys, but treatments and even cures often emerge, and when they emerge they enter into a well-organized market of eager producers and consumers."

Wilson cited a number of popular ideas that have emerged over the years in criminal justice -- the latest being community policing -- and that these "may have produced some gains, but by and large the research that has been done supports very few of them, and none as any kind of cure for crime." Despite these

*(continued on page nine)*

## SELECTED FEDERAL AGENCIES SINCE 1981: HIGHLIGHTS #5

Since 1981, the Consortium of Social Science Associations (COSSA) has advocated for increased federal funding for social and behavioral science research. In the following pages, we look back at the past 15 years of budgetary and non-budgetary activity in a select number of federal agencies. During this period three presidents have proposed budgets and negotiated with Congress: Ronald Reagan, George Bush and Bill Clinton. Driving much of budgetary policy were enormous deficits that ballooned during the Reagan-Bush years and began a descent during the Clinton presidency.

COSSA became an advocacy group in the first years of the Reagan administration when direct budgetary threats to federal support for social and behavioral science were part of that administration's strategy for defunding programs it did not like. Once that direct threat was confronted and dealt with, budgets in some places began to rebound. The second Reagan administration saw budgetary constraints imposed by Gramm-Rudman-Hollings in 1985 and a budget deal limiting spending following the stock market collapse in 1987. Other budget deals followed in 1990, when Bush broke his no new taxes pledge, and in 1993 when Congress passed Clinton's budget reduction plan by one vote in each House of Congress. In 1995, confrontation between the Republican Congress and the Clinton White House led to a partial shut down of the federal government. Another deal sent federal employees back to work and provided some of the agencies their FY 1996 appropriations five months late. Each of these agreements placed limits on discretionary spending, making it difficult to provide major increases. Now there is talk of another agreement that will finally get us to the holy grail of the balanced budget.

What follows is a look at some selected agencies that fund social and behavioral science research. The chart provides the numbers. They are in current dollars in the year given. Some lines are not directly comparable because of changes in account definitions. These figures should not be taken as definitive, but we believe they are useful for examining trends and assessing growth or, in some cases, non-growth.

**National Science Foundation:** The key event in the past 15 years for the social and behavioral sciences at the National Science Foundation (NSF) was the

creation of the directorate for Social, Behavioral and Economic Sciences in 1991. Despite attempts to eliminate it during the past two years, it survives. The SBE directorate has given these disciplines a place at NSF management meetings, and a base from which to pursue initiatives and increased funding. It has also provided a spokesperson for these disciplines internally to the Foundation and externally on Capitol Hill and with the science community.

The early years were dominated by the struggle to mitigate the funding cuts imposed by the Reagan administration in FY 1982. During the Erich Bloch directorship (1984-90), the Foundation became a favorite. The administration proposed doubling NSF's budget, although the time frame kept shifting. Unfortunately, Congress, in the appropriations process, generally reduced the double digit increases proposed by the White House during these years. Often, NSF competed with housing and environmental programs that the Democrats in Congress wished to save from Reagan administration cuts or elimination. During the Bush years NSF continued to grow significantly, especially as Congress tripled the science education account, restoring it from its almost complete elimination in FY 1982 and 1983. During President Clinton's first two years, he continued to propose double digit increases for NSF. In the past two years his proposals have not been that generous.

The social and behavioral sciences did well in the mid and late 1980s, as they were carried along in the increases for the entire agency. In addition, initiatives such as the Human Dimensions of Global Change, helped increase budgets, particularly after 1989, when the Bush administration recognized the economic dimension. In the past four years, congressional prodding on human capital, violence research, environmental research, and global change, has also enhanced funding.

**National Institutes of Health:** With strong support from champions on Capitol Hill such as Lowell Weicker, Joe Early, Mark Hatfield, and John Porter, NIH has done remarkably well in the past 15 years. In addition, the major national effort to cope with the AIDS pandemic and the major project to map the human genome have led to significant funding increases. Individual institute budgets have been helped by specific circumstances. Coping with

Alzheimer's and an increasingly older population have led to increases for the National Institute on Aging. The National Institute on Child Health and Development has benefitted from increased attention to pediatric AIDS, and other concerns with children's development. The major increases from the 1980s have slowed considerably during the past two years, but still remain ahead of almost any other federal agency in the current constrained climate.

For the social and behavioral sciences, the establishment of the Office of Behavioral and Social Science Research in 1993 gave new visibility and vitality to these oft-poor relations in this major biomedical research agency. Increased recognition of the relationship between health and social/behavioral factors have also led to greater support for these disciplines. In 1992 the Alcohol, Drug Abuse and Mental Administration was abolished and the three research agencies absorbed into NIH. The National Institute on Drug Abuse has seen its budget skyrocket from its inclusion in a number of the anti-drug initiatives of all the administrations, and from AIDS research support. The National Institute of Mental Health and the National Institute on Alcoholism and Alcohol Abuse also saw significant increases, fostered by a concern with schizophrenia research and the search for a biological cause of alcoholism. In these years, Nursing Research, another component of the social and behavioral portfolio at NIH was elevated from a center to an Institute.

*Centers for Disease Control:* Major increases come from more than one-half million dollars budgeted for AIDS research and prevention. In addition, there has been a growing interest in violence as a health problem.

*Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation:* This policy research arm of the Department of Health and Human Services has seen its budget cut significantly from the days when it was consistently above \$20 million in the 1970s and when long term studies, including randomized experiments were part of its portfolio. Although it played a role in providing the department with research support for the Clinton administration's efforts in health and welfare reform, significant budget increases did not occur.

In 1984, the Grace Commission recommended eliminating ASPE and spreading its research support across the other agencies in the Department. That did not happen. By contrast, in 1995, the Republican

Congress suggested ASPE should conduct all the policy related research and eliminated funding for such research in the other parts of the Department. It did not, however, give APSE the requisite funds to compensate. The large increase for FY 1997 is artificial; More than half of the funds will be allocated to the General Accounting Office for a study of medical savings accounts.

*Department of Agriculture:* A 1989 report from the National Research Council, *Investing in Research*, called for a \$500 million competitive grants program that would shift the research emphasis at USDA. Beginning in 1990, the National Research Initiative competitive grants program provided significant increases for peer reviewed research at USDA, including the social science component, Markets, Trade and Policy. However, Congress is not ready to give up its prerogative to fund Special Grants for its constituents. Skepticism of peer review and budgetary constraints have limited the growth of the NRI in the past few years.

The Economics Research Service profited from initiatives in the Bush White House under Council of Economics Adviser Chairman Michael Boskin to improve economics statistics and to support research on the economic aspects of global change. The Clinton administration in its first year sought a major cut, suggesting ERS was guilty of "duplication" of other USDA research efforts. Congress rejected the major reduction, but in the new budgetary climate, ERS has suffered reductions nonetheless.

*Department of Commerce:* The Census Bureau continues to be the whipping boy for those believe they cannot conduct an accurate count without breaking the bank. Both the 1980 and 1990 Censuses faced criticism. Nevertheless, the non-decennial census part of this agency's budget has crept up over the years. Again, the economic statistics initiative helped somewhat during the Bush years. The Bureau of Economic Analysis was also helped by the same initiative during those years.

*Department of Education:* The Reagan administration campaigned to abolish the Department. However, the 1983 report, *A Nation at Risk*, provided then Secretary Terrell Bell the opportunity to campaign for education reform. This did not have any significant impact on budgets for research and statistics, however. In the early 1980s, the National Institute of Education had gained a reputation among

conservatives for politicization on the liberal side. The Reagan administration completed this negative view of NIE by trying to politicize its agenda from the conservative side. This only made NIE a pariah on the Hill, as the research it supported was viewed with suspicion by all sides. Statistics received a slight boost in the later Reagan years to begin some longitudinal work.

Following the education summit in 1989 and the development of the National Education Goals, both research and statistics began to become important assessors of school reform and student performance. With the reorganization of the Office of Educational Research and Improvement (the successor to NIE) in 1994, research and improvement gained a more solid grounding and reputation as it rode the wave of spending on education reform. Although mainly focused on supporting national research centers and regional laboratories, OERI's budget for Field Initiated Studies, long mired below \$1 million, climbed to \$8.8 million in 1996.

For four straight years the Reagan administration tried to eliminate federal support for international education programs. Congress rejected it each time. The Bush administration then recognized the importance of international training and the budgets of these programs began to climb. Despite a cutback in FY 1996, the programs made a nice budgetary recovery in FY 1997.

***Department of Housing and Urban Development:*** Budgets for policy research at HUD surpassed \$40 million in the late 1970s as housing and urban research remained subjects for the federal government's research agenda. That ended with the Reagan administration. When Jack Kemp became HUD Secretary in 1989, the Department was in the midst of recovering from a series of scandals. Kemp proposed to use the Office of Policy Development and Research as the agency that would help clean up the Department by monitoring and evaluating its programs. He proposed a \$25 million increase for these purposes. Congress did not grant such a large increase, but more recently it has provided greater funds for the Office to continue the Annual Housing Survey, conduct evaluations, and provide seed money for research on developing a new urban agenda.

***Department of Justice:*** Although crime has always been a major issue for all three administrations, spending on research and statistics has not been a priority until very recently. In the late 1970s the

predecessor of the National Institute of Justice had a budget of over \$30 million. It took until FY 1997 to reach that figure again. Most of the recent increases have gone into developing technological answers to crime problems. However, after the 1994 and 1996 crime acts, NIJ has been the recipient of set-aside funding (not reflected in the figure in the chart) for research and demonstrations that has brought its total budget to almost \$100 million. The Bureau of Justice Statistics has also benefitted from set-aside funds from the Brady Bill and the crime acts that make its actual budget significantly larger than the annual appropriated funds reflected in the chart.

***Department of Labor:*** The Bureau of Labor Statistics has seen its budget increase significantly over the years. In the 1980s it received funds to study revising the Consumer Price Index and to redefine the Current Population Survey. It also absorbed the National Longitudinal Survey of Labor Market Experiences from the Employment and Training Administration. In the 1990s it is once again studying the CPI. Research at the rest of DOL has suffered these past 15 years. A once thriving ETA research program has deteriorated into support for evaluations of the Job Corps and what is left of the Job Training Partnership Act, plus some efforts to replace the Dictionary of Occupational Titles with an electronic Occupational Informational Network (O\*NET).

***National Endowment for the Humanities:*** Linked in Congressional minds to the National Endowment for the Arts, the NEH is threatened with extinction during the next two years. Its budget, which grew steadily until 1993, stagnated during the first two years of the Clinton administration and then was decimated by the Republican controlled Congress during the past two years.

***United States Information Agency:*** In the early 1980s, Sen. Claiborne Pell of Rhode Island placed a provision in the USIA authorization to double the budget of educational and cultural exchange programs by 1986. Working with then director Charles Wick, a favorite of the Reagan White House, Pell saw his efforts realized. In the Bush years an influx of funds for programs with the newly independent states further increased these budgets. The Clinton administration began to cut back the agency and the Republican Congress exacerbated the process during the past two years, so that these programs have lost almost 25 percent of their funds since FY 1993.

## A FIFTEEN-YEAR BUDGETARY PERSPECTIVE FOR AGENCIES THAT SUPPORT SOCIAL AND BEHAVIORAL SCIENCE RESEARCH

(all figures in millions of current dollars)

Agency	FY 1982	FY 1985	FY 1989	FY 1993	FY 1997
<b>National Science Foundation</b>					
Total	<1,000.0	1,507.0	1,923.0	2,750.0	3,270.0
Research and Related Activities	<1,000.0	1,311.0	1,621.0	2,046.0	2,432.0
Social and Behavioral Science Research	29.2	46.8	62.0	65.6	90.0 est.
Education and Human Resources	20.9	82.0	171.0	505.0	619.0
<b>Dept. of Health and Human Services</b>					
Total NIH	4,018.5	5,497.0	7,893.6	10,328.1	12,747.2
Nat. Inst. of Child Health and Human Development	226.3	312.6	425.3	527.8	631.7
Nat. Inst. on Aging	81.9	143.0	222.6	399.5	486.0
Nat. Inst. on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism	35.5	61.7	120.1	176.4	212.0
Nat. Inst. on Drug Abuse	57.2	81.1	228.1	404.2	489.4
Nat. Inst. of Mental Health	230.6	232.7	389.9	582.9	701.6
Centers for Disease Control	299.4	410.5	977.2	1,662.6	2,262.0
Asst. Secy. for Planning and Evaluation	13.2	9.7	7.9	8.0	18.5
<b>Department of Agriculture</b>					
Competitive Grants	16.3	46.0	39.7	97.5	94.2
Economic Research Service	39.3	47.1	49.3	58.9	53.1
<b>Dept. of Commerce/Census Bureau</b>					
Census Salaries and Expenses	57.2	84.8	96.0	126.7	135.0
Bureau of Economic Analysis	18.0	21.8	24.6	40.7	45.9
<b>Department of Education</b>					
Education Research	53.1	51.2	47.1	74.0	123.8
Education Statistics	8.5	8.7	21.7	48.6	50.0
International Programs	24.0	32.1	31.1	55.1	59.8
<b>Dept. of Housing and Urban Development</b>					
Policy Development and Research	21.3	16.9	17.2	23.3	34.0
<b>Department of Justice</b>					
National Institute of Justice	14.7	20.3	21.0	23.0	31.4
Bureau of Justice Statistics	16.2	16.6	20.0	21.4	21.4
<b>Department of Labor</b>					
Bureau of Labor Statistics	103.9	152.9	188.1	275.1	309.7
<b>Natl. Endowment for the Humanities</b>					
	130.6	139.5	153.0	179.1	110.0
<b>U.S. Information Agency</b>					
Educational and Cultural Exchanges	60.0	143.8	150.0	242.3	185.0

## WILSON ON CRIME RESEARCH

(continued from page four)

reservations, he said that "the federal R&D role is the right one. We have . . . learned about a lot things that don't work, and we wouldn't have done that if somebody had not been doing an evaluation."

### Take Research out of Justice Department

Wilson posed two questions: where should this R&D be sponsored, and what should it study? "As to the first," Wilson reiterated a notion he has had for many years, "It should not be done in the United States Department of Justice. It never should have been done there. Today we have an excellent NIJ director and there have been a few good ones before him," but DOJ is "an organization of lawyers," and one where historically empirical science has not fared well. Wilson said that NIJ should "be part of a federally supported scientific community where its work will build on scientific alliances and in an atmosphere of rigorous analysis. I leave it to Washington insiders to select that spot."

To ensure that quality research and evaluation is conducted, he proposed a set-aside mandate in all crime control legislation. Such a set-aside has been advocated by COSSA and included in some, but not all, crime legislation. The Justice Department, through administrative action, has supported research in this manner, but that could be erased in later administrations.

Regarding the topics such a research endeavor should pursue, Wilson said it would be difficult to prescribe in advance, but said that juvenile crime particularly concerns him. He cited data indicating a rise in juvenile crime and a decline in adult crime that suggest that "our society has somehow lost control of child development." He said there are vast research gaps and policy inconsistencies as to the causes and prevention of juvenile crime, and how the justice system should treat young offenders. He said the new welfare reform bill's call for teenage mothers to live with either their parents or in a alternative adult supervisory setting provides an excellent research and evaluation opportunity in the area of child development.

Wilson also expressed regret that there has been a "significant degree of suppression" of research on the

relationship of biological factors and crime. This suppression results, he said, from "an intimidating drive by a small amount of people" to silence or not fund such studies.

Concluding his address, Wilson commented that "the hardest task is not to create the agencies, encourage the practitioner links, or design the research. The core problem, for which I have no good ideas, is to persuade a Member of Congress that he can persuade his constituents that he has 'done something' about crime by spending on program evaluation. Since people believe they know what should be done about crime . . . it is next to impossible to persuade them that in fact they don't know and ought to find out."

NIJ intends to widely disseminate Wilson's remarks in 1997. The University of Maryland's Peter Reuter will continue the series on February 11.

## NIMH PREVENTION RESEARCH PLAN RELEASED

According to a recently released prevention research plan by the National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH), *A Plan for Prevention Research for the National Institute of Mental Health*, "a viable scientific agenda for the prevention of the first onset of mental disorders must rest upon a knowledge base of research in the core sciences that is aimed at understanding the development of mental disorders." The report "constitutes a national agenda for research efforts aimed at the prevention of the full spectrum of mental disorders and represents the culmination of more than five years of scientific investigation and review."

The Plan summarizes and combines two "landmark reports," the 1993 National Institutes of Mental Health Report, *The Prevention of Mental Disorders: A National Research Agenda* and the 1994 Institute of Medicine Report (IOM), *Reducing Risks for Mental Disorders: Frontiers for Preventive Intervention Research* into a single comprehensive document. Both reports form "the basis for the present integrative summary of the scientific and programmatic steps NIMH should take for advancing the field of prevention science." The combined recommendations in the present report developed a National Plan in three broad areas.

**SUPPORT OF PREVENTION RESEARCH IN MENTAL HEALTH** --It is only recently that the complex interactions of social and biological risk and protective factors have "been fruitfully investigated," although studies of these domains have long histories. In the area of research, the report "recommends support for research on potentially modifiable biological and psychosocial risk and protective factors, support for preventive intervention research aimed at the goal of risk reduction for mental disorders, and stimulation of scientific collaboration to enhance and disseminate scientific methodologies for prevention research in mental health." The report notes that "integrative research is essential to understanding and preventing mental disorders." The report further notes that the "boundaries between the behavioral and biological sciences should not be viewed as rigid and distinct . . . Behavior contributes to the organization of the biological process, and vice-versa."

**SUPPORT FOR THE TRAINING OF PREVENTION SCIENTISTS** - According to the report "[p]revention research training is a keystone for future scientific development in the prevention field." The report stresses that by the year 1999, NIMH should greatly increase its funding for "a wide array of training grants in prevention research such as institutional prevention research training grants, research scientist awards, prevention research consortia, predoctoral and postdoctoral minority fellows and outreach to minority students." It emphasizes that "significant effort" should be employed to increase the participation of scientists "from a wide spectrum of disciplines to ensure adequate attention to all aspects of the human condition that contribute to risk to mental illness" -- aspects that include biological, social, and behavioral factors, as well as their contexts. "Consequently, training in this area should acknowledge and emphasize the importance of interdisciplinary models for collaboration among the scientists to be trained," says the plan.

**SUPPORT FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF ORGANIZATIONAL AND POLICY INFRASTRUCTURE FOR THE FIELD** - The report recommends "changes in NIMH organizational structure to more effectively guide and coordinate prevention research." These changes, says the report, "are essential for the support of prevention research and for the application of this research, in the field, to the reduction of risk for mental disorders and the

promotion of mental health." Recommendations for changes in the structure of NIMH itself include:

- strengthening the role and the office of the Associate Director for Prevention Research;
- increasing collaborative efforts within NIMH in prevention research by establishing an Institute-wide Working Group on Prevention Research;
- enhancing the interaction between NIMH, prevention scientists, and community leaders through the support of an ongoing Advisory Committee on Prevention Research;
- increasing the precision of tracking prevention research by changes in accounting and budgeting practices;
- ensuring the quality of scientific review of extramural applications for support of prevention research; and
- improving and sustaining programs to disseminate the results of successfully prevention research.

A second set of recommendations deals with establishing NIMH as a leader in coordinating prevention intervention research across all federal agencies that are now or will become involved in this effort. The report notes that prevention research is conducted in many other federal agencies including the National Institute of Alcohol, Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism, National Institute on Drug Abuse, other agencies within the Department of Health and Human Services, the Defense Department. To increase interagency collaboration immediately, "the Committee recommends that NIMH, as the federal component most invested in research on the prevention of mental disorders, take a major leadership role to the extent appropriate within its mission as an Institute of NIH."

Single copies of this report may be obtained by contacting: Juan Ramos, Associate Director for Prevention, NIMH, Parklawn 9C-26, 5600 Fishers Lane, Rockville, MD 20857. Tel: 301/443-3533.

## **SOURCES OF RESEARCH SUPPORT: NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION** *KE*

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.

### **Initiative on Learning and Intelligent Systems**

Advanced information and communication technologies will radically transform the way people live, learn, create, and work in the 21st century. The Learning and Intelligent Systems (LIS) initiative, by integrating technology with research in the many disciplines that contribute to the study of learning and intelligent systems, has the potential to help inform and shape these changes. To do so, the initiative will build on approaches drawn from a wide variety of currently separate but related scientific disciplines and technological advances. The Social, Behavioral and Economic Science (SBE) Directorate along with five other directorates will coordinate and manage the initiative through a special Committee with an appointed Coordinator.

There are two parallel and compelling reasons why the NSF is framing a new initiative in the general area of learning and intelligent systems at the present time:

- The growing convergence of concepts, models and technologies used in many disciplines that address issues related to the improvement of information technologies and their application to learning and intelligent systems.
- As our understanding of learning, intelligent systems and information technologies grows, the need to integrate the knowledge generated and apply it within a broad social context is growing even faster. Research on learning technologies can point to significant breakthroughs and promises rapid advances in both theory and application.

LIS seeks to fund:

- high-risk, multi-year research by interdisciplinary teams designed to develop fundamental knowledge that will integrate concepts related to LIS. Projects must go beyond the scope of traditional disciplinary proposals and span the purview of more than one NSF Directorate.
- experimental prototype systems and technology testbeds that embody theory, test its consequences, and point out factors relating to its eventual efficient application.
- projects that contribute to the creative integration of research in education with research in information technology, and that use education at any level as an application domain.
- one or more (real or virtual) Center for Collaborative Research on Learning Technologies (CRTL) to undertake larger collaborative projects, act as a technology transfer mechanism, train new researchers and serve as an evaluation center for learning technology research.

**Budget:** The FY 1997 LIS initiative has a budget of \$19.5 million.

**Deadlines:** Preliminary proposals are due **February 7, 1997**.

**Contact:** The LIS solicitation and additional information can be found on NSF's Web server, at <http://www.nsf.gov/lis/index.htm> or send a message to [lis@nsf.gov](mailto:lis@nsf.gov).

---

---

## 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  
Society for Research in Child Development

---

## 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  
Institute For Operations Research  
and the Management Sciences  
Midwest Sociological Society  
National Council on Family Relations  
North American Regional Science Council  
North Central Sociological Association  
Population Association of America  
Rural Sociological Society

Society for Research on Adolescence  
Society for the Advancement of  
Socio-Economics  
Society for the Scientific Study of Religion  
Society for the Scientific Study of Sexuality  
Sociologists for Women in Society  
Southern Sociological Society  
Southwestern Social Science Association  
Speech Communication Association

---

## CONTRIBUTORS

---

American Council of Learned Societies  
American Institutes for Research  
University of Arizona  
Bowling Green 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 the Advancement of  
Social Work Research  
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  
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  
Princeton University  
Purdue University  
University of Rhode Island  
Social Science Research Council  
State University of New York, Binghamton  
State University of New York, Stony Brook  
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, N.W., Suite 836, Washington, D.C. 20005

---