105th Congress Begins: Budget Still Driving Policy

The 105th Congress resumed on January 21, following the second term inauguration of President Clinton. The House’s reprimand of Speaker Newt Gingrich (R-GA) was the first order of business, and the lingering effects of the ethics investigation and punishment will determine whether the spirit of bipartisanship so much a part of the post-election rhetoric, becomes a reality. Both Senate leaders, Majority Leader Trent Lott (R-MS) and Minority Leader Tom Daschle (D-SD) have introduced packages of legislation that indicate the priorities of the two parties. The President has suggested he is willing to work with the Republicans on reducing the growth of Medicare, but much skepticism greeted his initial proposal in this area.

On February 6, the President will release his proposals for spending in Fiscal Year 1998, (it begins on October 1, 1997), along with a tax reduction package. All parties now agree that deficit spending in annual federal budgets must end by 2002. The question remains how and by what mechanisms?

Balanced Budget Amendment

One suggestion, now becoming a perennial favorite, is to constitutionally require a balanced budget (BBA). Debate on an Amendment to compel this will begin in the Senate in early February, with a vote possible by the end of the month. The House is expected to follow suit. Following the 1996 congressional elections, the amendment’s supporters thought they would easily duplicate the large margin they received in the House in 1995, and with the massive turnover in the Senate, that they could easily overcome the one vote deficit they had in that body, thereby sending the amendment onto the States for the necessary three-quarters approval.

Things may not go that easy. Rep. John Spratt (R-SC), the ranking Democrat on the House Budget Committee, speaking at a Brookings Institution seminar, suggested that the amendment’s supporters were 10 to 12 votes short in the House of procuring the necessary two-thirds majority. In the Senate, the two North Dakota Senators, Byron Dorgan and Kent Conrad, are trying to complicate matters by insisting on excluding the Social Security Trust Fund in calculating whether the budget is in compliance with the balancing requirement. Also, some Senators, wishing to emulate the budget balancing requirements in the States, advocate separating the capital budget from the operating budget, with only the latter needing balance. Although the President has no role in the passage of a constitutional amendment, the administration will lobby vigorously against the BBA.

Budget Chairs Skeptical of Clinton

The President’s budget will go first to the respective budget committees. Sen. Pete Domenici (R-NM) is the veteran chair in the Senate. He has been skeptical of the President’s previous plans to achieve balance, accusing the administration of using gimmicks and saving all the large necessary reductions until 2001-2002 when Clinton will be out of office. Rep. John Kasich (R-OH) begins his second term as chair of the House Budget Committee. Kasich, one of the architects of the Republican drive to reduce budgets in the recent Congresses, will once again press spending reductions in many areas. Again, reforming entitlements such as Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security, will be a political football for both the administration and Congress.

Reaching balance may be somewhat easier, given the nation’s continuing economic strength, the slowdown in the growth of Medicaid spending, and a new apparent willingness to get serious about the difficulties facing the Medicare system. The deficit...
for FY 1996 came in at $107 billion, significantly below earlier projections. Enactment of welfare reform and the 1996 farm bill provided savings that will help produce smaller deficits into the near future.

The only fly in this ointment is the commitment of both the President and the Congress to fashion a tax reduction package. The mix of tax reductions and tax credits that emerges will add to the difficulties of reaching the Valhalla of a balanced budget in 2002. The budget committees will produce the budget resolution that will provide the overall parameters by budget function, e.g., science, health, that will guide the Congress as it moves through the process.

It's All In The Appropriations' Details

The details of the FY 1998 budget will get worked out in the 13 appropriations subcommittees that still control the purse strings for agency programs. The rosters of the four subcommittees in the House that determine the spending levels for the agencies where most social and behavioral science research is funded are found on page six. The Senate subcommittee rosters are still getting finalized, particularly on the minority side. Veteran's Affairs, Housing and Urban Development, and Independent Agencies has jurisdiction over NSF, HUD's Office of Policy Development and Research, EPA, and NASA. Labor, HHS, Education, decides funding for the National Institutes of Health, Centers for Disease Control (including the National Center for Health Statistics),

HHS Policy Research at the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, International and Graduate Education Programs, Research and Evaluation at the Employment and Training Administration, the Bureau of Labor Statistics, and the United States Institute of Peace.

The Commerce, Justice, State, the Judiciary and Related Agencies Subcommittee scrutinizes the budgets of the Census Bureau, the Bureau of Economic Analysis, the National Institute of Justice, the Bureau of Justice Statistics, the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, and the Educational and Cultural Exchange programs at the United States Information Agency. Finally, the Agriculture and Rural Development Subcommittee funds the Cooperative State Research, Economics, and Extension Service, which includes the National Research Initiative Competitive Grants program, the Economic Research Service and the National Agricultural Statistics Service.

Proposals to Increase Spending on Research

In the early days of the new Congress, some Senators have shown considerable interest in the research part of the budget. Sen. Phil Gramm (R-TX) has introduced S.124 to double, in the next ten years, the amount of federal investment for basic science and medical research in non-defense agencies. This would require a $32.5 billion increase in these budgets. In addition, Sen. Connie Mack (R-FL) has introduced S.15 to double, in the next five years, the budget of the National Institutes of Health. This would require an increment of $12.7 billion. Of course, both of these well-intentioned measures run into the necessity to conform to the discretionary spending caps provided in the budget resolutions that will require offsetting spending cuts in other areas of the budget.

NSF Reauthorization: SBE an Unlikely Target

Aside from budget and appropriations, the 105th Congress will face a number of other issues of concern to social and behavioral scientists. On the agenda, will be another attempt to reauthorize the National Science Foundation (NSF). The NSF authorization expired in 1993, and although that has not affected its ability to receive an appropriation, some in Congress think authorizations are good things for agencies to have.
The House Science Committee tried to reauthorize NSF the past three years, but the Senate has bogged down the process. In the 104th Congress, the NSF reauthorization included language instructing the agency to eliminate one of its directorates, with the Social, Behavioral and Economic Science Directorate (SBE), the favored target of House Science Committee Chairman Robert Walker (R-PA). Although Walker succeeded in getting his bill passed in the House, the Senate did not consider it.

With Walker retired, and Rep. James Sensenbrenner (R-WI) as the new chairman, the likelihood of a repetition of the attack on SBE is low. Although the Science Committee will not organize until February 5, Rep. Steve Schiff (R-NM) will likely remain as Chairman of the Basic Research Subcommittee, where the NSF reauthorization process will commence. The NSF leadership will testify at hearings on March 5. The difficulties in the Senate result from the dual jurisdiction of the Labor and Human Resources Committee and the Commerce, Science and Transportation Committee. Sen. Bill Frist (R-TN) will now chair the Science, Technology and Space Subcommittee on Commerce. Since Frist is also on Labor and Human Resources, it is hoped that this will smooth the way in the Senate for a NSF reauthorization bill.

Higher Education Act Reauthorization

This is also the year the process begins to reauthorize the Higher Education Act. In the past, it has usually taken two years to complete the process and enact a bill into law. The newly renamed Education and the Workplace Committee in the House, chaired by Rep. William Goodling (R-PA), and its Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education chaired by Rep. Howard ‘Buck’ McKeon (R-CA), will take the lead. On the Senate side, new Labor and Human Resources chairman Sen. James Jeffords (R-VT), has moved consideration of education issues to the full committee level by abolishing the Education, Arts, and Humanities Subcommittee. Of particular interest to the social and behavioral science community are the international education programs of Title VI and the graduate support programs of Title IX. In the latter, the Javits Fellowship program, which funds graduate students in the social sciences, arts, and humanities has lived a precarious life the past few years. The administration has asked for its elimination, the Senate has saved it, but has not provided sufficient funds for a new class of fellows. It has also been made part of the Graduate Assistance in Areas of National Need (GANN) program, although with a specific set-aside for Javits fellows. The original GANN program does not include the social sciences as one of the areas where students are eligible for support.

Other issues that are part of the agenda, include decisions surrounding the 2000 Census, (see following story), a possible return of the Family Privacy Protection Act, a reauthorization of the National Institutes of Health, renewing the research provisions of Farm Bill deferred from last year, some changes to the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, and some first readings on the impact of the welfare reform law, that may lead to revisiting its provisions.

1997: A CRUCIAL YEAR FOR CENSUS

A series of key decisions affecting the accuracy and comprehensiveness of the census will be made by Congress and federal officials in 1997, and this will occur in a climate of both fiscal austerity and skepticism on Capitol Hill about proposed methods for conducting the 2000 decennial census.

Following a 104th Congress that saw sharp rancor over the census, several new players will lead key panels. Rep. Dan Burton (R-IN) is the new chair of the House Government Reform and Oversight, and Sen. Fred Thompson (R-TN) will the chair the companion panel in the Senate. Partisan tensions are expected to be quite high in both quarters, as each committee will lead investigations into controversial fundraising activities by the Democratic National Committee. The subcommittee of Burton’s panel that will oversee the Census Bureau will be chaired by Rep. Dennis Hastert, an Illinois Republican who has been critical of the census in the past.

Also, William Daley, currently facing likely Senate confirmation, will take over the Commerce Department, which houses the Census Bureau. Bureau Director Martha Farnsworth Riche, a demographer, is expected to remain in the post she has held since late 1994.
A Ban on Sampling?

A lingering issue from last year is the proposed use of sampling in the 2000 survey. A year ago, the Census Bureau announced that the 2000 methodology would use two forms of sampling -- Sampling for Non-Response Follow-Up and Integrated Coverage Measurement -- to reduce costs and improve accuracy. The 1990 Census' record high cost and inaccuracy and differential undercount of minorities left a trail of litigation and calls for reforming the constitutionally-mandated endeavor. While endorsed by panels at the National Academy of Sciences and other statistical groups, sampling has been coolly received on Capitol Hill, with members of both parties questioning its scientific accuracy, legality, and its effects on public confidence and participation in the survey. Non-binding reports in 1996 from the both a Senate Appropriations subcommittee and the House Government Reform and Oversight Committee expressed disapproval of the Bureau's sampling proposals.

The census is the federal government's largest peacetime activity, and the 2000 Census has been projected to cost up to $4 billion over a ten-year cycle. The final fiscal years before 2000 entail a costly "ramp-up," some of which will be reflected in the Clinton Administration's budget request for Fiscal Year 1998 when it is released on February 6. Rep. Harold Rogers, the Kentucky Republican who chairs the House Appropriations subcommittee that funds the Census Bureau, has been reluctant to grant the agency the funds it says are necessary for planning and design. His panel will hold hearings on the Bureau's budget this spring. The Census Bureau will conduct a large-scale "dress rehearsal" in 1998.

Content of Questionnaire Due This Year

By April 1, 1997, the Bureau is required by law to submit to Congress a list of questions it seeks to include in both the short and long census questionnaires. What is known as the "long form" -- sent to one in six households -- is the primary vehicle for the widest, most comprehensive set of data used by the public and private sectors. The cost and scope of this form may face congressional scrutiny in a time of tight budgets and reductions in the size and scope of governmental activities.

Also, by the middle of this year the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) is expected to announce what, if any, changes it is recommending to the racial and ethnic categories used in federal data collection. Any revisions -- including the creation of a "multiracial" or "multiethnic" classification would appear on the 2000 Census. Rep. Thomas Petri (R-WI) says he will introduce legislation to create such a "multiracial" category.

SENATE EBONICS HEARING FEATURES LINGUISTS

A January 23 Senate hearing on Ebonics, the first Capitol Hill hearing on the controversial African American dialect, allowed prominent linguists and other experts to share their work in this area.

The hearing was held by the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor, HHS, and Education, which funds several federal programs which educate disadvantaged children. After some combative remarks by a North Carolina Senator, the hearing was a rather low-key examination of what has become a heated public topic. Republican Sen. Lauch Faircloth denounced Ebonics as "absurd . . . it is political correctness gone out of control." Rather than "searching for a new form of English" to solve the problems of our schools, he instead suggested a return to "old-fashioned remedies" of better teaching, allowing teachers to discipline, and school uniforms. After his opening statement, Faircloth remained only briefly.

Panel chair Sen. Arlen Specter (R-PA) noted the intensely controversial nature of the subject and commented on striking the right balance between "fitting in a melting pot" society and preserving one's background. He noted that Yiddish was spoken at home in his youth. While saying that education is primarily a state and local issue, his panel "has the responsibility to exercise oversight" over the use of federal funds for educational assistance, research, and dissemination. In the wake of the Oakland School Board's recognition of Ebonics in the classroom, U.S. Education Secretary Richard Riley said that because federal law defines Ebonics as a dialect and not a language, no federal bilingual aid can be used for the Oakland program. No U.S. Department of Education officials testified at the hearing. Rep. Peter King (R-
NY) has introduced a bill to prohibit the use of federal funds in programs teaching of Ebonics as a language. Some school districts in Los Angeles and San Diego are using Title I Aid for Disadvantaged Children money for experimental programs encompassing Ebonics.

**Congresswoman Cites LSA Resolution**

Testifying at the hearing, both Rep. Maxine Waters (D-CA), chair of the Congressional Black Caucus, and leaders of the Oakland school system defended the Ebonics policy. They said its goal of teaching Standard English has been mischaracterized in the furor; it is a pragmatic recognition of the need to raise academic achievement, they argued. The Los Angeles congresswoman said “different language patterns are real” and noted the recent resolution adopted by the Linguistic Society of America (LSA), which said that the “decision to recognize the vernacular of African American students in teaching them Standard English is linguistically and pedagogically sound.”

Orlando Taylor, Dean of the Howard University Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, told the panel “that while the controversy has raged, one central fact remains and that is that far too many African American children have not acquired sufficient proficiency in Standard English to facilitate academic success and career mobility.” He said that the challenge is to devise positive ways to teach children Standard English in ways that recognize the human right to retain culture, utilize the language system one brings to school as a bridge, and do not denigrate the student.

At the federal level, Taylor urged greater research and dissemination on improved teaching methods for Standard English and greater research on language and communication systems used by African Americans and other culturally diverse groups. He said that most research on African American communication has regrettably focused on the working classes, and that the “results of that research have been overgeneralized.”

**Former LSA President Reviews Research**

William Labov, Professor of Linguistics at University of Pennsylvania and a former LSA president, provided an overview of studies of the roots and variances of regional and cultural dialects. He said that there has only been one thorough test of transitional programs to teach Standard English, but while that program was highly successful, it was cancelled over objection to the use of African American English in the classroom.

Labov offered this conclusion for the panel: “At the heart of the controversy, there are two major points of view taken by educators. One view is that any recognition of a nonstandard language as a legitimate means of expression will only confuse children, and reinforce their tendency to use it instead of Standard English. The other is that children learn most rapidly in their own home language, and they can benefit in both motivation and achievement by getting a head start in learning to read and write in this way. Both of these are honestly held and deserve a fair hearing. But until now, only the first has been tried in the American public school system. The essence of the Oakland School Board resolution is that the second deserves a fair trial as well.”

The inventor of the term Ebonics, Robert L. Williams, Professor Emeritus of Psychology and African American Studies at Washington University, outlined what the term he coined in 1973 entails. He recognized that Standard English is “lingua franca” or common language of America, and that this should be the goal in educating African American children. Ebonics, he said, is about finding the best methods for achieving this goal. Williams discussed several studies that have been conducted on Ebonics, including one that switched “couch” for “sofa” and “fixing to” for “beginning” and led to African American 1st and 2nd graders increasing their test scores. Williams advocated a “bridge” program that “starts where the child is.” When asked by Specter whether this brings the student to the same place as others, Williams said it did.

After the hearing Specter said he was not ready to make a judgement on the issue, and said additional hearings are possible.
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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.

National Assessment of Educational Progress Secondary Analysis Program

The National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) provides information on the educational achievement of school children. The purpose of the NAEP Secondary Analysis program is to encourage eligible parties to apply new ideas or state-of-the-art techniques to the analysis and reporting of the information contained in NAEP and NAEP High School Transcript Studies.

The Secretary is particularly interested in applications that meet one or both of the invitational priorities in this notice. However, an application that meets one or both of these invitational priorities does not receive competitive or absolute preference over other applications.

Invitational Priority 1: Projects that address the instructional factors, family background factors, and school and teacher characteristics that the educational research literature suggests are correlates of academic performance.

Invitational Priority 2: Projects that include the development of statistical software that would allow more advanced analytic techniques to be readily applied to NAEP data.

Eligible Applicants: Public or private organizations and consortia of organizations.

Deadline: Applications must be transmitted by March 24, 1997.

Available Funds: Budget is up to $700,000 with an estimated 5-10 awards averaging $85,000.

Contact: For additional information, send a written request to:

Alex Sedlacek
U.S. Department of Education
National Center for Education Statistics
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
Room 404B
555 New Jersey Avenue, NW
Washington, D.C. 20208-5653

Internet (alex_sedlacek@ed.gov); or fax your request to (202) 219-2061; or phone (202) 219-1734.
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