

**COMMITTEES MARK UP
BUDGET RESOLUTION: AN
END TO THE DEFICIT? *HS***

The comprehensive plan to balance the budget by 2002, announced by President Clinton and the congressional leadership two weeks ago, began to take a less amorphous shape with the markup by the House Budget Committee of the FY 1998 budget resolution on May 16. The Senate committee is to put its package together on May 19, and it is reportedly identical to the House. The hope is to have the resolution through the Congress before the Memorial Day recess begins on May 23.

Although the budget resolution only sets guidelines for the appropriations process, it is the first step in implementing the deal that will lead, in fiscal year 2002, to the first balanced federal budget since 1969. Filling in the details of the agreement will be left to the 13 appropriations subcommittees in both Houses. Also heavily involved will be the tax committees, House Ways and Means and Senate Finance, as they fill in the blanks on the tax reduction provisions of the deal.

The process will speed up after the recess, with the House panels expected to move swiftly into decision making with the hope that the appropriations bills will move through the House floor by the July 4th recess. The Senate will probably move more slowly, with the subcommittees completing their jobs in mid-to-late July. Fiscal Year 1998 begins on October 1, 1997 and all involved hope that the process will be finished by then, negating the necessity for a continuing resolution to keep the government funded. (A provision to provide for an automatic continuing resolution remains in the supplemental appropriations bill and the White House maintains it will veto the bill if it is not removed.)

(continued on page five)

**CENSUS SAMPLING
SURVIVES BRUSH
WITH DEATH — FOR NOW *MB***

The ability of the Census Bureau to incorporate statistical sampling methods into the 2000 Census — never popular on Capitol Hill — remains intact for now. Given the mood in Congress on this issue, the question appears when — not if — another threat to statistical sampling will emerge. The House and Senate versions of the supplemental spending bill must be reconciled in a conference committee, and this could provide an opportunity for opponents of sampling to act.

The Senate Appropriations Committee, chaired by Senator Ted Stevens (R-AK), included provisions in the Fiscal Year 1997 supplemental appropriations bill that would have prohibited the use of sampling for non-response follow-up and reducing the undercount. It would have had the effect of eliminating the decennial long form, which is sent to one in six households and provides a wide range of demographic, housing, and socioeconomic data.

At the committee level, an amendment to delete the anti-sampling language was defeated on a primarily party-line vote. However, the amendment's

(continued on page five)

INSIDE UPDATE...

- Senate Looks at NSF Research and Education
- NIH Releases Merit Review Criteria
- NIH Study Sections Under Review
- NIMH Director Talks of Reorganization
- Academy Releases New Report on Organizational Performance
- COSSA Seminar Spotlights Importance of Census Data
- Sources of Research Support: National Science Foundation

SENATE HEARING LOOKS AT NSF RESEARCH AND EDUCATION EFFORTS *HS*

The Senate Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee, chaired by Sen. Bill Frist (R-TN), heard from NSF Director Neal Lane and National Science Board Chairman Richard Zare on May 7. The Subcommittee will participate in any Senate activity to reauthorize NSF. In the Senate, the Commerce, Science and Transportation Committee, of which Frist's panel is a part, shares jurisdiction over NSF with the Labor and Human Resources Committee

Chairman Frist noted that there are "simple truths," regarding science and technology that "creates the links between spending and results." These truths are: research and development, science, and education bring advancements and innovation; innovation has been the basis of our competitive edge -- peaceful and defensive -- and of our extraordinary lifestyle; and funding research and creating an environment that encourages private research and innovation are the bedrock upon which much of our national economy is built. At the same time, Frist declared: "We must do a better job of defining and explaining the value and impacts of these programs to the American public."

Lane and Zare, as they had at earlier hearings, presented the case for NSF and its budget. Both

CONSORTIUM OF SOCIAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATIONS

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

President:	Eleanor Maccoby
------------	-----------------

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 sciences. *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.

highlighted the new initiative in Knowledge and Distributed Intelligence (KDI). Described by Lane as "an ambitious Foundation-wide effort designed to take information, communications, computing and networking to a new level of technological, economic, educational, and society impact," KDI will also include the Next Generation Internet. Lane also noted the opportunities KDI provided for multidisciplinary investigations that should include psychologists and education researchers.

Frist indicated an interest in K-12 education and the NSF's role in improving American students' proficiency in science in those grades. He referred to the recent National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) results and voiced approval of the redesigned test that now includes performing a laboratory-based experiment as part of the evaluation. Lane remarked about his "exciting" experience interacting with students in a middle school class in Nashville and the utility of hands-on science instruction.

Sen. Jay Rockefeller (D-WV), Ranking Democrat on the Subcommittee, also focused his remarks on K-12 education. Pleased by the announcement of a Federal Communications Commission decision that will expedite the costs of wiring for computers all the schools and libraries in the country, Rockefeller expressed concern about teacher training efforts in this area. He also proclaimed his continuing interest in the Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Research program (EPSCOR). NSF spends about \$38 million to help small states like West Virginia build capacity to help their universities compete for NSF funds. Lane noted that in the FY 1998 budget proposal, NSF is moving the EPSCOR program beyond the Education and Human Resources Directorate by asking all the research directorates to co-fund projects in EPSCOR states.

Frist ended the hearing by focusing on the dearth of women and minorities in science and engineering. Lane admitted this is "the most serious challenge we face as we move into the 21st Century." He cited the NSF's Alliance for Minority Participation program as a success, but indicated that it clearly was not enough to solve a problem for which, Lane said, "we have not done a good job as a community."

NIH RELEASES CRITERIA FOR RATING GRANT APPLICATIONS AS

Beginning in fiscal year 1998 (October 1, 1997), the National Institutes of Health (NIH) will use five new review criteria -- significance, approach, innovation, investigator and environment -- to rate grant applications. The decision concludes almost a year of discussion by the NIH Peer Review Oversight Committee (PROG) chaired by NIH Deputy Director for Extramural Research Wendy Baldwin. (See *Update*, June 24, 1996)

Reviewers will be instructed to use the criteria to "judge the likelihood that the proposed research will have a substantial impact on the pursuit of these goals . . . and consider them in assigning the overall score." The application, however, "does not need to be strong in all categories to be judged likely to have a major scientific impact and thus deserve a high priority score."

Significance - Does this study address an important problem? If the aims of the application are achieved, how will scientific knowledge be advanced? What will be the effect of these studies on the concepts or methods that drive this field?

Approach -- Are the conceptual framework, design, methods, and analyzes adequately developed, well-integrated, and appropriate to the aims of the project? Does the applicant acknowledge potential problem areas and consider alternative tactics?

Innovation -- Does the project employ novel concepts, approaches or methods? Are the aims original and innovative? Does the project challenge existing paradigms or develop new methodologies or technologies?

Investigator -- Is the investigator appropriately trained and well suited to carry out this work? Is the work proposed appropriate to the experience level of the principal investigator and other researchers (if any)?

Environment - Does the scientific environment in which the work will be done contribute to the probability of success? Do the proposed experiments

take advantage of unique features of the scientific environment or employ useful collaborative arrangements? Is there evidence of institutional support?

NIH TO REVIEW STUDY SECTIONS AS

"Its time to walk the talk," said Division of Research Grants (DRG) Ellie Ehrenfeld at her first meeting with the DRG Advisory Committee in May. Prior to officially joining the DRG, Ehrenfeld noted that she had "invested time and made contact with sectors of the extramural community" to help her identify areas of concerns to establish a set of priorities for things that need doing and for things that she wants to do. The first set of issues, said Ehrenfeld, will be an en bloc look at the organization of study sections. It has been a long time since the organizational structure had been looked at, she said. Over the years, she noted that there have been additions and divisions but "no systematic effort to ask whether we were cutting science in the right way -- to give the best, fairest and appropriate review."

Emphasizing that the science is changing and becoming more multidisciplinary, Ehrenfeld said "we have a need to make sure that the review process accommodates the way science is changing. Important science should be driving the way we review it." One of the problems, Ehrenfeld noted, "is that too much of the hottest, most active fields are too small a subset of the study sections," while at the same time emerging areas, "orphans," have no homes and are forced in pre-existing groups and as a result "may not be getting the best review . . . There is a need to initiate a big study; an experiment of the overall organization of study sections," said Ehrenfeld. It is not a short term project, she continued, and indicated that the National Academy of Sciences and others have expressed an interest and a willingness to help.

Says Behavioral Scientists "Vocally Dissatisfied"

Acknowledging her "lack of expertise and credibility in clinical research and behavioral science," Ehrenfeld said she felt DRG would do better to bring individuals from these communities

with stature and visibility who would come and work with her to see if this mechanism turns out to be useful. Michael Simmons of the University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill will serve as liaison to the clinical research community. She is currently looking for a liaison to the behavioral and social sciences community -- a group, said Ehrenfeld, that is "vocally dissatisfied with how they feel and/or perceive the review process is working." In the next year or so Ehrenfeld related that she would look to add a DRG liaison to the technology development and instrumentation community.

NIMH DIRECTOR TALKS OF REORGANIZATION AS

Presenting his Director's Report to the May 13th National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH) Advisory Council, Director Steven Hyman noted that in order to more efficiently administer research in the NIMH's special areas of emphasis, three new divisions are being proposed: the Division of Mental Disorders, Behavioral and AIDS Research; the Division of Basic and Clinical Neuroscience; and the Division of Epidemiology Services and Intervention Research. The three new divisions would replace the Division of Neuroscience and Behavioral Science; the Division of Clinical and Treatment Research; and the Division of Epidemiology and Services Research.

The Behavioral Science Research Branch is located within the Division of Mental Disorders, Behavioral and AIDS Research and consists of the following programs: Cognitive Sciences, Personality and Emotion, Interpersonal Processes, and Socio-Cultural.

Why reorganize? Because science and public health needs are changing, Hyman said. "The most striking and obvious change," he continued, "is the change in health care delivery. Decisions are being made by corporate benefit managers," and others which "demands a different kind of data." "It requires bringing domains together," said Hyman.

According to a summary in the director's report released to the advisory council, the reorganization is necessary to incorporate the four areas of special research emphasis selected by NIMH, including:

"1) Basic research in molecular biology, neuroscience, genetics, and behavior; 2) Translational research designed to speed new basic knowledge into clinical applications; 3) Controlled efficacy studies, real-world outcome assessments, and health services research, a broad domain in which the common theme is an intent to improve the quality of care available *now* as well as in the future to individuals who live with mental disorders in a world in which managed care has become the dominant vehicle of clinical care, and 4) Focused policy-relevant research and targeted research dissemination activities."

Noting that translational research has been the most difficult to administer, Hyman said, "my hope is that this new organization [will] bring basic behavioral research into contact with issues related to mental health, and basic molecular neuroscience research into contact with areas related to mental illness."

ACADEMY RELEASES NEW REPORT ON ORGANIZATIONAL PERFORMANCE AS

The National Academy of Sciences has released a new study, *Enhancing Organizational Performance*. Part of a series on enhancing human performance, sponsored by the Army Research Institute, the new report joins earlier studies titled *In The Mind's Eye* and *Learning, Remembering, Believing*. These previous reports examined techniques to improve individual effectiveness. Jerome Singer of the Uniformed Services University of Health Services, chaired the panel, and Dan Druckman of the National Research Council served as study director for the new review focused on organizations.

The key conclusions indicate: 1) organizations function best when they are appropriately matched to their environment; thus the importance of context; 2) organizations are constantly changing as their missions shift; 3) research lags practice, leading to large and expanding markets for popular approaches to organizational transformation. Although many of these are passing fads, they should be systematically evaluated. 4) the research base and organization theory are in their infancy; therefore it is difficult to

draw systematic conclusions on what does or does not work to enhance organizational performance; and 5) research is more likely to address practical issues if it is guided by a conceptual framework that specifies the relationships among the various influences on organizational effectiveness. Measures of satisfaction should not be confused with measures of effectiveness.

Copies of the report are available from the National Academy Press: 1-800-624-6242 or at <http://www.nap.edu/bookstore>.

DETAILS OF BUDGET PLAN

(continued from page one)

The numbers in the House Committee plan include a \$100 million reduction in the Science, Space and Technology category in outlays from FY 1997 to FY 1998. There is a \$500 million reduction in Budget Authority (BA) during the same period. The former indicates how much can be spent in a particular year. The latter includes projected spending beyond the next fiscal year. The projections for 2002 suggest this function will have \$15.6 billion in BA and \$15.7 billion in outlays. By contrast, the Education, Training and Employment Services function will go from \$54.2 billion in BA to \$63.3 billion and \$50.5 billion to \$62.3 billion from FY 1997 to FY 2002. In Health, spending jumps from \$125.3 to 172.1 billion (BA) and \$127.4 to \$171.7 billion (outlays).

We have been down this road before -- the Gramm, Rudman, Hollings Act and the Budget Agreement of 1990 both mapped out ends to the deficit. Whether this new agreement to end almost 30 years of deficit spending accomplishes its goal remains to be seen.

CONGRESS THREATENS CENSUS SAMPLING

(continued from page one)

author, Sen. Ernest Hollings (D-SC), successfully introduced a compromise amendment on the Senate floor that forbids the Census Bureau from making "irreversible" plans for sampling.

As the legislation moved to the House, advocates were concerned that anti-sampling language would reappear. COSSA and the American Sociological Association joined three Members of Congress and other census stakeholders at a press conference to denounce efforts to prohibit scientific sampling. When the bill reached the House floor, no provisions were added. Observers say that a widely publicized flip-flop by House Speaker Newt Gingrich may have been a factor. Several newspapers reported that a 1991 letter from the Georgia Republican urged the Commerce Department to use statistical revisions to increase the 1990 count of his state. Yet earlier this month he joined other Republican leaders in a letter opposing sampling.

COSSA SEMINAR SPOTLIGHTS IMPORTANCE OF CENSUS DATA

MB

The May 2 COSSA seminar, *Using the Census: What it Tells Us About America's People, Workforce, and Small Communities*, brought three leading social scientists to Capitol Hill to illustrate that the Census is more than simply a count, but offers significant information about who we are, how we got here, and where we are going. The event, attended by almost 70 congressional and federal agency officials and representatives of interest groups and the media, was held in the Rayburn House Office Building.

After a brief welcome by COSSA Executive Director Howard J. Silver, Reynolds Farley, Research Scientist and Professor of Sociology at the Population Studies Center at the University of Michigan, gave an overview of social and economic changes taking place in American society. Farley said "censuses are cameras that capture and freeze frame our history." A major change, he said, is the incorporation of women into the mainstream of our economy. He said that Census data reveal the dramatic increases in women's educational and professional attainment. A second area of social change, according to Farley, is the composition of family life. Demographic data show that the age of marriage has advanced rapidly, an acceptance of cohabitation as a substitute of marriage, an increased divorce rate, and an increase in nonmarital births.

Census: Best Source for Immigration Data

The third of area of social change Farley discussed regards immigration, and he commented that "the Census is our best source of information about immigration." He said that this data indicate that we are a nation with a slow growing white population, a slow growing black population, and very rapidly growing Asian and Latino populations. Farley noted the geographic concentration of immigration, saying that only 14 locations have a proportion of foreign-born above the national average. With the exception of Chicago, most of the Midwest, Rocky Mountain, and much of the South have been unaffected by immigration, while cities such as Miami and Los Angeles have been transformed. The fourth and final example he cited of policy-relevant data supplied by the Census concerned economic restructuring. What social scientists have found, Farley said is: a high rate of employment, the ability of the economy to incorporate women, and a polarization of income. While the causes of macroeconomic shifts can be debated, Farley said it is the Census that can tell us the impacts of these changes.

Suzanne Bianchi, Professor of Sociology and Faculty Associate at the Center on Population, Gender, and Social Inequality at the University of Maryland, presented Census data on women in the workforce. She said that the Census "reveals a lot about the working family . . . how much women's lives have changed in just a generation, and consequently how much families have changed." She said that one theme that clearly emerges is balancing work and family, as women have added labor market activity at the same time they are rearing children, a "dramatic departure" from previous generations. Bianchi said that the Census can measure our success in gender equality.

Four findings unique to Census data, Bianchi said, are: a long-term analysis on women's educational and economic attainment; the ability to look at women in terms of generations, in that each decennial census captures a generational cohort (i.e., Depression, World War II, etc.); extensive occupational detail, and comprehensive racial, ethnic, and geographical detail. Bianchi presented data showing female labor participation rates based on the

1990 Census that indicate large proportions of women in the workforce along the Eastern Seaboard and in the Heartland, but far lower in the South. As Farley said of immigration, Bianchi noted those working women are also geographically concentrated.

Small Communities and the Census

Paul Voss, Professor and Chair of the Department of Rural Sociology at the University of Wisconsin-Madison, discussed the significance of the Census for small communities. He said that rural communities use the Census to see how they have changed in the decade since the last Census. In a sophisticated way they compare themselves with neighboring communities, he said, as the decennial data provides even the smallest communities with information such as educational status, income and poverty, transportation patterns, labor force participation, languages spoken, and housing data. Voss said the richness of the data makes it more than just a count. An example, he said, was a small community in southwestern Wisconsin whose population has remained flat for nearly a century. A closer look, Voss said, reveals that 18 percent of the population did not reside there five years earlier, indicating "that underlying that rather flat profile of change is a very strong dynamic of population turnover" A specific example of the Census' impact on rural areas are the influences of prisons. Voss said that many small communities are seeking out these facilities, and that the Census data allows one to look at the impact of the area's social and economic condition before and after the facility was created. He said that the demographic data supplied by the Census is crucial to the planning efforts of small communities.

Voss expressed concern about the current state of the Census in Congress. Terming it "an undertaking that is in deep, deep trouble," he noted congressional opposition to the Census Bureau's plans to use statistical sampling methods for non-response follow-up, and also those in Congress who would eliminate the "long form" questionnaire sent to a sample of households. He said that the data user community is worried that federal budget pressures will inhibit the critical information needed in the 21st century. He said sampling is a scientifically-proven method to reach the hardest to count segments of our

population, and would help reduce the cost of the 2000 Census. He said he found it hard to believe Congress would reject something proven to save money. Voss noted studies showing that there would be an insufficient supply of temporary enumerators in

2000 to conduct a successful Census without sampling.

A full transcript of the proceedings will be published this summer by COSSA.

SOURCES OF RESEARCH SUPPORT: NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION *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.

Division of Social, Behavioral and Economic Research

The Societal Dimensions of Engineering, Science and Technology (SDEST) program folds together two former NSF programs, Ethics and Values Studies, and Research on Science and Technology, in the Division of Social, Behavioral and Economic Research of the National Science Foundation.

In SDEST, the Ethics and Values Studies (EVS) component focuses on developing and transmitting knowledge about ethical and value dimensions associated with the conduct and impacts of science, engineering, and technology. The Research on Science and Technology (RST) component supports research to improve approaches and information for decision making concerning management and direction of research, science and technology.

Besides historical and philosophical modes of analysis, research on ethics and the conduct and impacts of science and engineering involves theories and methods from science and technology studies, applied ethics, and other areas of the social sciences and humanities. Research for decision making concerning science and technology takes an empirical approach to data collection and analysis. Information and analysis from the natural and physical sciences and engineering may also play a role in these research areas.

Application Procedures: All applicants to the program must follow the requirements listed in the NSF Grant Proposal Guide; you may get a copy by calling (703) 306-1130 or Internet: pubs@nsf.gov in the NSF Home Page: <http://www.nsf.gov/>

Deadlines: SDEST has two rounds each year for consideration of proposals. The target dates are February 1 and August 1.

Contact: For further information on SDEST, contact Program Directors Rachele Hollander or John Perhonis, at (703) 306-1743 or E-mail: rholland@nsf.gov or jperhoni@nsf.gov, respectively.

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 Association of Schools of Public Affairs
and Administration
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
