A NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR INTERNATIONAL COMPETENCE?

The Coalition for the Advancement of Foreign Languages and International Studies (CAFLIS), consisting of close to 150 organizations, held another in a series of meetings on March 6 to develop strategies for providing Americans with improved foreign language skills and increased understanding of the interdependent world in which they live. (For stories on earlier CAFLIS meetings, see Update, December 9, 1988, and September 23, 1988.)

In the CAFLIS working group on federal support, a consensus has emerged to support the creation of a new national entity to enhance the federal government’s leadership role in achieving Americans’ international competence. While continuing to support and seek greater funding for existing programs, such as Title VI of the Higher Education Act, the Soviet-East European Training Act, and the Fulbright-Hays Act, the group felt that these current programs are not enough; a major new federal initiative is necessary. The proposed endowment would support the growth of an integrated, comprehensive approach to meet the nation’s international education needs by working with state and local governments, the private sector, and all levels of the education system.
State governments have demonstrated increasing concern with this policy area, as evidenced by the release of a National Governors Associations (NGA) report, "American in Transition: The International Frontier" (see Update March 3, 1989). At the March 6 meeting, the state and local initiatives working group of CAFLIS explored institutional changes necessary to mesh the new federal entity with the current state and local initiatives addressed in the NGA report.

John Berndt, senior vice-president of AT&T, addressed the CAFLIS meeting at lunch and reflected the growing concern about an under-educated and untrained workforce in the face of increasing international competition. CAFLIS’s private sector working group will produce case studies of collaboration among the public-private sector in international education; it will also conduct a needs assessment of what the private sector wants from the education/exchange community by the year 2000. CAFLIS’s next meeting, on June 26, is intended to firm up the endowment proposal and develop an action plan to sell the proposal.<<

GAO ON 1990 CENSUS: $2.6 BILLION NOT ENOUGH

The U.S. Census Bureau’s $2.6 billion cost estimate for the 1990 census may be $400 million below the amount that will actually be needed, a leading General Accounting Office (GAO) official told a House subcommittee on March 23. At the same hearing, Census Bureau Deputy Director C. Louis Kincannon held to the $2.6 billion figure, calling it "sufficient to take a good census."

Testifying before the House Subcommittee on Census and Population, chaired by Rep. Thomas Sawyer (D-OH), GAO General Management Issues Director Gene Dodaro said the Census Bureau would have to spend $3 billion to do a decent job on the 1990 census. "The Bureau historically has had difficulty controlling costs without compromising data quality," he said. "Cost estimates for the 1990 census are following the 1980 pattern, when they rose dramatically as the census year drew closer."

Dodaro said he is concerned that last-minute cutbacks in census operations may be "more drastic than occurred in 1980," diminishing data quality and forcing the Bureau to request supplemental appropriations. (He noted that cost estimates for the 1980 census rose from $450 million in 1975 to $1 billion in 1980; the final figure was $1.1 billion.)

Meanwhile, the Bureau faces the difficult task of attracting and retaining the more than 400,000 temporary employees it will require to perform the 1990 census, Dodaro said. GAO recommends that the Bureau explore options to expand the labor pool for decennial employment, including the possible adoption of legislation that would enable federal retirees to work for the
1990 census without having their retirement benefits reduced. Dodaro observed that the Bureau seems to be making some headway in facing the personnel challenges that the 1990 census is expected to create. As an example, he noted that the Bureau is considering assigning geographic pay scales for its census employees.

Noting the Bureau’s progress in addressing personnel problems and other challenges that are cropping up as 1990 approaches, Kincannon argued that $2.6 billion will be adequate. "We are constantly examining and refining the census design so that realistically it can be carried out within currently approved budget levels," he said. If factors "outside our control" increase the cost of conducting the census, the Bureau will promptly report it to Congress, he said.

Late in the hearings, Rep. Robert Garcia (D-NY) opened an old wound by referring to scuttled plans to remedy the historic undercount of minorities and the poor in the decennial census (see Update, October 7, 1988). Those plans were dropped two years ago, a move that was "probably one of the most embarrassing things to ever happen to the Bureau of the Census," Garcia said. Kincannon said he refused to be drawn into a debate with Garcia, calling Garcia’s recollection an "oversimplification."

PEACE INSTITUTE ASKS CONGRESS FOR NEARLY $10 MILLION

In keeping with tradition, the United States Institute of Peace (USIP) is once again taking advantage of its special status as an agency independent of the executive branch: the Institute is taking its own budget to Congress.

While most other federal agencies must echo the administration’s request for their budgets when they go before Congress, USIP can use its own figures. In the case of FY 1990, the Institute is asking for about $9.5 million, approximately $2.5 million more than the administration requested for the agency. (The administration’s FY 1990 request matched USIP’s actual appropriation of $6.9 million for the current fiscal year.) USIP presented its budget to a Senate appropriations subcommittee on March 17; the Institute is expected to present its budget to the appropriate House appropriations subcommittee on April 20.

When the Institute took its budget to Congress last year, there was a much wider gap between USIP’s request ($8.6 million) and the administration’s ($3.4 million). The gap was even greater the year before. As one would expect, actual appropriations in each case fell somewhere between the administration’s number and the USIP request. Nevertheless, the trend has been in the the Institute’s favor, with increases in actual funding in each of the last three years.
In testimony presented at the March 17 hearing of the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, Education and Related Agencies, chaired by Sen. Tom Harkin (D-IA), USIP President Samuel Lewis noted that the Institute has increased its momentum in the past year. To keep this momentum going, he said, and to carry out all aspects of the Institute's "very large and complex mandate," USIP will require the funds it has requested for FY 1990. Quoting this mandate, expressed in the USIP Act, Lewis noted that it "charges the Institute to develop the 'widest possible range of education and training, basic and applied research opportunities, and peace information services' on the means to promote international peace and conflict resolution without recourse to violence."

Lewis outlined the three principal ways in which USIP works to address this goal: by expanding basic and applied knowledge about the origins and character of war and peace by sponsoring a wide range of research and "eliciting the personal reflections" of experts active in the field of international negotiations; by disseminating this knowledge to policy-makers and others who can play a role in resolving international conflicts; and by supporting education and information programs for the general public.

According to USIP's FY 1990 budget plan, its grants program would be increased by about one third over the current fiscal year, with the most dramatic increases reserved for solicited grants. Unsolicited grants would be funded at current levels.

**NSF DIRECTOR ADDRESSES ARCTIC SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH**

Arctic social science research was a major topic of discussion at a recent meeting of the Interagency Arctic Research Policy Committee. National Science Foundation (NSF) Director Erich Bloch, who chaired the March 27 meeting, used the occasion to offer some words of support for a report that recommends stronger and better coordinated federal support of arctic social science research.

The report, *Arctic Social Science: An Agenda for Action*, was compiled by the Committee on Arctic Social Sciences, an offshoot of the National Research Council's Polar Research Board. It recommends, among other things, that the NSF be given official recognition as the lead agency in coordinating arctic social science research, and that the agency hire a social scientist to manage the overall effort (see Update, February 17, 1989).

At the March 27 meeting, Bloch told the attending agency representatives that each federal agency with an existing or potential role to play in arctic social science should give Agenda for Action serious consideration. Such a report, he said, should not be put on a shelf to collect dust. Bloch further recommended that after thoroughly reviewing the report, relevant
federal agencies should develop a policy statement to address the
issue of arctic social science and help give it the coordinated
structure and direction it now lacks.

In the course of discussion, it was noted that the existence
of an all-encompassing theme might help to improve interagency
social science research. Human dimensions of global climate
change, it was suggested, might serve as such a theme -- an idea
set forth in Agenda for Action. Such an approach could also help
bring social, physical, and biological scientists together in a
common research cause.

Agenda for Action's authors are hoping the report will be
used, at least in part, as a guide in the first biennial revision
of the U.S. Arctic Research Plan, due in July. Agenda for
Action's mention at the March 27 meeting seems a positive
indication that their hopes may be realized.<<

COMMISSION SEeks ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON WORKFORCE QUALITY

The Commission on Workforce Quality and Labor Market
Efficiency will be holding a series of hearings around the
country this spring to help it develop recommendations to improve
the quality and competitiveness of the American work force. The
Commission, appointed by former Secretary of Labor Ann McLaughlin
in July of 1988, is chaired by Richard Schubert, president of the
American Red Cross and a former under-secretary of labor, and
includes 21 members from business, labor, academia, government
and the public.

The Commission is interested in such issues as: incentives
for student achievement; "second chance" education and training
systems; lifetime training and retraining; financing and tax
treatment of education and training; matching of workers to jobs;
 enhancement of labor force participation through flexibility; and
the industrial relations system's efforts to increase
productivity.

The Commission will hold hearings in Irving, Texas, on May
2; Indianapolis on May 4; Philadelphia on May 9; and San
Francisco on May 11. Those who wish to testify must provide
notice of intent. The Commission will accept written statements
in lieu of oral testimony. An announcement of the hearings is
listed in the March 16, 1989, edition of the Federal Register
(pps. 11154-11156). Further information may be obtained from
John R. Beverly, Secretary's Commission on Workforce Quality and
Labor Market Efficiency, Room C-2313, 200 Constitution Avenue,
NW, Washington, DC 20210; 202/523-6836.

A report on what transpires at the hearings will be
available upon request after June 26, 1989. The Commission's
recommendations will be presented to the new labor secretary,
Elizabeth Dole, next Labor Day.<<
SOURCES OF RESEARCH SUPPORT: DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

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 Institutes of Health

The National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (NICHD) and the National Institute on Aging (NIA) are seeking applications for research on the nature, antecedents, and consequences of sense of control over the life course. "Sense of control" refers to people’s interrelated beliefs and expectations about their ability to behave in a way that leads to desired outcomes. It also refers to the environment’s responsiveness to behaviors.

Emphasis will be placed on investigations of the environmental, cultural, social, behavioral, and biomedical antecedents of the emergence, maintenance, and alteration of sense of control from early childhood to the later years of life. Additional emphasis will be directed at specifying the processes by which sense of control produces consequences. Attention will also be focused on developing independent, yet convergent, age-appropriate measurement instruments for use with children, parents, and older adults. Intervention research is encouraged.

Application Procedure: Potential applicants are encouraged to discuss their project with NIA or NICHD staff (preferably through a 3- or 4-page research prospectus) in advance of formal submission. Prospectuses or requests for more details should be sent to the appropriate contact listed below.

Budget: An undetermined amount of support will be provided from the research budgets of the participating agencies.


Deadlines: Deadlines occur on a four-month cycle; the next application receipt deadline is June 1, 1989.

Contacts: Ronald Abeles  Sarah Friedman
Behavioral & Social  Human Learning Branch
Research NICHD, Room 633B
NIA, Building 31 Executive Plaza North
Room 5C-32 Bethesda, MD 20892
Bethesda, MD 20892 301/496-6591 <=
301/496-3136
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SOURCES OF RESEARCH SUPPORT: DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

National Institutes of Health

The National Institute on Aging (NIA) and the National Center for Nursing Research (NCNR) are seeking cooperative agreement applications for research that will help lead to reducing frailty and injury in older people. Specifically, NIA and NCNR are seeking applications for sites to carry out biomedical, behavioral, or environmental intervention studies designed to reduce the loss of functional capabilities and to prevent fall-related injuries in older persons. The agencies also seek candidates for a coordinating center for these interventive studies.

Two related investigative approaches are sought: studies aimed at increasing physical functional capabilities and reducing injuries by improving mobility, strength, and balance; and studies aimed at optimizing health behaviors and/or environmental conditions with the intent of reducing fear of falling, the actual occurrence of falls, consequent injuries, or other negative sequelae. Given the multiple causes of functional impairments and injury risk in old age, individual applications addressing either one or both of these approaches will be accepted for review.

Application Procedure: Potential applicants are encouraged to discuss their project with NIA or NCNR staff in advance of formal submission, either through a telephone conversation or a brief letter giving the title of the proposed project, the principal investigator, and other key participants when known. This letter should be sent to (and further details should be requested from) the appropriate contact listed below. Applications may be requested from the Division of Research Grants, National Institutes of Health, 301/496-7441.

Budget: Up to $2 million in funding is anticipated for the first year, contingent upon the availability of funds.


Contacts:

Marcia Ory
Behavioral and Social Research
NIA, Building 31
Room 5C-32
Bethesda, MD 20892
301/496-3136

Moira Shannon
Health Promotion and Disease Prevention
NCNR, Building 31
Room BIC-02
Bethesda, MD 20892
301/496-0526

Richard Weindruch
Geriatrics Branch
NIA, Building 31
Room 5C-27
Bethesda, MD 20892
301/496-1033
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CONSORTIUM OF SOCIAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATIONS

MEMBERS
American Anthropological Association
American Economic Association
American Historical Association
American Political Science Association
American Psychological Association
American Statistical Association
Association of American Geographers
Association of American Law Schools
Linguistic Society of America

AFFILIATES
American Assembly of Collegiate Schools of Business
American Association for Public Opinion Research
American Educational Research Association
American Society of Criminology
Association for Asian Studies
Association for Social Sciences in Health
Eastern Sociological Society
Federation of State Humanities Councils
Gerontological Society of America
History of Science Society
International Studies Association
Law and Society Association
Midwest Sociological Society
National Council on Family Relations
National Council for the Social Studies
North Central Sociological Association
Northeastern Anthropological Association
Operations Research Society of America
Population Association of America
Regional Science Association
Rural Sociological Society
Social Science History Association
Society for the History of Technology
Society for Research on Adolescence
Society for Research in Child Development
Society for the Scientific Study of Religion
Southern Sociological Society
Southwestern Social Science Association
Speech Communication Association
The Institute of Management Sciences

CONTRIBUTORS
American Council of Learned Societies
Arizona State University
Boston University
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
University of Colorado
Columbia University
Cornell Institute for Social and Economic Research
Cornell University
Duke University
Florida State University
Harvard University
Howard University
University of Illinois
Indiana University
Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan
University of Iowa
University of Maryland
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs, Syracuse University
University of Michigan
University of Minnesota
University of Missouri
National Opinion Research Center
University of Nebraska
New York University
University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill
Northwestern University
Ohio State University
University of Oregon
University of Pennsylvania
Pennsylvania State University
University of Pittsburgh
Princeton University
Rutgers University
Social Science Research Council
University of Southern California
Stanford University
State University of New York at Stony Brook
University of Tennessee, Knoxville
Texas A & M University
Tulane University
University of Virginia
University of Washington
University of Wisconsin, Madison
University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee
Yale University

CONSORTIUM of Social Science Associations
1625 I STREET, N.W., Suite 911, Washington, D.C. 20006

FIRST CLASS