

COSSA WASHINGTON UPDATE

Volume IX, Number 15

August 10, 1990

CLUTTER APPOINTS BBS RESTRUCTURING COMMITTEE *HS*

The National Science Foundation (NSF) has named a 20-person committee to examine the structure of the Biological, Behavioral, and Social Science (BBS) directorate. Appointed by Mary Clutter, assistant NSF director for the BBS directorate, the committee is expected to hold its first meeting in mid to late September; a report is planned for next April.

The new committee grew out of a task force report from a panel of social and behavioral scientists. Chaired by Indiana University psychologist Linda Smith, the task force recommended last March that the BBS Advisory Committee consider a separate directorate for the social and behavioral sciences. (See UPDATE, March 23, 1990.)

In appointing the restructuring committee, Clutter expanded its focus to include a thorough examination of BBS's structure. The directorate currently consists of six divisions: Molecular Biosciences (with \$48 million in funding for FY 1990); Cellular Biosciences (\$57 million); Biotic Systems and Resources (\$67 million); Behavioral and Neural Sciences (\$46 million); Social and Economic Science (\$32 million); and Instrumentation and Resources (\$38 million).

The new committee will examine BBS's organizational structure to evaluate its effectiveness in meeting the current and future needs of BBS disciplines. The committee will also recommend possible organizational changes to improve BBS's response to new opportunities and challenges.

Clutter has invited interested groups to present testimony to the committee, probably in October. For more information on the committee, contact COSSA.

Meanwhile, Reps. Doug Walgren (D-PA) and George E. Brown, Jr. (D-CA) have introduced a bill to create a separate NSF directorate for the social and behavioral sciences. The American Psychological Society, a COSSA Affiliate, has actively supported the measure. The Science, Space, and Technology Committee has scheduled no hearings on the bill, and action seems unlikely in the near future.

BLOCH MAKES VALEDICTORY APPEARANCE BEFORE SENATE COMMERCE COMMITTEE *HS*

Hailing Erich Bloch as one of the most "innovative science policy officials of the post-war era," Sen. Ernest Hollings (D-SC) saluted the outgoing National Science Foundation (NSF) director at an August 2 hearing of the Senate Commerce, Science, and Transportation Committee. Hollings, who chairs the panel, was joined in praising Bloch by Ranking Republican John Danforth (R-MO), Science Subcommittee Chairman Albert Gore (D-TN), and Sen. Jay Rockefeller (D-WV).

Taking the opportunity to reflect on his six years at NSF, Bloch discussed the role of science and technology in the "changing global economy."

INSIDE UPDATE . . .

- Down on the Farm: Agriculture Legislation Includes Social Science Research *HS*
- Senate Takes Up HHS Reauthorization Bills *SC*
- House Panel Examines U.S. Academic Exchange Programs *JT*
- House Passes Foreign Aid Funding; Senate Panel Approves Eastern Europe Aid Legislation *JT*
- Census Bureau Announces 1991 Annual Research Conference *JT*
- Sources of Research Support: Department of Education *KC*

With the world moving toward a "knowledge-based, skill-based economy," he asserted, NSF "is at the very center of what is most important to our society today." Funding for research and education "is no longer simply a public expenditure," he said, "it is an investment in the future fortune of the nation."

During his tenure, Bloch stated, he focused on the revitalization of education and human resources in math, science, and engineering. In 1983, just before Bloch's arrival at NSF, the Reagan administration had abolished the Science and Engineering Education Directorate.

Bloch also noted NSF's increased emphasis on partnerships and leveraged resources. Claiming that "the years of plentiful federal funding for basic research are past," Bloch stressed the continuing need for cooperative arrangements with state governments, the private sector, and other non-profit research sponsors. "A list of all the promising basic research," he warned, "carries a price tag far above what the federal government is able and willing to pay."

Bloch defended his sponsorship of multiple research modes, including groups, centers, and international projects, as well as individual investigators. "NSF," he declared, "is not the captive of individual investigators."

Growing Focus on Economics

Looking to the future, Bloch predicted a growing national emphasis on economics. "In the next

decades, I believe the central focus of U.S. policy is going to be on economics, on our ability to compete in international markets." The result, he ventured, will be more federal support for research and development in the civilian sector.

NSF will continue to focus on education and human resources, he said, helping the president and the governors meet their goal of making the United States "number 1" in science and math by 2000. The years ahead will also see NSF supporting research on generic technologies, he continued, since "the boundary lines between research and technology are shrinking, if not overlapping completely." Bloch also noted the need to improve international cooperation and to develop priorities for research and development.

Although Bloch's post-NSF plans are unclear, most observers expect him to continue as an outspoken force for redoubled efforts in science and technology.

DOWN ON THE FARM: AGRICULTURE LEGISLATION INCLUDES SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH

The social science agenda for rural America and farm problems has evolved in recent years to include research on rural revitalization, as well as studies of markets and trade policy. Last fall's National Academy of Sciences report, *Investing in Research*, included several items from this agenda in its recommendations for a competitive grant program.

So far, the administration and Congress have ignored the recommendations, but the massive farm bill now wending its way through Congress offers a somewhat brighter picture. The House and Senate have both passed versions of the bill, and it now awaits action by a joint conference committee.

The House version of the farm bill, H.R. 3950, provides a competitive grant program to be administered through the Cooperative State Research Service. The program is included, according to a House committee report, "for the purpose of encouraging research and analysis of the social, eco-

CONSORTIUM OF SOCIAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATIONS

Howard J. Silver Executive Director
 Stacey E. Beckhardt Government Liaison
 Joe Thorndike Staff Associate
 Karen E. Carrion Office Manager
 Raymond E. Wolfinger President

The Consortium of Social Science Associations represents more than 185,000 American scientists across the full range of the social and behavioral sciences, functioning as a bridge between the research world and the Washington community. Update is published fortnightly. Individual subscriptions are available from COSSA for \$50; institutional subscriptions, \$90; overseas mail, \$90. ISSN 0749-4394. Address all inquiries to COSSA, 1522 K Street, NW, Suite 836, Washington, DC 20005. Phone: (202) 842-3525 Fax: (202) 842-2788

conomic, and other factors influencing the economic vitality of rural areas." The bill authorizes funding for "such sums as may be necessary" and gives priority to research on enhancing the social and economic vitality of rural areas.

The Senate farm bill, S.2830, does not include specific authorization for rural revitalization research. The bill's report, however, does note that the primary purpose of agricultural research is "to increase employment opportunities in agricultural and rural communities . . . [and] contribute to a more equitable rural, social, and economic structure, while enhancing the social and economic viability and quality of life of rural communities."

The Senate bill also stipulates that research programs "develop rural development strategies and extension programs to disseminate those strategies."

Rural Development Act

The Senate accepted an amendment by Sen. Howell Heflin (D-AL) to include the Rural Development Act in the farm bill. Passed by the Senate last year, the act includes a \$2 million authorization for grants to support "research to improve economic competitiveness and diversification, support strategic planning for economic investments, improve human resources, and improve the data base for rural development decision-making in rural areas."

In addition, the Rural Development Act would allow the Census Bureau to expand its data collection efforts in rural America to include "data on rural employment, poverty and income, and other information concerning the rural labor force." The House version of the Rural Development Act, which passed earlier this year (see UPDATE, April 6, 1990), is included in the House farm bill.

Both farm bills reflect the national research initiative described in *Investing in Research*. The Senate legislation includes "markets, trade, and policy" as part its "high priority research," and the measure notes that increased efforts are needed to develop "optimal strategies for entering and being competitive in overseas markets." The Senate bill also calls for "new approaches to economic development and viability in the rural United States."

The House bill mentions research on "markets, trade and agricultural policy" and also includes "new approaches to economic development and viability in the rural United States, with emphasis on family farming operations" as part of that research agenda.

Both the House and the Senate bills extend the authorization for grants to fund counseling programs for financially strapped farmers and rural families. Such programs would be coordinated with state offices of mental health and rural health. Both bills also provide assistance for local officials and groups that develop income and employment alternatives for displaced farmers; the Senate bill also provides retraining assistance.

Finally, the Senate legislation would strengthen the Extension Service/Forest Service rural revitalization program to help diversify the economic bases of communities hurt by declining timber industries. The House provides special grants to land grant institutions for the study of constraints on agricultural trade.

Appropriations

Despite the success of injecting the social science agenda into reauthorization bills, the bottom line is still found in the appropriations process. The current situation is difficult.

The House Rural Development, Agriculture, and Related Agencies Appropriations Subcommittee, chaired by Rep. Jamie Whitten (D-MS), made its recommendations to the House for FY 1991 funding on July 13. The full House passed the measure on July 18 after rejecting amendments to reduce spending levels across the board.

The Cooperative State Research Service received \$372.8 million, a 10 percent increase over FY 1990 funds. Payments under the Hatch Act formula grant program increased by only 5 percent to \$163.3 million. For Special Research Grants, the increase was slightly more than \$1 million to \$56.1 million. The Competitive Research Grant program received \$73 million. (*Investing in Research* targeted \$500 million for this program and the administration requested \$100 million). Following the administration's lead, the House did not include any funding

for the "Markets, Trade, and Policy" category of the competitive grant program.

The House bill also restricts grant overhead costs to 14 percent, a reduction from the 25 percent limit in the FY 1990 bill. The House legislation further requires that the Agriculture Department submit "a summary of each grant proposal as it is approved, as well as a summary of what each completed grant has accomplished."

In other action, the Economic Research Service received an 8 percent increase over FY 1990 funding to \$54.4 million.

SENATE TAKES UP HHS REAUTHORIZATION BILLS

As Congress prepared to adjourn for its month-long August recess, the Senate took up several measures reauthorizing programs within the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS).

NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH

Reauthorization of the National Institutes of Health (NIH) can be a complicated process. There is no single NIH reauthorization bill; each institute has its own reauthorization schedule.

This year, two major research institutes – the National Cancer Institute and the National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute, as well as the National Library of Medicine and the National Research Service Awards program – were up for consideration. The Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee, chaired by Sen. Edward Kennedy (D-MA), included no surprises when it passed routine reauthorizations on August 1.

Women's Health

Nonetheless, as in past years, the reauthorization bill, S.2857, served as a vehicle to address more controversial issues related to biomedical research. As anticipated, women's health research was a central focus. While the bill emphasizes women in clinical research, it remains unclear how the statutory language will affect other research projects.

Senate attention to women's health was spurred by Sen. Barbara Mikulski (D-MD), who introduced a comprehensive Women's Health Equity Act the day before the Senate panel took action. Mikulski's bill is a companion to a House measure introduced on July 27 by Reps. Patricia Schroeder (D-CO) and Olympia Snowe (R-ME).

While the scientific community and NIH have been generally supportive of congressional interest in this issue, both groups have raised concerns about the Senate committee's specific requirements.

Setting a January 1, 1991 deadline for notification of grantees, the Senate bill codifies existing policy at NIH and the Alcohol, Drug Abuse, and Mental Health Administration to require the inclusion of a statistically valid sample of women and minorities in clinical research projects.

Significantly, the bill would require NIH to issue regulations outlining any allowable exceptions to the policy. According to the bill, exceptions are only allowed if including these populations is inappropriate with respect to health or the purpose of the research. The legislation does, however, allow some discretion to the Secretary of Health and Human Services.

The bill also mandates the establishment of "clinical research equity subcommittees" within each institute's advisory council. The subcommittees are to assess all clinical projects for policy compliance. The HHS secretary, moreover, is vested with the authority to suspend or revoke any clinical study not conducted in accordance with the policy. The bill requires that peer review groups consider the inclusion of women and minorities in evaluations of technical and scientific merit.

An Office of Women's Health Research is established in the office of the NIH director to ensure that women's health needs (including prevention) are identified, addressed, and, if appropriate, coordinated across NIH's intramural and extramural activities. The bill sets up an intramural program of gynecology at the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, as well as a clinical service in gynecology.

The bill also requires the establishment of a Center for Women's Health Research to support research on women's health. The legislation sets a January 1, 1993 deadline for creation of the center.

The Office of Women's Health Research would be advised by two bodies: (1) a coordinating council composed of the directors of all NIH and ADAMHA institutes, centers, offices, and divisions, and (2) a traditional NIH advisory council. The advisory council is instructed to request an Institute of Medicine study on improving women's health research and to prepare biennial reports. The first report, due January 1, 1992, must recommend whether the mandated center should be a freestanding intramural program or an intramural program attached to an existing institute.

The Senate bill requires NIH to compile in a formalized data bank information concerning gender differences and women's health, as well as establishing a registry of on-going clinical studies relevant to women's health.

Foundation for Biomedical Research

In addition to women's health research, the bill addresses NIH and ADAMHA'S increasing difficulty in attracting and retaining senior scientists. The measure establishes a National Foundation for Biomedical Research as a non-profit, independent entity authorized to support endowed scientific positions in the NIH and ADAMHA intramural programs. The foundation would also provide support for the NIH Scholars program.

The legislation requires that the new foundation's board include at least one member representing the general biobehavioral sciences.

Contraception and Infertility Centers

Prior to approval by Kennedy's committee, the bill was amended to add authority for three contraception centers and two infertility centers, as well as for educational loan repayment for scientists in the contraception and infertility fields. The amendment, offered by Sen. Tom Harkin (D-IA), met with considerable opposition from anti-abortion senators. Anti-abortion proponents were able to sustain the NIH moratorium on fetal research.

NATIONAL CENTER FOR HEALTH STATISTICS

On August 4, the Senate passed legislation to reauthorize the National Center for Health Statistics (NCHS) through 1995. The bill includes a section specifically calling for "an annual collection of data from a statistically valid sample concerning the general health, illness, and disability status of the civilian noninstitutionalized population." Although not mentioned by name, the wording accurately describes the National Health Interview Survey (NHIS), an NCHS mainstay for more than 30 years.

Concern over the FY 1991 NCHS appropriation request likely served as the impetus for the statutory language. The proposed budget left NCHS \$9 million short of its FY 1991 commitments, and according to NCHS sources, the agency decided to compensate by taking NHIS out of the field in FY 1991. How the Senate reauthorization language will affect the FY 1991 appropriation remains unclear. The House has yet to act on reauthorization and has deferred appropriation action.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF MENTAL HEALTH

Also on August 4, the Senate passed the Mental Health Amendments of 1990, S. 2628. The measure reauthorizes certain National Institute of Mental Health services demonstration projects, and extends and mandates changes in the State Comprehensive Mental Health Services plan. The bill's impact on research grants is minimal.

HOUSE PANEL EXAMINES U.S. ACADEMIC EXCHANGE PROGRAMS

The House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on International Operations, chaired by Rep. Mervyn M. Dymally (D-CA), convened a hearing August 1 to examine the current operation and future needs of U.S. exchange programs.

Leading off the session's witnesses was Eugene P. Kopp, deputy director of the U.S. Information Agency (USIA). USIA, which oversees most U.S. exchange programs, currently budgets \$154.3 million for such programs.

Kopp outlined a variety of USIA programs, including several focusing on Eastern Europe. Through the Fulbright program, he noted, American studies programs have been introduced throughout the region. Moreover, he said, the John Marshall Study Program will allow more than 50 Eastern European legal scholars, judicial officials, and legislators to study U.S. jurisprudence and American legislative systems.

Kopp went on to describe a variety of programs focusing on Central America, the Caribbean, South Africa, as well as other nations and global regions.

Also testifying was Edwin J. Feulner, Jr., chairman of the U.S. Advisory Commission on Public Diplomacy. Noting that USIA's budget has declined notably since 1986, Feulner singled out Eastern Europe as an example. Funding and staffing for USIA's programs in that region, he contended, have changed little from Cold War levels. He also pointed out a decline in Fulbright Fellowships from 5795 in 1986 to 4000 in 1991.

Feulner went on to support enhancements for USIA public affairs and educational exchange programs. He also called for a reassessment of the agency's funding balance between exchange programs, publications, English teaching, radio and television broadcasting, and other programs; he discouraged "disproportionate emphasis" on broadcasting and exhibits.

Richard W. Dye, executive vice president of the Institute for International Education, outlined the conclusions of EXCHANGE 2000, a project of the Liaison Group for International Educational Exchange. Dye argued for a significant expansion of U.S. exchange programs and called for a White House conference on "Education for U.S. International Competence."

EDITOR'S NOTE

With Congress adjourned until early September, COSSA will cease publication of UPDATE until after Labor Day. Our next issue will be published on September 7.

Dye specifically endorsed recent legislation introduced by Sens. David Boren (D-OK), George Mitchell (D-ME), and Claiborne Pell (D-RI) that would substantially expand USIA's exchange programs over the next four years. S. 2865 would increase funding authority for such programs by \$50 million in 1991, \$100 million in 1992, \$150 million in 1993, and \$200 million in 1994. COSSA has joined other groups in supporting the legislation.

HOUSE PASSES FOREIGN AID FUNDING; SENATE PANEL APPROVES EASTERN EUROPE AID LEGISLATION

President Bush and members of Congress have repeatedly declared their strong commitment to fostering East European democracy. Behind the rhetoric are a collection of specific aid programs, some of which support research and exchange programs for social and behavioral scientists. Two bills to expand these programs are pending in Congress.

In 1989, Congress passed the Support for Eastern European Democracy (SEED) Act. The law authorized \$12 million over the next three years for academic exchange programs to be administered by the United States Information Agency (USIA). The funds were specifically targeted at Poland and Hungary, and most of the money was used for broad-based grant solicitations that brought East European researchers to the United States.

Currently pending before the House is the 1990 version of the SEED Act (known as SEED II). Part of the International Affairs Authorization Act of 1990, the SEED provisions would leave authorized funding for social and behavioral science programs unchanged. The bill does, however, include Czechoslovakia under the SEED provisions and allow for other countries to be included if they pass muster as emerging democracies.

The House version of SEED II, however, departs markedly from its 1989 predecessor in its funding mechanism. While last year's bill allotted money directly to USIA, the 1990 measure provides the money in one lump sum to the Agency for International Development (AID), which can then allocate it to specific agencies. The Bush ad-

ministration favors this approach because it allows the White House maximum flexibility in determining which programs to fund.

The Senate version of SEED II is considerably less generous in the discretion it allows the administration. While using AID as a channel for much of SEED II's funding, the bill also targets support at specific programs, including \$40 million for educational, cultural, and scientific programs. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee approved the \$535 million authorization bill on July 20, but did so without the support of committee Republicans.

Meanwhile, the appropriations process has been less than kind to social science programs authorized under SEED I and II. The House SEED authorization notes that education and cultural spending for FY 1991 should be about \$4 million, but the Foreign Operations appropriations bill (which funds all

SEED programs) includes no money for such expenditures. The Senate spending bill has not yet emerged from committee.

CENSUS BUREAU ANNOUNCES 1991 ANNUAL RESEARCH CONFERENCE

The Census Bureau's 1991 Annual Research Conference will be held March 17-20, 1991 at the Holiday Inn Crowne Plaza in Arlington, VA. The conference will include a wide variety of topics, including longitudinal methodology for survey data, model-based approaches to sampling theory, modeling and measuring nonsampling errors, cognitive and noncognitive aspects of questionnaire design, data collection technologies, and economic measurement methods and issues.

SOURCES OF RESEARCH SUPPORT: DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

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.

Drug Prevention Programs In Higher Education

The Department of Education is offering grants to institutions of higher education to develop "promising new approaches to individual and institutional leadership and responsibility related to drug abuse education and prevention" among college and university students.

The department is particularly interested in papers that develop and articulate new theories, theoretical models, and conceptual approaches on a variety of topics related to individual and institutional leadership and responsibility in drug abuse education and prevention.

Possible fields for exploration include: (1) higher education, (2) psychology, including motivation, character, and responsibility, (3) social psychology, including social deviance, (4) ethics and moral education, (5) health, (6) sociology of organizations, (7) management science, and (8) leadership.

Budget: The Department has budgeted \$90,000 for the grants and expects to grant six awards of up to \$15,000.

Deadline: October 25, 1990

Contact: Donald R. Fischer
FY 1991-C Competition, FIPSE
U.S. Department of Education
400 Maryland Avenue, SW
Washington, DC 20202-5175
Tel: (202) 708-5771

MEMBERS

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

American Psychological Association
American Sociological Association
American Statistical Association

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

AFFILIATES

American Agricultural Economics Association
American Assembly of Collegiate Schools of Business
American Association for Public Opinion Research
American Educational Research Association
American Psychological Society
American Society of Criminology
Association for Asian Studies
Association for Social Sciences in Health
Eastern Sociological Society
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 American Regional Science Council
North Central Sociological Association
Northeastern Anthropological Association
Operations Research Society of America
Population Association of America

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 for Management Sciences

CONTRIBUTORS

American Council of Learned Societies
American University
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
Cornell Institute for Social and Economic Research
Cornell University
Duke University
Florida State University
University of Georgia
Harvard University
Howard University

University of Illinois
Indiana University
Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan
University of Iowa
Johns Hopkins University
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
Pennsylvania State University
University of Pittsburgh
Princeton University
Purdue University
Rutgers University
Social Science Research Council
University of Southern California
Stanford University
State University of New York, 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

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