Early in the morning of October 5, the House of Representatives rejected the budget deal negotiated by White House and congressional leaders. The compromise, which would have cut $40 billion from the FY 1991 deficit, failed by a vote of 197-254, reflecting a bipartisan rebuff of both President Bush and congressional leaders. Voting against the bill were 105 of the House's 176 Republicans and 149 of the chamber's 257 Democrats.

Washington awakes this morning to ask: what now? If action is not completed on a new continuing resolution, the government will be forced to shut down a wide variety of functions after the current resolution expires October 5. Failure to pass the stopgap measure will trigger automatic—and much-dreaded—40 percent cuts in all programs. Moreover, the federal government's authority to borrow money also expires October 5 since the debt ceiling has not been increased.

President Bush has threatened to veto any further continuing resolutions, thus chastising Congress for failing to accept the budget deal and creating fiscal chaos. If sequestration occurs, the impact on research funding will be severe. How long the sequestration will last and whether a new deal will be cut remains to be seen. Stay tuned!

NSF APPROPRIATIONS BILL PASSES SENATE; REPORT NOTES SEPARATE DIRECTORATE ISSUE

The FY 1991 appropriations bill for the National Science Foundation (NSF) passed the Senate on October 3. After approving the bill by a vote of 90-8, the Senate sent the measure to a conference committee for negotiations with House legislators.

The committee report accompanying the bill directs NSF to examine "recommendations that NSF create a separate directorate and increase funding for psychology, behavioral science, and social science. The report asks the foundation to respond to the committee's directive by January 31, 1991.

The VA-HUD-Independent Agencies Appropriations Subcommittee, chaired by Sen. Barbara Mikulski (D-MD), also included report language directing NSF to maintain its commitment to archaeological research activities at a minimum of FY 1990 funding levels.

In addition, the panel's comments on the Education and Human Resources Directorate note that "the behavioral sciences can provide important information that will help educators improve the way in which we teach and learn about science and technology."

HUD Provisions

The subcommittee's bill also provides the Office of Policy Research and Development (OPDR) in the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) with an appropriation of $27 million for FY 1991. Like the House, the Senate committee rejected HUD Secretary Jack Kemp's proposal to transfer $25 million from programs to pay for enhanced program evaluation and monitoring ac-
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tivities at OPDR. The committee instead allocated $10 million for these activities, while increasing the total funding for the office by $6.5 million from its FY 1990 level. The House appropriated $30 million overall, and $8 million for program evaluation.

SENATE BILL SETS FUNDING FOR RURAL POLICY RESEARCH

The Senate agriculture appropriations bill, passed on September 25, includes a special grant of $750,000 to establish a rural policy research institute at the universities of Arkansas, Missouri and Nebraska. According to the report of the Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies Subcommittee, chaired by Sen. Quentin Burdick (D-ND), the institute will "assemble, analyze, and package, for policymakers, information on the numerous factors that shape the economic and social well-being of rural America so that this information can be used by policymakers to fashion government programs to meet the needs of rural areas." There are no funds for the institute in the House bill.

In other action, the Senate allocated $161.3 million for Hatch Act payments, $2.1 million less than the House appropriation but $6.2 million more than FY 1990 funding. The Senate also appropriated $73 million for the competitive grants program, as did the House. Again following the House's lead, the Senate did not include "markets, trade and policy" as one of the areas within the competitive grants program. The National Research Council, in its Investing in America report, called for federal support of such research.

NIH REAUTHORIZATION MOVES QUIETLY THROUGH HOUSE, BUT BUSH THREATENS A VETO

Surprisingly, a bill introduced by Rep. Henry Waxman (D-CA) to reauthorize the National Institutes of Health has so far skirted controversy in the House. Observers await the "fireworks" expected from conservative Republicans, most notably Rep. William Dannemeyer (R-CA).

Moreover, the administration has threatened to veto the measure, which deals with such contentious issues as fetal tissue transplantation, women's health, contraception and infertility, and scientific conflict of interest.

The bill moved through Waxman's Health and the Environment Subcommittee to approval by the full Energy and Commerce Committee on September 26. The legislation encountered little substantive discussion in either panel. The subcommittee vote was unanimous (with several abstentions), and while the full committee vote was closer, it still yielded an approval. The latter vote came on the heels of a letter of opposition from HHS Secretary Louis Sullivan to committee chairman John Dingell (D-MI).

It remains unclear whether the bill will be brought to the House floor this session. The Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee, chaired by Sen. Edward M. Kennedy (D-MA), passed a similar measure on August 1, but the bill has received no further attention (see UPDATE, August 10, 1990).

Differences With Senate

The House reauthorization bill differs from its Senate counterpart in several ways. Provisions concerning women's health research are far less restrictive, having been changed in response to input from a number of scientific organizations, including COSSA and the Association of American Universities.

Most notably, the plan for an NIH center on women's health research has been dropped. The provision requiring a sample adequate to allow a statistically valid assessment of gender and minority differences has been modified to allow exceptions when scientific evidence suggests that no such differences exist.
MEDICINE INSTITUTE REPORTS ON HEALTH SCIENCE RESEARCH FUNDS

Research training and facility improvement—not research projects grants—should receive a greater proportion of federal funds. That, at least, was the recent advice of a panel from the Institute of Medicine (IOM).

The Committee on Policies for Allocating Health Sciences Research Funds offered its recommendation at a September 27 symposium. A full report, Funding Health Sciences Research: A Strategy to Restore Balance, will be released on November 9, about two years after its initiation.

The IOM committee was charged with examining current funding trends in the health sciences and with devising strategies for balancing support among various public and private mechanisms. The committee's dual charge, however, was punctuated by a strong caveat from IOM President Samuel Thier, who warned that a simple recommendation for more money was not adequate.

The report follows a June meeting, jointly sponsored by IOM and the National Academy of Sciences, on near-term problems in biomedical research funding (see UPDATE, June 29, 1990). The concerns raised at that forum suggested a funding crisis for new awards, and participants warned of the deleterious effect tight money is having on the next generation of scientists. The IOM panel echoed these views in its report.

Federal Support Falls

According to the panel's calculations (in both constant and current dollars), the past decade has seen a progressive rise in overall support for the health sciences, with most new money coming from the private sector. In contrast, the panel noted a decrease in the proportion of research funding offered by the National Institutes of Health (NIH) and the Alcohol, Drug Abuse, and Mental Health Administration (ADAMHA).

The panel also noted a significant increase in the number of grant applications submitted for review. Despite growth in the system generally, the committee found that the percentage of successful grants has declined during the past three years.

Committee chair Floyd Bloom, of the department of neuropharmacology at the Research Institute of Scripps Clinic, led the symposium discussion, emphasizing the committee's concern that the number of trainees "has not incremented with growth in the research enterprise." Brookings Institution economist Henry Aaron called for a modest shift in budgetary resources from current research activities to the long term development of human and physical "capital."

On behalf of the committee, Aaron provided several scenarios for re-balancing allocations based on assumptions of zero to 4 percent annual real growth. Under zero growth, the committee's proposals would cut 60 NIH research project grants per year for the next decade, allowing approximately 5000 new and competing awards annually.

The plan would also shift 0.2 percent of available funds, assuming zero percent growth, to training. This action would increase the pool of investigators by about 400 per year, still less than the number anticipated to leave the health sciences. The panel made several recommendations for recruiting young people into the health sciences, including an effort by the National Science Foundation to provide undergraduates with health sciences experiences.

Infrastructure Recommendations

The committee recommended a doubled investment to rebuild the scientific infrastructure. The panel also called for the establishment of a competitive grants matching fund and changes in the methods by which indirect costs are negotiated. The infrastructure recommendation relies on some new money, and the panel made clear that adequate improvements could not be made in this arena without additional funds.

Aaron noted that an increase of 8 percent in real growth would be required to return NIH to a 35 percent grant approval rate (assuming the number and size of grants remain constant).

As a means of broadening access to federal funds, the committee proposed a pilot program at NIH and ADAMHA to allow funding on a sliding scale based on priority scores rather than the current system of "all-or-none" funding. The concept, quite controversial in the biomedical research community, has surfaced in the past. According to some observers, this version is greatly improved because it allows for a cut in the scope of the proposal consistent with the size of the funding cut. Others remain skeptical.
An underlying theme of the panel's report is the need for improved coordination in policy and priority development. The committee calls for a health sciences subcommittee of the Federal Coordinating Council for Science, Engineering, and Technology in the Office of Science and Technology Policy. Additionally, the panel suggested the formation of an informal forum to facilitate communication among government, universities, and industry.

**NICHID COUNCIL REVIEWS DEMOGRAPHIC AND BEHAVIORAL RESEARCH PROGRAM**

The Demographic and Behavioral Sciences Branch of the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (NICHID) highlighted its research program during a September 17 meeting. The session was part of the National Advisory Child Health and Human Development Council's routine program review.

Branch Chief Wendy Baldwin led the discussion, focusing primarily on research related to contraceptive behavior and adolescent childbearing. She pointed to several troublesome trends, including the increased use of sterilization as a form of contraception and significant increases in adolescent pregnancies. Baldwin stressed that knowledge alone is inadequate to alter contraceptive and sexual behavior. To understand better what interventions produce behavior change, she said, researchers must design large-scale studies that pull together different theoretical models and a broad variety of potential variables.

Larry Bumpass, president of the Population Association of America, a COSSA Affiliate, provided an extensive overview on research on the changing nature of family life. As radical as some changes in the family may appear, he noted, most are continuations of long-term trends. Bumpass singled out marital disruption as the factor that most influences the family.

**OERI POISED TO ANNOUNCE CENTER AWARD RECIPIENTS**

The Education Department's Office of Educational Research and Improvement is poised to announce seven recipients for its research and development center awards. The official announcement is expected early next week.

Listed below are the primary award recipients. (All awards are for five years):

- Center on Education in the Inner Cities – Temple University ($7.4 million)
- Center on Families, Communities, and Children's Learning – Boston University ($6.3 million)
- Center on Adult Literacy – University of Pennsylvania ($10.2 million)
- Center on Organization and Restructuring of School – ($7.2 million)
- Center on Teacher Performance Evaluation and Educational Accountability – Western Michigan University ($5.2 million)
- Center on Education Quality of the Workforce – University of Pennsylvania ($6.5 million)
- Center on Science Teaching and Learning – Ohio State University ($6.9 million)

Ten additional research and development center awards will be announced later this year.

---

**JOINT COMMITTEE OFFERS U.S.-SPANISH RESEARCH FELLOWSHIPS**

The U.S.-Spanish Joint Committee for Cultural and Educational Cooperation is seeking applications for advanced research grants. In past years, the program has covered fields in the humanities, natural sciences, and social sciences. For details about the fields covered in the 1991-92 program, contact the address below.

Applicants must be U.S. citizens at the postdoctoral or equivalent professional level and must demonstrate competence in oral and written Spanish.

**Deadline:** January 1. For information and application forms, contact the Council for International Exchange of Scholars, 3400 International Drive, NW, Suite M-500, Box NEWS, Washington, DC 20008-3097. Phone: (202) 686-6242.
NewsBriefs

Campbell Nomination on Hold While Committee Asks Questions

The nomination of W. Glenn Campbell to the National Science Board has been placed on hold. Although the Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee, chaired by Sen. Edward M. Kennedy (D-MA), cleared the nomination on September 12, the full Senate has not acted on the appointment.

Kennedy's panel has asked Campbell to respond in writing to a series of questions concerning the social and behavioral sciences. In comments to the media, Campbell has suggested that the social sciences should not receive research support from the National Science Foundation.

Judd Resigns as Mental Health Institute Director

Lewis Judd announced September 27 that he intends to step down as the director of the National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH). The resignation is expected to take effect in mid-October, but a replacement has yet to be named.

During his tenure at NIMH, Judd was known as a strong proponent of neuroscience research. He is returning to the University of California at San Diego, where he will resume his former post as chairman of the school's psychiatry department.

House Panel Considers Education Research on 'At-Risk' Students

"Young African-American males are in serious trouble in this country," according to Rep. Major Owens (D-NY), chairman of the House Subcommittee on Select Education. With more black males in their twenties in prisons than in colleges, a crisis grips the African-American community, Owens stated.

During a September 27 hearing, Owens' subcommittee explored how education can help alleviate this crisis. Owens himself has proposed the creation of an Institute for the Education of At-Risk Students. The new agency would conduct research and demonstration initiatives to provide assistance to schools with predominantly "at-risk" students, such as economically disadvantaged minorities, bilingual individuals, and persons living in high-poverty rural areas.

Among those testifying at the hearing was W. Curtis Banks, a psychologist from Howard University, and Geneva Gay, from Purdue University's School of Education.

Geography Week Slated for November 11-17

Congress has declared November 11-17 to be Geography Awareness Week. The Senate and House passed the resolution in late September and called upon President Bush to proclaim the observance.

The joint resolution notes a disturbing trend away from geographic studies in colleges and universities. The measure's preamble specifically warns that "departments of geography are being eliminated from institutes of higher learning in the United States, thus endangering the discipline of geography in this country."

The resolution's main sponsors were Sens. Bill Bradley (D-NJ) and Nancy Landon Kassebaum (R-KS).

Aaron Tapped to Direct Economic Studies at Brookings Institution

Henry Aaron, author of numerous studies on the social security system and health care financing, has been named to replace Charles Schultze as director of economic studies at the Brookings Institution, a major Washington think tank.

Aaron, a former member of the COSSA Board of Directors, is also the editor of Setting National Priorities: Policy for the Nineties. Schultze, head of the Council of Economic Advisers during President Carter's tenure and chief of the Bureau of the Budget under Lyndon Johnson, has helped COSSA as a strong advocate of social science research.

Editor's Note

With this issue, UPDATE inaugurates the NewsBriefs page, a new home for announcements and short news stories. If you have an announcement that you think our readers would like to see, send it to COSSA. While we cannot publish all items, we will try to include as many as possible.
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.

Mid-Career Teacher Training Program

The Mid-Career Teacher Training Program seeks applications for 1991 awards. Intended to promote the establishment of training programs for people moving to teaching from another career, awards are available to educational institutions that maintain a department or school of education.

Award recipients will establish and maintain a program of mid-career training that prepares individuals for teacher certification requirements. Programs should be designed for career changers who already hold a baccalaureate or advanced degree and have job experience in education-related fields of study. Such fields include: pre-school and early childhood education; military education or training; business education or training; and other education experience in fields facing teacher shortages.

Proposed programs must include at least the following elements:

- a screening mechanism to assure that individuals admitted to the program possess the current subject knowledge and characteristics that would make them likely to succeed as classroom teachers;
- a clear set of program goals and expectations for participants;
- a curriculum that will provide participants with the skills and credentials to teach in specific subject areas.

The Mid-Career program has been developed with the cooperation and assistance of the local business community and will be operated under a cooperative agreement between the institution and one or more state or local educational agencies. The program must also be designed and operated with the active participation of qualified teachers (including early childhood education specialists) and will include an inservice training component and follow-up assistance.

Eligible Applicants: Institutions of higher education, as defined by section 1201(a) of the Higher Education Act, with a school or department of education are eligible to apply for a grant under this program.

Budget: The department has made $987,000 available for this program and expects to grant 10 awards. Awards will range from $80,000 to $100,000, with the mean award about $98,700.

Deadline: November 30, 1990:

Contact: Joseph Vaughan
U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
555 New Jersey Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20208-5643
Phone: (202) 357-6187 (before October 26)
(202) 219-2187 (after October 26)
SOURCES OF RESEARCH SUPPORT: ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

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.

Office of Exploratory Research

The Office of Exploratory Research (OER) seeks grant applications for projects involving exploratory environmental research in biology, health, chemistry, physics, engineering, or socioeconomics. Projects may focus on any aspect of pollution identification, characterization, abatement or control. Alternatively, research may address the effects of pollutants on human health or the environment. Finally, OER welcomes projects on environmental policy and its social and economic consequences.

Proposals must feature investigative research. Unacceptable proposals include: state-of-the-art or market surveys; development of proven concepts; and the preparation of materials and documents, including process designs or instruction manuals.

Application Procedure: Application forms, instructions, and other pertinent information are available in the EPA Research Grants Application/Information Kit. Kits are available from:

Grants Operations Branch, Grants Administration Division (PM-216F)
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
401 M Street, SW
Washington, DC 20460
Phone: (202) 382-5266

Eligible Applicants: Non-profit and educational institutions, and state or local governments are eligible under all existing authorizations. Profit-making firms are eligible only under certain laws, and then under restrictive conditions, including the absence of any profit from the project.

Budget: OER's typically grants approximately $100,000 per year for two or three years. Funding levels range from a minimum of about $40,000 to approximately $150,000 per year. The maximum project period is three years, but shorter periods are encouraged.

Review Process: Peer review

Deadlines and Contacts: Applicants should contact the appropriate individuals identified below for further information on schedules and review procedures. All individuals may be reached at: Office of Exploratory Research (RD-675), U.S. Environmental Agency, 401 M Street, SW, Washington, DC 20460.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>Application Closing Date</th>
<th>Contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>October 19, 1990</td>
<td>Clyde Bishop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>April 12, 1991</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socio-economics</td>
<td>March 22, 1991</td>
<td>Robert Papetti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>September 20, 1991</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEMBERS</td>
<td>AFFILIATES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Anthropological Association</td>
<td>American Agricultural Economics Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Economic Association</td>
<td>American Assembly of Collegiate Schools of Business</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Historical Association</td>
<td>American Association for Public Opinion Research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Political Science Association</td>
<td>American Educational Research Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Psychological Association</td>
<td>American Psychological Society</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Society of Criminology</td>
<td>American Society for Criminology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association for Asian Studies</td>
<td>Association for Social Sciences in Health</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association for the History of Science</td>
<td>Eastern Sociological Society</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerontological Society of America</td>
<td>History of Science Society</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History of Science Society</td>
<td>Howard University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Council of Learned Societies</td>
<td>Indiana University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American University</td>
<td>Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona State University</td>
<td>Johns Hopkins University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston University</td>
<td>University of Iowa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California, Berkeley</td>
<td>University of Illinois</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California, Los Angeles</td>
<td>University of Maryland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California, San Diego</td>
<td>Massachusetts Institute of Technology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California, Santa Barbara</td>
<td>Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs, Syracuse University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carnegie-Mellon University</td>
<td>University of Michigan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences</td>
<td>University of Minnesota</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Chicago</td>
<td>University of Nebraska</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Colorado</td>
<td>University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell Institute for Social and Economic Research</td>
<td>Northwestern University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duke University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emory University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida State University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Georgia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvard University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Psychological Association</td>
<td>Association of American Geographers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Sociological Association</td>
<td>Association of American Law Schools</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Statistical Association</td>
<td>Linguistic Society of America</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTRIBUTORS</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Council of Learned Societies</td>
<td>Howard University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American University</td>
<td>Indiana University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona State University</td>
<td>Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston University</td>
<td>Johns Hopkins University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California, Berkeley</td>
<td>University of Iowa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California, Los Angeles</td>
<td>University of Maryland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California, San Diego</td>
<td>Massachusetts Institute of Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California, Santa Barbara</td>
<td>Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs, Syracuse University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carnegie-Mellon University</td>
<td>University of Michigan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences</td>
<td>University of Minnesota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Chicago</td>
<td>University of Nebraska</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Colorado</td>
<td>University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell Institute for Social and Economic Research</td>
<td>Northwestern University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duke University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emory University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida State University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Georgia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvard University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio State University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania State University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Pittsburgh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Princeton University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purdue University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutgers University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Science Research Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Southern California</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanford University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State University of New York, Stony Brook</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Tennessee, Knoxville</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas A &amp; M University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tulane University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Virginia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Washington</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Wisconsin, Madison</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yale University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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