

COSSA WASHINGTON UPDATE

Volume IX, Number 8

May 4, 1990

BUDGET RESOLUTION PASSES HOUSE, SENATE COMMITTEE; BUSH NEGOTIATIONS SET TO BEGIN *HS*

In a close vote, the House of Representatives approved on May 1 its version of the FY 1991 federal budget. The measure, which passed 218-208, found no Republican support. GOP legislators declined, however, to offer President Bush's budget plan as an alternative. Republican Whip Newt Gingrich (GA) said the Bush budget has been superseded by events since its January submission to Congress.

Meanwhile, the Senate Budget Committee approved its fiscal blueprint May 2. Both the House and Senate resolutions set spending levels by government function. These levels serve as parameters for the appropriating committees as they set about determining agency and program budgets.

With agreement on a Democratic fiscal plan, negotiations with the White House will now begin in earnest. Bush has already invited congressional leaders to begin hammering out a compromise budget. According to Bush, early talks will concern the "process" of future negotiations.

With Democratic leaders reluctant to take the lead in politically painful negotiations, the House resolution includes an explicit call for White House cooperation. In splendid bureaucratese, the resolution states: "the President and the bipartisan congressional leadership should ultimately agree on a substantial, multi-year deficit reduction package and the reconciliation of revenues mandated by this resolution will not be advanced legislatively unless and until such time as there is bipartisan agreement with the President of the United States on specific legislation to meet or exceed such reconciliation requirements."

Budget talks are likely to focus on the economic assumptions underlying revenue and spending es-

timates in the various budget plans. Other major topics for discussion are the size of defense budget cuts and the size and nature of necessary revenue increases.

Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Director Richard Darman has admitted that the economic assumptions underpinning the administration's budget proposal have proven to be overly optimistic. Since both the House and the Senate budget committee adopted the OMB figures, none of the three proposed budgets is likely to meet the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings deficit target of \$64 billion. Without a workable budget agreement, another sequestration (across-the-board reduction) looms large on the budget horizon.

The Senate figure for FY 1991 defense outlays is more than \$12 billion less than Bush requested and \$1.7 billion below the House number. (Outlays are the important figure for estimating the deficit and the allocations to the appropriations committees.)

The House and Senate both envision revenue hikes of \$13.9 billion, but the nuts and bolts behind this figure are left to the House Ways and Means and the Senate Finance committees. Ways and

Inside Update . . .

- COSSA Executive Director Testifies on NSF Funding *HS*
- House Panel Ponders Death Penalty Discrimination *JT*
- PHS Holds Workshop on Data Sharing and Management *SA*
- New OIRA Director Named; Paperwork Act Stalled *HS*
- House Panel Considers NEH Reauthorization *JT*
- Sources of Research Support: National Institute of Mental Health *KP*
- Congressional Fellowships Offered For Social Scientists (Part 2) *KP*

Means Chairman Rep. Dan Rostenkowski (D-IL) has stated publicly that he will not convene his committee to work on a tax package "without a bipartisan agreement that includes the President of the United States." Rostenkowski, who presented his own budget deficit reduction plan weeks ago, argued that the House used "too many budget gimmicks to reach the Gramm-Rudman deficit target of \$64 billion."

Both the House and Senate resolutions reduce the requested FY 1991 outlays for the Science Function (#250) by \$610 million. The House committee report assumes this reduction will come largely from the administration's proposed budget boost for NASA; the National Science Foundation, according to the report, should be fully funded. The science function reduction may, however, hinder the appropriations committees' ability to fully fund the NSF request.

Both resolutions provide extra funding for the Education function (#500) and the Health function (#550), with the House a little more generous than the Senate.

COSSA EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR TESTIFIES ON NSF FUNDING

COSSA Executive Director Howard J. Silver testified before a House appropriations panel on May 3, calling for increased funding of social and behavioral science programs at the National Science

CONSORTIUM OF SOCIAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATIONS

Howard J. Silver Executive Director
 Stacey E. Beckhardt Government Liaison
 Joe Thorndike Staff Associate
 Karen E. Carrion Office Manager
 Katherine L. Pringle Intern

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.

Foundation (NSF). Rep. Lindy Boggs (D-LA) chaired the Subcommittee on Veteran's Affairs, Housing and Urban Development, and Independent Agencies; subcommittee chairman Robert Traxler (D-MI) was absent from the hearing.

Silver asked the panel to support the full 14.4 percent NSF increase proposed in the President's FY 1991 budget. Silver particularly stressed the need to appropriate the 13.3 percent requested increase for research and related activities. Citing ten years of stagnant funding for NSF's core social and behavioral science programs, Silver urged the subcommittee to increase overall funding so that these programs can receive significant increases. The social and behavioral science community is increasingly unhappy with NSF, Silver said, and support is growing for consideration of a separate NSF directorate for these disciplines.

Echoing presidential science adviser Allan Bromley's sentiments, (see UPDATE April 20, 1990), Silver noted the vital role of social and behavioral science in global warming research. Funding for research on the human dimensions of global change, Silver added, is still only 5 percent of the NSF budget commitment in this area.

Silver pointed out that global change research includes study of recent events in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union. NSF-supported social and behavioral scientists are currently studying the attitudes of East Bloc citizens toward democratization.

Silver went on to call for increased participation by social and behavioral scientists in NSF's science education programs. Praising efforts to enhance science education, Silver called particular attention to *Project 2061*, sponsored by the American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS). The AAAS program recognizes the importance of social and behavioral sciences in pre-college science curricula. Silver asked the subcommittee to encourage similar recognition in NSF science education programs.

HOUSE PANEL PONDERES DEATH PENALTY DISCRIMINATION

As gubernatorial candidates around the nation compete for the title of most zealous executioner, some Washington politicians are seeking to sharply limit death penalty sentencing. Bills pending in both the House and Senate would require that death penalty imposition be free of racial bias. The administration opposes the proposed legislation.

In a May 3 hearing before the House Judiciary Subcommittee on Civil and Constitutional Rights, chaired by Rep. Don Edwards (D-CA), Assistant Attorney General Edward S.G. Dennis, Jr. attacked a February report from the General Accounting Office (GAO) that identified patterns of racial discrimination in capital punishment. The GAO report evaluated existing social science research to determine whether such studies indicate racial discrimination. The studies included research by University of Iowa law professor David C. Baldus, who testified at the hearing.

According to GAO, existing research reveals racial disparities in the charging, sentencing, and imposition of the death penalty. Lowell Dodge, director of the GAO Administration of Justice Issues program, told the committee that 82 percent of the studies evaluated found discrimination based on race of victim; killers of white victims were substantially more likely to receive the death penalty than killers of black victims. "This finding was remarkably consistent across data sets, states, collection techniques and quality of studies," according to Dodge's testimony.

Dennis, however, attacked the GAO findings. "The weight of reliable empirical study indicates that legally relevant factors overwhelmingly account for apparent disparities relating to the race of the victim or the offender," he said. While noting the impact of legal factors, GAO's report maintains that such influences do not fully explain racial disparities.

Dennis went on to argue that even if the GAO's conclusions were correct, the appropriate response would be to seek more consistent application of the death penalty across racial lines.

Rep. John Conyers (D-MI), sponsor of H.R. 4618, the Racial Justice Act, pressed Dennis on his objections to the GAO report. In particular, Conyers sought to uncover the Justice Department official responsible for negatively evaluating the GAO report. Told that Bureau of Justice Statistics Acting Director Joseph Bessette had done the evaluation, Conyers asked for a copy of his conclusions. Dennis insisted that no such report exists.

PHS HOLDS WORKSHOP ON DATA SHARING AND MANAGEMENT

Should research data be shared? If so, when, to whom, in what format, and at what cost? Who owns the data from publicly sponsored research?

Scientists, university administrators, representatives from industry and scientific associations, and federal agency staff wrestled with these and other tough questions at a two-day workshop sponsored by the Office of Health Planning and Evaluation of the Public Health Service (PHS). The April 25-26 meeting was convened by the Office of Scientific Integrity Review (OSIR), recently established to handle scientific misconduct issues for PHS.

Assistant Secretary for Health James Mason, in opening remarks to workshop participants, stated that the goal of the meeting was "to initiate dialogue ... not to come up with rigid prescriptions" on issues related to data ownership, retention, access, and sharing. Both Mason and OSIR Director Lyle Bivens emphasized that the focus should be on the responsible conduct of research. Despite repeated claims to the contrary, attendees remained somewhat skeptical throughout the workshop that scientific misconduct and the possibility of regulations were not, in fact, the driving force behind the meeting.

From the outset, meeting participants interpreted their mandate broadly. Biomedical research was defined to include "clinical, basic, behavioral, and epidemiological research in the health domain." Subsequently, the term "behavioral" was clarified to ensure that its scope included the breadth of disciplines within the social and behavioral sciences. Speakers and other participants represented a broad spectrum of disciplines; the social and behavioral

sciences, particularly psychology, were well represented.

The workshop was structured to facilitate discussion, with participants meeting in small breakout sessions. One such session focused on behavioral research and was co-chaired by Gary VandenBos, acting executive director for science at the American Psychological Association, and Martha Storandt, professor of psychology at Washington University. COSSA Government Liaison Stacey Beckhardt served as rapporteur for that session.

The meeting's bias clearly favored data sharing and open communication among scientists. During the behavioral research session, two basic, overarching principles were endorsed:

- "Access to data is open, although restrictions may be required in limited circumstances. However, there is no compelling need or expectation to share data prior to publication."
- "Data and relevant documentation should be retained for a fixed period following the first publication of findings. Use of an appropriate and recognized data repository is an acceptable alternative to personal retention by the investigator. All retention should be sensitive to issues of confidentiality."

Support for these principles was tempered by a recognition that many unanswered questions remain – issues related to timing (e.g., how soon after publication should the original scientist relinquish sole access to data and how long should data be retained); standards for citation and the documentation of procedures and data; training of young investigators in the use of these standards; special concerns with longitudinal research; credentials, skills, and motives of the requestor; and disciplinary differences.

The meeting ended with many ideas shared and some consensus achieved. At least two messages were clearly expressed: further regulation is unwarranted at this point and data sharing should be encouraged. Attendees made several specific recommendations which ranged from holding a PHS workshop on data archiving to encouraging professional societies to take a lead role in developing standards

for and educating their disciplines about data management. However, no consensus was reached on data ownership issues. Just how PHS will implement the recommendations or foster consensus on unresolved issues is unclear.

Data management has also drawn the attention of the National Research Council's Committee on National Statistics. The committee, in conjunction with the Social Science Research Council, convened a panel last year on confidentiality and data access. The panel, which held its second meeting on April 27-28, will sponsor several conferences and meetings during the next two years. The group will ultimately prepare a report detailing its findings.

NEW OIRA DIRECTOR NOMINATED; PAPERWORK ACT STALLED

President Bush has tapped James F. Blumstein to be the administration's point man on information policy. Blumstein, a law professor at Vanderbilt University, was nominated April 24 to head the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs (OIRA) at the Office of Management and Budget (OMB). Blumstein would succeed Jay Plager, a former Indiana University law professor who was elevated to the Court of Appeals last year.

OIRA administers the Paperwork Reduction Act, the Office of Statistical Policy, and general information management policies. The office also implements the administration's regulatory reform efforts.

Blumstein, a 1970 graduate of Yale University law school, has chaired the Association of American Law Schools' Law and Medicine section. He has also served as consultant to the President's Commission for the Study of Ethical Problems in Medicine and Biomedical and Behavioral Research.

On a related front, reauthorization of the Paperwork Reduction Act remains stalled in the Senate. The Governmental Affairs Committee, chaired by Sen. John Glenn (D-OH), has tried unsuccessfully to mark up the Senate bill (S. 1742) during the past two months. The small business community, with the help of Sen. Sam Nunn (D-GA), is attempting to reduce the bill's restrictions on OMB's regulatory powers.

HOUSE PANEL CONSIDERS NEH REAUTHORIZATION

Making the requisite rounds, National Endowment for the Humanities chairwoman Lynne Cheney moved to the House side of the Capitol last week, restating her case for the endowment's reauthorization. Speaking before the House Education and Labor Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education, chaired by Rep. Pat Williams (D-MT), Cheney restated her opposition to grant restrictions and graduate student financial aid.

The continuing controversy over grantmaking at the National Endowment for the Arts still haunts NEH hearings. Cheney, however, voiced confidence in the endowment's grant procedures. Applications contain sufficient detail, she said, to forestall any inappropriate grants. Cheney's position found a sympathetic audience with both panel members and fellow witnesses.

Reflecting the delicate balance required of administration witnesses during appropriations discussions, Cheney voiced a cautious desire for more endowment funding. "I would like to see modest but substantial increases in the years ahead," she told the committee. When asked whether current

budgets force the endowment to turn away deserving applicants, Cheney was equally careful in her wording. "For the most part, we are able to provide funding for those projects which, through the review process, have been judged excellent."

The only point of real contention at the hearing involved the question of graduate financial aid. Cheney has consistently rejected the likelihood of a future shortage in humanities Ph.D.s. Encouraging graduate students would be unfair, she argued, since the job market is not likely to make room for them. Cheney opposed suggestions that NEH make money available to support doctoral candidates.

A variety of witnesses joined Cheney in testifying before the committee, including Stanford University's Richard Lyman, testifying on behalf of the National Humanities Alliance and the Association of American Universities. Lyman echoed Cheney's opposition to grant restrictions, but went on to support graduate financial aid. Stanley Katz, president of the American Council of Learned Societies, a COSSA Contributor, also testified on behalf of the National Humanities Alliance.

The NEH reauthorization legislation is currently scheduled for a May 16 mark-up session.

SOURCES OF RESEARCH SUPPORT: THE NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH

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.

NIMH is offering grants for research on mental disorders among rural Americans. The institute seeks greater understanding in the area of the mental health problems associated with rural areas. Research is also needed on ways to organize effective services for rural populations.

Application Procedure: Support for Research that does not include funds for demonstration services may be requested through applications for a regular research grant (R01), small grant (R03), First Independent Research Support and Transition (FIRST) Award (R29), or Center Grant (P50). Support for research demonstrations that include funds for services may be requested through applications for research demonstration grants (R18).

Contact: Ann A. Hohmann or Charles Windle
Division of Biometry and Applied Sciences, NIMH
Biometric and Clinical Applications Branch
Room 18-14, 5600 Fishers Lane
Rockville, MD 20857
Telephone: (301) 443-3364 or (301) 433-4233

CONGRESSIONAL FELLOWSHIPS OFFERED FOR SOCIAL SCIENTISTS

In the April 20 issue of UPDATE, COSSA spotlighted a variety of congressional fellowships, most sponsored by Consortium members. This week, COSSA focuses on two other types of congressional fellowships: those offered by congressional support agencies and those designed for advanced graduate students with specialized backgrounds. COSSA provides this information as a service and encourages readers to contact the relevant agencies for further information and application materials.

Office of Technology Assessment (OTA)

OTA provides congressional committees with analyses of various technical issues. Fellows are selected for their potential to add to OTA research and analysis capabilities. Successful applicants are given one-year appointments beginning in September. Salaries range from \$28,000 to \$55,000 depending on current salary and experience. The program is open to doctoral-level specialists in such areas as the physical sciences, law, economics, public policy, or social science. Applicants must have significant experience in technical fields or management. Applications are due by January 31, 1991.

Contact: Bill Norris
Congressional Fellowships
Personnel Office
Office of Technology Assessment
Congress of the United States
Washington, DC 20510-8025

General Accounting Office (GAO)

The GAO provides congressional committees and individual members with a wide variety of information and analyses. GAO funds doctoral students whose dissertation research would benefit from access to GAO projects and information. Fellows work with the office while completing their research. Appointments begin on or about October 1 and do not exceed one year.

Yearly salaries range from \$23,000 to \$29,000 with some additional benefits. Doctoral candidates who have completed all necessary course work are eligible for this program. Applications are due by February 2, 1991.

Contact: Kenneth W. Hunter
Doctoral Research Program
Training Institute
U.S. General Accounting Office
441 G St., NW, Room 7822
Washington, DC 20548
Tel. (202) 275-8074

Congressional Black Caucus Foundation (CBCF)

CBCF sponsors two fellowship programs that place black students with congressional staffs. Senior Congressional Fellowships are offered to individuals who have completed graduate degrees or are currently doctoral candidates. Applicants must have at least five years of experience in a concentrated area.

Congressional Fellowships, by contrast, are available to individuals in the process of completing a graduate degree with five years or less of experience.

Additionally, an applicant may receive designation as an R.J.R. Nabisco Fellow. Nabisco fellows must be graduate students in government or public policy and be receiving graduate credit for their fellowship work. All fellows serve from October 1 through July 1. Senior Congressional fellows receive a \$15,000 stipend, and Congressional Fellows receive a \$12,000 stipend. All black full-time graduate students, professionals pursuing part-time studies, or university or college faculty are eligible. The application deadline is April 30, 1991.

Contact: Andre D. Owens
Research Associate
Congressional Black Caucus Foundation
1004 Pennsylvania Ave., SE
Washington, DC 20011
Tel. (202) 675-6735

Congressional Hispanic Caucus Institute, Inc. (CHCI, Inc.)

Similar to the CBCF fellowships, these positions are designed to provide Hispanic graduate students with one year of experience on a Congressional staff. In addition to a staff assignment, CHCI fellows participate in a weekly seminar examining the components of government. The program runs from September 8 to May 13 and includes a stipend of \$1,000 per month plus travel expenses.

Hispanic graduate students, or students for whom hispanic heritage has been an integral part of their academic studies, are encouraged to apply. Applicants should be working toward a graduate degree in areas of public policy or policy related fields. The application deadline is May 15, 1991.

Contact: Eva E. De Luna Castro
Project Coordinator
Congressional Hispanic Caucus Institute, Inc.
504 C Street, N.E.
Washington, D.C. 20002
(202) 543-1771

Women's Research and Education Institute (WREI)

WREI places female graduate students on congressional and committee staffs. The program begins with a month-long orientation on women and public policy, followed by an office assignment spanning the remainder of the academic year. No particular field of study is required, but applicants should be graduate students with an interest in public policy and gender issues. Tuition and living stipends are provided. Applications are due in mid-February.

Contact: Fellowship Director
Women's Research and Education Institute
1700 18th St., NW, #400
Washington, DC 20009
Tel. (202) 328-7070

American Anthropological Association
American Economic Association
American Historical Association

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

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
University of Georgia

MEMBERS

American Political Science Association
American Psychological Association
American Sociological Association
American Statistical Association

AFFILIATES

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

CONTRIBUTORS

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

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

North American Regional Science Council
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

Ohio State University
University of Oregon
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

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