

COSSA WASHINGTON UPDATE

Volume XI, Number 8

May 4, 1992

MS SENATE BILL INCLUDES RESCISSIONS OF INDIVIDUAL NSF GRANTS; WOULD THREATEN PEER REVIEW

Congress is in the midst of hearings on the FY 1993 budget, but neither it nor the President are completely finished with the FY 1992 budget. The bill that emerged April 30 from the Senate Appropriations Committee to rescind funding for FY 1992 appropriations includes cancellation of 32 grants already funded by the National Science Foundation (NSF). These grants, which are identified by their titles in the bill, include many from the new Social, Behavioral and Economic Sciences Directorate, and some from the Biological Sciences Directorate. All went through the peer review process.

The bill clearly strikes at the heart of the integrity of the NSF's merit review process. Rather than scientists deciding the merits of individual grant applications, members of Congress have now taken it upon themselves to determine the scientific relevance of projects.

Reaction to White House Proposal

This legislation, S 2403, is the Senate's response to President Bush's proposal to cut spending in FY 1992 (which began October 1, 1991) by eliminating grants the president called wasteful. None of the grants identified by the administration came from the NSF, and most were from the Department of Agriculture. The House version of the rescission bill does not include any specific grants, but does rescind the \$1 million NSF was to receive for a Critical Technologies Institute. Sen. Robert Byrd (D-WV), chairman of the full Senate appropriations committee, argued that while the president has grants that he doesn't like, the Senate also has grants it doesn't like.

The full Senate is expected to vote on the bill on May 5. A House - Senate conference committee will resolve the differences in the bill shortly thereafter and determine whether funding for these grants survives, or if Congress will have overridden the peer review process at the nation's premier basic research agency.

COSSA ACTION ALERT

ISSUE: RESCISSION BY THE SENATE OF PEER REVIEWED NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION RESEARCH GRANTS.

MESSAGE: URGE KEY MEMBERS OF CONGRESS TO VIGOROUSLY OPPOSE THIS ACTION.

LET THEM KNOW THAT YOU BELIEVE CONGRESS SHOULD NOT BE DECIDING THE FUNDING OF INDIVIDUAL GRANTS, AND THAT THE INTEGRITY OF THE MERIT REVIEW PROCESS AT THE NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION MUST BE PRESERVED.

CONTACT: KEY CONFEREES INCLUDE:

SEN. BARBARA MIKULSKI (D-MD) 202/224-4654 (FAX 202/224-8858);
SEN. JAKE GARN (R-UT), 202/224-5444;
REP. BOB TRAXLER (D-MI) 202/225-2806 (FAX 202/225-3046);
REP. BILL GREEN (R-NY) 202/225-2436 (FAX 202/225-0840)

FOR MORE INFORMATION: PLEASE CONTACT COSSA AT 202/842-3525 (FAX 202/842-2788)

INSIDE UPDATE...

- MS •COSSA Urges House to Support NSF Increase
- MS •Traxler Announces Retirement
- MS •Landmark Educational Exchange Bill Adrift in Sea of Politics
- MS •House Panel Examines Science Priorities
- MS •Elliott Nominated as Commissioner of Education Statistics
- MS •Two New Reports Focus on Scientific Fraud and Misconduct
- MS •Sources of Research Support: Department of Health and Human Services

COSSA URGES HOUSE TO SUPPORT NSF RESEARCH INCREASE

COSSA Executive Director Howard J. Silver delivered testimony to the House Veterans Affairs, Housing and Urban Development and Independent Agencies appropriations Subcommittee, chaired by Rep. Bob Traxler (D-MI), on April 29. In his testimony, Silver called for full funding of the FY 1993 budget request of the National Science Foundation, particularly the 18 percent increase for research and related activities and the 26 percent increase for the Social, Behavioral and Economic Science Directorate (SBE).

Claiming that "1991 was a very good year for the social, behavioral and economic sciences" at NSF, Silver noted NSF Director Walter Massey's decision to create a new directorate for those disciplines, calling it the culmination of "a ten year effort to enhance the status of these disciplines at the Foundation and an intense two-year effort for the separate directorate." Silver praised the Subcommittee for supporting Massey's decision, and commended the appointment of Dr. Cora Marrett as the first Assistant Director for SBE. He described Marrett as "a strong, well-connected leader who will make the new directorate work."

In pointing out the proposed increase for SBE in the FY 1993 budget, Silver noted that the magnitude of the increases for the two research divisions was still relatively small -- \$8.6 million for the Social and Economic Science division and \$2.7 million for the Behavioral and Cognitive Science division.

CONSORTIUM OF SOCIAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATIONS

Executive Director:	Howard J. Silver
Government Affairs:	Judy Auerbach
Public Affairs:	Michael Buckley
Administrative Officer:	Karen Carrion

President:	Joseph E. Grimes
------------	------------------

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, \$100, overseas mail, \$100. ISSN 0749-4394. Address all inquiries to COSSA, 1522 K Street, NW, Suite 836, Washington, D.C. 20005. Phone: (202) 842-3525, Fax: (202) 842-2788

Silver supported NSF's decision to limit increases for the Education and Human Resources (EHR) directorate, noting that NSF has "requested that FY 1993 serve as a time-out to consolidate the recent gains at EHR." Stating that EHR has received over a 100 percent increase in funding the past two years, he expressed concern about effective management and quality control of programs in EHR, as personnel increases have not matched the funding enhancements. Silver supported the NSF request for a \$3.3 million research instrumentation program, asserting that the instrumentation needs in the social, behavioral and economic sciences are growing increasingly complex and costly.

In discussing research currently supported by NSF in SBE, Silver pointed to projects in the economics and human dimensions of global change, the cognitive science initiative, and the work of the National Center for Geographic Information and Analysis. He also urged continued support for the multi-user data bases, the Panel Study on Income Dynamics, the National Election Studies, and the General Social Survey.

Finally, Silver called for a set-aside for studies on the societal effects of the High Performance Computing and Communication Initiative (HPCC). This initiative has been highly touted by Presidential Science Adviser Allan Bromley and others being of enormous societal impact. Silver argued: "If indeed we are going to wire every home with fiber optics, if we are going to transform our education system, if we are going to alter the way we communicate with each other, we should be exploring what the consequences of these changes will be." The set-aside is not unique, he added, as both the Human Genome Project and the Biotechnology Initiative include funds for research on the social, economic and legal issues associated with these projects.

Rep. Chester Atkins (D-MA), who chaired the hearing, wondered aloud whether the social and behavioral sciences were becoming too empirical and were not providing enough good policy advice. He questioned why NSF was not taking the results of the social research it supported and providing solutions to the social problems facing the country. Silver responded that this was not NSF's mission, noting that NSF supports basic research to provide information for policymakers to make informed choices about solutions to public problems.

TRAXLER ANNOUNCES RETIREMENT

Rep. Bob Traxler, Chairman of the VA, HUD, Independent Agencies appropriations subcommittee, announced that he will retire from the House of Representatives at the end of this Congress. The Michigan Democrat has served in Congress since winning a special election in April 1974. His subcommittee has jurisdiction over funding for the National Science Foundation.

Traxler is the third House appropriations subcommittee chairman -- the so-called "College of Cardinals" -- to decide to leave Congress at the end of this year. Currently twelve of the 59 members of the full House Appropriations committee will not be returning for the 103rd Congress in January 1993. Fifty-eight members of the House have either announced their retirements, are running for other offices, or have been defeated in primaries. Given redistricting and the strong anti-incumbent sentiment throughout the country, many observers of Congress are predicting 100 to 120 new members in 1993.

Traxler's retirement announcement came the day after he received the Distinguished Public Service award from the National Science Foundation. Both he and Senate VA, HUD, Independent Agencies appropriations subcommittee chair Sen. Barbara Mikulski (D-MD) received their awards at the annual National Science Board dinner on April 29. Earlier this year Rep. Traxler received an award from the Coalition for National Science Funding (see *Update*, March 9, 1992) for his support of the NSF.

Rep. Louis Stokes (D-OH) is next in line to succeed Traxler as chair of the subcommittee, assuming the Democrats maintain their majority in the House. If the Republicans were to become the majority party, Rep. Bill Green (R-NY) would be in line to become chairman. However, Green may face a redistricting situation where he would be forced to run against Rep. Ted Weiss (D-NY). The two other Republicans currently on the subcommittee, Rep. Lawrence Coughlin (R-PA) and Bill Lowery (R-CA) are retiring.

LANDMARK EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE BILL ADRIFT IN SEA OF POLITICS

When the National Security Education Act (NSEA) was adopted by Congress and signed into law by the President last December, (see *Update*,

December 9, 1991), supporters hailed it as a landmark event in the field of international studies. However when the applause of leaders in these disciplines and their advocates on Capitol Hill died down, the task of implementing the NSEA soon became mired in a blend of Congressional politics, poorly crafted legislation, disagreements within the academic community, and questions regarding membership on advisory boards created by the act. As a result, no funds have been released to implement the NSEA.

Authored by Sen. David Boren (D-OK), chair of the Senate Intelligence Committee, the NSEA establishes a \$150 million trust fund to provide undergraduate scholarships for study abroad and support for graduate fellowships in foreign languages, area and international studies. It also includes federal support for institutions to begin or enhance programs in these disciplines. Funds for the first year of the program's operation were expected to be \$35 million. The intent of the act was to convert funds from the intelligence budget to the Defense Intelligence College to administer the NSEA programs. Because of a technical error in the bill, the funds appropriated for NSEA for FY 1992 are being stalled by House Defense Appropriations subcommittee chair John Murtha (D-PA). Murtha, capitalizing on the fact that correcting a technical error in a bill requires consent of all parties involved, is balking on NSEA funding as a bargaining chip in several unrelated disputes with Boren's committee.

Defense Secretary Dick Cheney has named DOD official Martin Hurwitz to oversee the program, and he has been meeting with various groups in the area studies, foreign language, and international studies community to develop ideas for implementing the program.

The law created the National Security Education Board to serve as a policy advisory board. One of the major roles of the board will be to select "critical areas" of study to make the scholarship and fellowship awards. Membership of the board consists of the Secretaries of Defense (who serves as chair), Education, State, Commerce, and the Directors of the CIA and the United States Information Agency. It also includes four individuals appointed by the President "who shall be experts in the fields of international, language, and area studies education." COSSA has learned that Lynne Cheney, chairman of the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH) would like to become one of the four presidential appointees.

The AAAS report makes the point that research institutions have been slow to develop specific mechanisms for dealing with fraud and misconduct in science as they historically have depended on the peer review system and self-policing within the scientific community. The collegial spirit of universities and concern over protecting intellectual freedom have contributed to the resistance toward establishing formal mechanisms, says the report.

AAAS Cites Responsibility of Institutions

The AAAS report discusses ways in which scientific journals, professional societies, and research institutions can and should play a more active role in educating, preventing, and, if necessary, dealing with allegations of misconduct. It locates primary responsibility for detecting, investigating, and resolving allegations with research institutions themselves, and argues that much more should be done to prevent misconduct through education of researchers.

The report closes with an acknowledgment that a number of fundamental issues still need clarification: the definition of scientific misconduct itself; the scope of due process required in misconduct investigations; the treatment of whistleblowers; and efforts to promote responsible research conduct.

Although much more lengthy and detailed than the AAAS document, the NAS report contains many of the same points. In describing the mandate of the COSEPUP panel, the report said it "(1) examined scientific principles and research practices; changes within the contemporary research environment; and the roles of individuals, educational programs, and research guidelines in fostering responsible research practices and (2) considered the incidence and significance of misconduct in science; examined how institutions have handled allegations of misconduct; and also analyzed the complex problems associated with responding to such allegations."

The NAS panel defined misconduct in science as "fabrication, falsification, or plagiarism, in proposing, performing, or reporting research." This was distinguished from two other problematic behaviors: "questionable research practices" (for example, failing to retain essential data for a significant period of time, or maintaining inadequate records); and "other misconduct" (unacceptable behavior not specific to science, such as sexual harassment, misuse of funds, etc.) The panel noted

the importance of separating out these three behaviors and dealing with all of them.

Like the AAAS document, the NAS report ascribed primary responsibility for handling allegations of misconduct to the research institution, and acknowledged the need to balance accountability and intellectual freedom. The panel emphasized the need for increased education about potential misconduct, and the importance of integrating guidelines into the every-day processes and activities of research and education in order to prevent "questionable research practices."

Twelve Recommendations

The NAS report included twelve recommendations for identifying and dealing with fraud and misconduct in science. Two of the most significant of these called for developing common definitions of misconduct and distinguishing it from other unacceptable behaviors; and establishing an independent Scientific Integrity Advisory Board (SIAB) to gather data on allegations and provide assistance to institutions (but not to adjudicate claims).

Two panel members dissented from the majority view and presented a brief "minority statement" at the end of the NAS report. These two identified three concerns they had with the report: 1) that "its overall tone presents an unbalanced treatment of scientists and institutions" by failing "to convey the overriding importance of intellectual freedom and trust in a creative process that has been remarkably successful;" 2) that it "is equivocal in defining misconduct in science," and that the "other misconduct" category introduces ambiguities into the definition, and blurs the boundaries between misconduct in science and questionable practice;" and 3) that it "does not stress sufficiently the importance of establishing a regularized institutional 'response pathway' for allegations of misconduct" and pays insufficient attention to conflict of interest.

For information about the availability of these reports, contact the Directorate for Science and Policy Programs, AAAS, 1333 H Street, NW, Washington, DC 20005, (202) 326-6600; and the National Academy Press, 2101 Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20418, (202) 334-3313.

SOURCES OF RESEARCH SUPPORT: DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH & 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.

Centers for Disease Control

The Centers for Disease Control (CDC), the nation's disease prevention agency, announces that grant applications are being accepted for Injury Control Research Centers (ICRCs) and Injury Control Research Program Project Grants (RPPGs). The Public Health Service (PHS) is committed to achieving the health promotion and disease prevention objectives of Healthy People 2000, a PHS-led national activity to reduce morbidity and mortality and improve the quality of life. This announcement is related to the priority areas of Violent and Abusive Behavior and Unintentional Injuries.

Application Procedure: Although it is not a prerequisite, potential applicants are encouraged to submit a nonbinding letter of intent to apply to the Grants Management Officer. It should be postmarked no later than two months prior to the submission deadline (December, 1992 for February, 1993). Applicants using Form PHS-398 should submit an original and five copies and applicants using Form PHS-5161-1 should submit an original and two copies of the application to Henry S. Cassell, III, Grants Management Officer, Grants Management Branch, Procurement and Grants Office, Centers for Disease Control, 255 East Paces Ferry Road NE, Room 300, Mailstop E-14, Atlanta, GA 30305.

Eligible Applicants: Eligible applicants include all nonprofit and for profit organizations. Thus, universities, colleges, research institutions, hospitals, and other public and private organizations, state and local health departments and small, minority and/or women-owned businesses are eligible for these grants.

Budget: Approximately \$1.2 million is expected to be available in Fiscal Year 1993 to fund approximately two to four center awards and/or research program project awards for up to five years. The amount of funding actually available may vary and is subject to change. New center grant awards will not exceed \$600,000 per year, new research program project awards will not exceed \$350,000 per year and supplemental funding awards will not exceed \$225,000 per year.

Review Process: Applications may be evaluated through a three step review process. The first review may be conducted with a screening of the applications by reviewers from the Injury Research Grants Review Committee (IRGRC) to eliminate non-responsive and non-competitive applications from further review. The second review will be a peer evaluation of the scientific and technical merit of the application. The final review will be conducted by senior Federal staff, who will consider the results of the peer review together with program need and relevance. Awards will be made based on merit and priority score ranking by the IRGRC, program review by senior Federal staff, and the availability of funds.

Deadlines: Deadline date for the receipt of applications is February 1, 1993 with the initial review in May; secondary review in July; and earliest award date to be September, 1993.

Contact: To receive additional written information call (404) 332-4561. You will be asked to leave your name, address and phone number, and will need to refer to Announcement Number 913. You will receive a complete program description, information on application procedures, and application forms.

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 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
Association of Research Libraries
Eastern Sociological Society
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
Operations Research Society of America
Population Association of America
Rural Sociology Society
Social Science History Association

Society for Research on Adolescence
Society for Research in Child Development
Society for the Advancement of
Socio-Economics
Society for the Scientific Study of Religion
Society for the Scientific Study of Sex
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
Brookings Institution
University of California, Berkeley
University of California, Los Angeles
University of California, San Diego
University of California, Santa Barbara
Carnegie-Mellon University
Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences
University of Chicago
University of Cincinnati
University of Colorado
Cornell Institute for Social and Economic Research
Cornell University
Duke University
Emory University
University of Georgia
Harvard University

University of Illinois
Indiana University
Institute for Social Research, University of
Michigan
University of Iowa
Johns Hopkins University
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public
Affairs, Syracuse University
University of Michigan
Michigan State University
University of Minnesota
University of Missouri
National Opinion Research Center
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
University of Rhode Island
Nelson A. Rockefeller College of Public
Affairs and Policy, State University of New
York at Albany
Social Science Research Council
University of Southern California
Stanford University
State University of New York, Stony Brook
University of Tennessee
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
