
CONSORTIUM OF SOCIAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATIONS

COSSA WASHINGTON UPDATE

Volume V, Number 15
August 22, 1986

This Week . . .

- ✓ ● NSF Authorization Clears: Appropriations in Trouble
- ✓ ● Appropriations Moving Through Senate
 - Health and Human Services Agencies Receive Increase
 - Labor Research Receives Large Increase
 - Higher Education Mostly Level-Funded
- Is the Canadian Glass Half Empty of Half Full?
- Peace Institute: Moving Toward Substance
- COSSA Welcomes The University of Oregon as Contributor

* * *

NSF AUTHORIZATION CLEARS CONGRESS: APPROPRIATIONS IN TROUBLE

On August 6 the Congress sent to the President the FY 1987 authorization bill for the National Science Foundation (H.R. 4184). Since the staffs of the House Science and Technology Committee, the Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee, and the Senate Science, Technology and Space Subcommittee cooperated in shaping the final version of the Senate bill, the House simply accepted the Senate bill, rendering unnecessary a conference.

The bill authorizes \$1.685 billion for NSF in FY 1987, the amount the President requested in his budget. It provides \$1.479 billion for Research and Related Activities. The bill also establishes floors for the Social and Economic Sciences Division (\$33.34 million), the Behavioral and Neural Sciences Division (\$49.87 million), the Astronomical Sciences Division (\$89.06 million), and the College Science Instrumentation Program (\$11.5 million). (See Update, July 4 & 18, 1986.) The final version accepted the Senate language that the additional funds should come from "funds available to the Foundation," rather than the House version where the money came from the Antarctica program.

This authorization bill reflects the efforts of COSSA and others to increase funding for social and behavioral science at

COSSA Washington Update is published 20-24 times per year, normally biweekly, by the Consortium of Social Science Associations (COSSA), 1200 Seventeenth Street, NW, Suite 520, Washington, D.C. 20036 (202/887-6166). Individual subscriptions are available from COSSA for \$40.00; institutional subscriptions, \$90.00; overseas airmail, \$50.00. ISSN 0749-4394. COSSA Members, Affiliates, and Contributors are listed on the back. The **Update** is written and produced by the Consortium's staff: David Jenness, Howard J. Silver, John H. Hammer, Susan D. Quarles, and Katrina R. Styles.

The Consortium 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.

Risa I. Palm, *President*

David Jenness, *Executive Director*

NSF. However, a major problem remains. The appropriations level voted by the House Appropriations Committee would wipe out the hard-won gains in the authorization bill. The Senate Appropriations Committee has not yet marked up its version of NSF FY 1987 appropriations. The recess is an excellent time to convince members of the Senate committee, in particular Senators Jake Garn (R-UT), chairman, and Pat Leahy (D-VT), ranking member, to fund NSF at the requested and authorized levels: \$1.479 billion for research, \$1.686 billion for the Foundation total.

APPROPRIATIONS MOVING THROUGH SENATE

With the House almost finished with its appropriations bills, the Senate has moved forward with its appropriations activities. The following describes actions by the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, Education and Related Agencies. [In the following, unless noted, all FY 1986 figures are post-GRH deductions taken in March.] For full descriptions of corresponding House Appropriations figures see Update, August 1, 1986.

o HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES AGENCIES RECEIVE INCREASES

The National Institutes of Health (NIH) received \$6.08 billion from the Subcommittee, with the full Appropriations Committee ratifying its actions. This is an increase of \$810 million (15%) over FY 1986, a \$1 billion increase over the President's request, but \$72 million under the House appropriation. The Senate Committee intends this to fund 6,100 new and competing grants in FY 1987. The Subcommittee, as it has in previous years, included language in its report, submitted by COSSA and the American Psychological Association, encouraging more research by NIH on the relationship between health and behavior.

Within NIH, the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development received \$362.9 million, a \$55.1 million increase (18%) from FY 1986, a \$53.7 million increase from the requested funding, but \$5.6 million less than the House. The National Institute on Aging received \$179.6 million, a \$30 million (20%) increase from FY 1986, a \$33.8 million increase over the request, and a \$5.3 million increase over the House.

The Subcommittee included \$355.4 million for AIDS research. This represents a \$131.1 million increase from FY 1986 and \$18.7 million more than the House. The Senate Subcommittee went along with the House and rejected the administration's request to centralize all AIDS research in the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Health. Thus, funds were appropriated to a number of health agencies for this work.

The Subcommittee voted \$253.1 million for research funding at the National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH). The increase is \$52.7 million (21%) over the FY 1986 level, \$58.3 million over the request, and \$24.1 million more than the House. Research

training at NIMH is funded at \$20 million, \$2 million more than the House, which funded at the FY 1986 pre-GRH level. Research at the National Institute on Drug Abuse was allocated \$115.5 million, a huge \$50.3 million (44%) increase over FY 1986 and \$48.1 million over the request. Most of the large increase will go to research on AIDS. The National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism received \$68.2 million for research, \$13.7 million (20%) over FY 1986 and \$11.6 million over the request. Both of these Institutes received \$3 million each for research training. [Funding for the Drug and Alcohol Institutes was deferred by the House pending their reauthorization.]

The National Center for Health Services Research and Health Care Technology Assessment received \$18.9 million for FY 1987 research and program support. This 21% increase is primarily for full funding of the National Medical Expenditure Survey. This survey was last conducted in 1977 and Congress wants new information (see Update, April 4, 1986). The Subcommittee has included bill language ordering \$16 million for the NMES to be transferred from the evaluation fund for the Public Health Service. The National Center for Health Statistics was appropriated \$52.2 million, an increase of \$7.5 million (17%) from FY 1986 and a \$2.1 million increase from the request. The Subcommittee language indicates continued support for a national health and nutrition examination survey.

The Subcommittee bill includes \$7.2 million for policy research carried out by the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation. After years of reducing this budget (it was \$13.2 million in FY 1982), the 17% increase voted by the Senate Committee is still \$1 million below the House appropriation. Most of the increase will go to the Institute for Research on Poverty at the University of Wisconsin.

o LABOR RESEARCH RECEIVES LARGE INCREASE

For FY 1987 the Senate Subcommittee voted to significantly increase the Department of Labor's research and evaluation budget at the Employment and Training Administration. The \$20.2 million appropriated is a 39% increase over FY 1986, but a \$5.7 million decrease from the request, and \$5 million below the House figure. However, as the Senate Committee report notes, this increase "should reestablish the Department's lead in examining how declining Federal resources can best be focused to assist those most in need of employment and training assistance."

The Bureau of Labor Statistics received \$168.3 million from the Subcommittee, an increase of \$16.5 million (11%) from FY 1986, a \$7.6 million increase over the request, and \$1.7 million more than the House allowance.

o HIGHER EDUCATION MOSTLY LEVEL-FUNDED

Unlike the House, the Senate Committee was willing to vote appropriations for programs not yet reauthorized. Thus, higher

education programs and educational research, whose reauthorizations are currently the focus of a House-Senate conference committee, received funding levels from the Senate Appropriations Committee. All programs for graduate students received appropriations at the FY 1986 pre-GRH levels: Graduate and Professional Opportunity Fellowships (\$11.75 million), Public Service Fellowships (\$2.5 million), National Graduate Fellowships (\$2.5 million), and the Law School Clinical Program (\$1.5 million).

The Office of Research and Educational Improvement received \$63.6 million. Of this amount \$8.75 million is appropriated for statistics activities, the same as FY 1986 pre-GRH and the same as the House. The \$54.8 million appropriated for research reflects a \$6.6 million increase over FY 1986, but \$6.7 million below the request. However, the increase is slated for a new program to identify and support the development of promising rural small-school activities and practices within their regions. These funds are earmarked for the regional laboratories.

IS THE CANADIAN GLASS HALF EMPTY OR HALF FULL?

A circular letter, distributed earlier this year and signed by William E. Taylor, President of the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada (SSHRC), thanks academics, researchers, and other interested parties for their help in persuading the Canadian government "to increase our grants at a time when many other department or agency budgets were frozen or cut." The letter continues, "Even though the budget for the next five years does not match your need and our request, the government has signalled the importance it gives to research." Compassionate outside observers may find that signal faint.

The Canadian research councils -- the Natural Sciences and Engineering Council, the Medical Research Council, and the National Research Council, together with the SSHRC -- all submitted five-year plans in 1985 to the federal cabinet. The SSHRC's plan called for a budget of about \$105 million (Can.) a year by 1990-91, compared to the 1985-86 level of about \$60 million. Doctoral, postdoctoral, and research fellowships were to double in number, while the number of independent research projects was to increase by nearly 50 percent.

The government has accepted the Councils' five-year plans, though at very different funding levels from those proposed. For the SSHRC, the 1985-86 budget was increased to \$63.7 million. This base budget from federal sources is "assured" through the 1990-91 year. Most people would interpret that as a five-year freeze -- a base budget indeed.

But there is a gimmick. In 1986-87 there is a one-time supplement of \$9.3 million to serve as a bridge to a matching funds arrangement to be implemented in 1987-88. In that year and in the following years the private sector is projected as

contributing steadily increasing amounts on behalf of the Council: in 1987-88, \$4 million, and by 1990-91, \$18.5 million. Those donated funds are to be matched dollar for dollar by the government. If all goes well, the SSHRC's budget will total \$100.7 million at the end of the period. If private sector donations fall short, presumably the SSHRC will end up with something between \$63.7 and \$100.7 million. The other three Councils face similar challenges. There is no provision for adjusting the Councils' bases for inflation.

COSSA has not seen the basis for the projections of private-sector donations. Canadian sources say that it's mostly a case of wishing it so helping to make it so. The Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada reports that in academic year 1984-85, Canadian institutions of higher education received \$267.6 million from all private sources (alumni, bequests, foundations, manufacturers, etc) to support all special activities including research (i.e., everything except donations for general operating expenses). If the new plan is to operate as the Canadian government anticipates, private donations to support research will have to increase rapidly -- perhaps more than doubling by the end of the decade, by which time the four research councils will be requiring over \$150 million annually in non-governmental funds.

The social sciences and humanities also face the additional burden that donations in support of research in those areas do not qualify for the tax credits which are available to donors for research in physical, medical, and biological sciences. In other respects, Canadian sources suggest that the SSHRC may be better off in this game than some of the other Councils. For example, the biomedical and biotechnology industrial base in Canada may be too small to provide the Medical Research Council with its needed challenge funds. A number of other questions come to mind. Where will support for the new fundraising effort come from? Can the research councils use federal funds to pay fundraising costs? What impact will the massive channeling of private funds into basic research have on other organizations dependent upon philanthropy?

The wishing-it-so/making-it-so model clearly necessitates a lot of effort on everyone's part. President Taylor begins his letter by thanking the social science and humanities community for their efforts vis-a-vis the government. He ends by remarking, "I cannot stress too strongly the need of your help in attracting private funds."

Canada's strategy is a risky one. If it works, the 'base' is enlarged. Presumably, the government might rebalance its own share sometime in the future. But what if, given some initial success, the government decides to set the matching funds challenge even higher? There is something sobering in the SSHRC's published comment that the matching-funds concept is "the only avenue through which Council can hope to increase its budget during the next four years."

PEACE INSTITUTE: MOVING TOWARD SUBSTANCE

After an extraordinarily slow start, the United States Institute of Peace (USIP) seems to be resolving administrative start-up problems and beginning to grapple with the substantive issues for which it was established nearly two years ago. (See also Update, August 1, 1986 for information on the Peace Institute's grant application procedures.)

At its second full public meeting held August 14-15 in Washington, the Board of Directors reviewed the largely organizational activities of the previous six months. Chairman John Norton Moore indicated that while he anticipated another six months of intensive administrative work (recruiting a permanent president as well as more staff, selecting permanent housing, and so forth), the shift to substance was already under way. Moore outlined areas in which he anticipates activity. He did not indicate how the work would be accomplished (e.g., through solicited grants or contracts, by in-house resident scholars, etc.), but suggested that individual board members may be asked to conduct hearings in various part of the country to both publicize and gather suggestions for the board's agenda. The areas mentioned are:

- o Support for development of a scholarly public television series (e.g., a four to six hour treatment of US-USSR relations);
- o A multipart initiative on negotiation, which could include a series of studies on past US negotiations;
- o A project to train negotiators;
- o Support for development of a curriculum on conflict resolution for use in secondary schools. Moore asserted that the Peace Institute would bring a balance to such an undertaking that has been absent from curricular projects supported by private groups;
- o A project to develop an intellectual map to approaches to peace and conflict management. USIP Director W. Scott Thompson of the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy was mentioned as the initiator of this initiative;
- o A project aimed at stimulating development of library collections on conflict resolution. Moore sees this project as important for the creation of the academic field of peace studies.

The Senate Appropriations Committee has voted \$1.25 million of new money in FY 1987 for the USIP. Since \$2 million of the original FY 1985 appropriation is still unspent, the Institute will have \$3.25 million to operate with in FY 1987.

COSSA WELCOMES THE UNIVERSITY OF OREGON AS A CONTRIBUTOR

COSSA is pleased to announce that the University of Oregon has recently rejoined the Consortium as a Contributor. The Consortium now comprises 46 Contributors and 30 Affiliates in addition to its 10 founding Members.

SOURCES OF RESEARCH SUPPORT: DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES AND DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

COSSA provides this information as a service and encourages readers to contact the agency rather than COSSA for more information.

Research on the Etiology of Drug Abuse Among Ethnic and Minority Juvenile Populations

The National Institute on Drug Abuse (NIDA) and the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) will jointly fund research on drug abuse among ethnic and minority juvenile populations from a variety of etiologic perspectives. Although epidemiological survey data indicates that adult members of specific population subgroups (i.e., Blacks and Hispanics) are overrepresented in drug treatment programs and drug-related emergency hospital admissions and that there is an increasing trend in drug abuse among ethnic and minority populations, previous research on drug abuse has tended to focus on white, middle class youth. NIDA and OJJDP are encouraging research applications in the following areas:

- 1) the interactional effects of minority status, acculturation, and drug abuse;
- 2) drug availability and patterns of drug use among inner city minority youth;
- 3) behavioral and physiological risk factors which may play a role in the development of drug abuse and the effects of such use on ethnic and minority youth;
- 4) the interrelationship of risk factors related to both criminal behavior and drug abuse; and
- 5) intergenerational traits associated with drug abuse.

Budget: \$500,000 for new projects in FY 1987

Application/Review Process: Applications should be submitted on PHS Form 398 and will be processed through the Division of Research Grants of the National Institutes of Health. OJJDP and NIDA will nominate ad hoc committee minority members to review applications.

Funding Mechanisms: Applications submitted under this announcement may request support for a period of 12 to 18 months.

Deadlines: October 1 and February 1 (for FY 1987 awards)

Contact:

Catherine S. Bell
Division of Clinical Research
Nat'l Institute on Drug Abuse
5600 Fishers Lane, Rm 10A-20
Rockville, MD 20857
301/443-1514

Pamela Swain
OJJDP, Room 782
633 Indiana Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20531
202/724-5929

CONSORTIUM OF SOCIAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATIONS

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 Association for Public Opinion
Research
American Educational Research
Association
American Evaluation Association
American Society of Criminology
Association for Asian Studies
Association for Social Sciences in Health
Eastern Sociological Society
Economic History Association
Gerontological Society of America
History of Science Society
International Studies Association
Law and Society Association
Midwest Sociological Society
National Council on Family Relations
National Council for the Social Studies
North Central Sociological Association
Northeastern Anthropological Association

Operations Research Society of America
Population Association of America
Regional Science Association
Rural Sociological Society
Social Science History Association
Society for the History of Technology
Society for Research in Child Development
Society for the Scientific Study of Religion
Southern Sociological Society
Southwestern Social Science Association
Speech Communication Association
The Institute of Management Sciences

CONTRIBUTORS

University of California, Berkeley
University of California, Irvine
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
Florida State University
Harvard University
University of Illinois
Indiana University

Institute for Research in Social
Science, UNC-Chapel Hill
Institute for Social Research,
University of Michigan
University of Iowa
The Johns Hopkins University
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Maxwell School of Citizenship and
Public Affairs, Syracuse University
University of Michigan
University of Missouri
University of Nebraska
New York University
Ohio State University
University of Pennsylvania
Pennsylvania State University
University of Pittsburgh
Princeton University
Rutgers University
Social Science Research Council
University of Southern California
Stanford University
State University of New York at
Stony Brook
University of Tennessee, Knoxville
Texas A & M University
Tulane University
University of Virginia
University of Washington
University of Wisconsin, Madison
University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee
Yale University

CONSORTIUM OF SOCIAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATIONS

1200 SEVENTEENTH STREET, N.W., SUITE 520, WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036

FIRST CLASS