
CONSORTIUM OF SOCIAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATIONS

COSSA WASHINGTON UPDATE

Volume VII, Number 14
July 22, 1988

This Week . . .

- NIH Reauthorization Bill Boosts Social and Behavioral Science *HS*
- NSF Appropriations Bill Passes Senate *HS*
- Congressional Agencies, Archives, Smithsonian Marked Up *SC*
- Assess Science Materials Development, Congress Tells NSF *SC*
- Arctic Social Science Needs Begin to Garner Attention *SC*
- House Judiciary Committee Passes Visa-Reform Bill *SC*
- Chomsky Wins Kyoto Prize *BD*

* * *

NIH REAUTHORIZATION BILL BOOSTS SOCIAL AND BEHAVIORAL SCIENCE

The National Institutes of Health (NIH) reauthorization bill, reported by the Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee--Sen. Edward Kennedy (D-MA) chairman--at the end of May, includes language designed to enhance the role of social and behavioral scientists at the institutes.

For many years COSSA and other groups have pushed to increase the number of social and behavioral scientists serving on NIH advisory councils. Despite these efforts and the acknowledged impact of social and behavioral factors on health and well-being, the NIH record has been dismal. The 1985 NIH reauthorization bill instructs that "two-thirds of the members [of advisory councils] shall be appointed...from among the leading representatives of the health and scientific disciplines (including public health and the behavioral or social sciences)." As one Senate committee staffer suggested, NIH was given a chance to demonstrate its commitment to the appointment of behavioral and social scientists on the advisory councils. In the ensuing three years, NIH has generally not met that commitment. As a result, this year's bill makes the directive stronger "by inserting 'two individuals who are leaders in the field of' after [the word] including" in the earlier bill language quoted above.

COSSA Washington Update is published 20-24 times per year, normally biweekly, by the Consortium of Social Science Associations (COSSA), 1625 I Street, NW, Suite 911, Washington, D.C. 20006 (202/887-6166). Individual subscriptions are available in 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: Howard J. Silver, Simon Cordery, Brian Daly, 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.

Victor G. Rosenblum, *President*

Howard J. Silver, *Executive Director*

The report discusses the committee's "displeasure" with the current status and activities of the NIH Associate Directors of Prevention. The report notes: "It is the Committee's intent that the Associate Directors of Prevention serve as active promoters of the disease prevention and health promotion research of the National Institutes of Health and that research and programs in the area of health and behavior be given heightened attention." The committee also makes clear that it expects the Associate Directors of Prevention to give their full-time attention to that job and that the occupants of those positions should "have appropriate experience in prevention, public health, or health and behavior in their professional background."

The bill also calls for the creation of Centers for Biomedical Ethics and the enhancement of Centers for Geriatric Research and Training. The bill is expected to pass the Senate later this summer. The reauthorization process is moving more slowly in the House, where two key figures (Energy and Commerce Committee Chairman Rep. John Dingell [D-MI], who has been focusing on biomedical research fraud, and Health and Environment Subcommittee Chairman Rep. Henry Waxman [D-CA], busy with other medical issues such as AIDS and health-professions training) are concentrating their energies elsewhere.<<

NSF APPROPRIATIONS BILL PASSES SENATE

On July 13, by a vote of 86-11, the Senate passed the HUD-Independent Agencies Appropriations bill, which includes the FY 1989 funding levels for the National Science Foundation (NSF). None of the funding levels for NSF changed from the figures reported by the Senate Appropriations Committee: Total, \$1.88 billion; Research and Related Activities, \$1.593 billion; Science and Engineering Education, \$156 million (see Update, June 24, 1988).

The bill now moves to a House-Senate conference committee, which may meet the week of July 25. One issue facing the conference is a \$600 million difference between the House and Senate subcommittees' 302B allocation. An optimistic resolution of this difference could yield extra funds for NSF, especially for research and the initiation of the Science and Technology Research Centers program.<<

CONGRESSIONAL AGENCIES, ARCHIVES, SMITHSONIAN MARKED UP

Unlike the last few years, one of the difficulties facing those who follow the appropriations process is keeping up with the unusually swift passage of the FY 1989 funding bills. The House and Senate have approved their respective versions of the FY 1989 funding levels for the agencies noted below; the differences will be resolved by conference committees later this summer. The budget numbers given below are in millions of dollars and represent budget authority for program funds.

General Accounting Office

While both Senate and House recommendations are below the administration's request, the General Accounting Office (GAO)

would receive an increase over FY 1988. Couched in the language of international competitiveness is a Senate proposal for a study of the federal role in biotechnology research and commercializing biotechnology, to be conducted in conjunction with the the Office of Technology Assessment.

| <u>Actual</u> <u>FY1988</u> | <u>Proposed</u> <u>FY1989</u> | <u>Senate</u> <u>FY1989</u> | <u>House</u> <u>FY1989</u> |
|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| \$329.9 | \$393.9 | \$348.6 | \$346.3 |

Library of Congress

The administration requested a 15% increase for the Library of Congress, while Congress itself recommends significant but smaller increases. Both House and Senate address the issue of the preservation of acid-based books, agreeing to increase funding for aspects of the Library's preservation program but calling upon the Library to seek alternative methods of preservation and not to commit itself to the deacidification process currently in use. In addition, the House calls for the Library to plan a "brittle books inventory" with GAO.

| <u>Actual</u> <u>FY1988</u> | <u>Proposed</u> <u>FY1989</u> | <u>Senate</u> <u>FY1989</u> | <u>House</u> <u>FY1989</u> |
|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| \$138.9 | \$159.2 | \$153.0 | \$152.6 |

These figures do not include the Congressional Research Service, which would receive \$44.7 million under the House and Senate bills. This is a 4% increase over the FY 1988 appropriation but is 7% below the administration's \$47.9 million request.

National Archives and Records Administration

Given the rate of growth of the federal government over the past 50 years, an annual increase for the National Archives could almost be expected, but that has not always been the case. For FY 1989, the House proposes a 9% increase while the Senate accepts the administration's \$117.9 million request. Both House and Senate have raised the \$1 million request for the National Historical Publications and Records Commission to \$4 million.

| <u>Actual</u> <u>FY1988</u> | <u>Proposed</u> <u>FY1989</u> | <u>Senate</u> <u>FY1989</u> | <u>House</u> <u>FY1989</u> |
|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| \$116.0 | \$117.9 | \$117.9 | \$126.0 |

Office of Technology Assessment

The House and Senate recommendations for the Office of Technology Assessment (OTA) are slightly below the request (less than 1% in the case of the Senate and 4% in the House). The Senate bill includes \$100,000 for ongoing work on the health and behavior problems of adolescents, while the House mandates continued topic flexibility but denies OTA the ability to solicit external funding.

Office of Technology Assessment (continued)

| <u>Actual</u> <u>FY1988</u> | <u>Proposed</u> <u>FY1989</u> | <u>Senate</u> <u>FY1989</u> | <u>House</u> <u>FY1989</u> |
|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| \$ 16.9 | \$ 18.3 | \$ 18.2 | \$ 17.5 |

Smithsonian Institution

The administration requested a substantial increase for research and museum services at the Smithsonian Institution. This increase has been denied and small increases recommended instead. The main concern of both House and Senate is an update on the progress of the Smithsonian's affirmative-action plan and a report on the proposed Afro-American museum.

| <u>Actual</u> <u>FY1988</u> | <u>Proposed</u> <u>FY1989</u> | <u>Senate</u> <u>FY1989</u> | <u>House</u> <u>FY1989</u> |
|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| \$201.4 | \$216.2 | \$208.7 | \$208.8 << |

ASSESS SCIENCE MATERIALS DEVELOPMENT, CONGRESS TELLS NSF

The Senate HUD-Independent Agencies Appropriations Subcommittee has asked the NSF to evaluate teaching materials developed with Science and Engineering Education Directorate (SEE) funding. Congress mandated an assessment of all NSF education programs in 1984, which was produced in two phases by SRI International and which has been all but ignored by the Foundation, according to the report's authors. Reaction from both NSF and SRI International to this new demand for assessing SEE has been muted. Sources in Congress told COSSA that concern on the subcommittee over continuing criticism of teaching materials in the sciences--particularly at the secondary level--is behind this latest call for accountability.

The call for a new evaluation, which is part of the subcommittee's appropriations bill, specifies concerns "over recent reports indicating that textbooks and other teaching materials are less than adequate despite a substantial federal investment in the creation of innovative science teaching tools." Partial responsibility, in the eyes of the subcommittee, lies with NSF for "an institutional failure to objectively evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of teaching materials once they have been developed."

The SRI report--mandated by Congress in FY 1985 and covering six volumes in two stages in FY 1986 and FY 1987--tackles the problems of defining objectives for and evaluating results in science and engineering education. The first phase, summarized in Opportunities for Strategic Investment in K-12 Science Education, identifies how NSF could help expand the pool of science and engineering students, given limited resources and (according to the authors) a growing consensus on what is important in science education. The report deals extensively with educational content and suggests ways NSF can exercise influence over the development of instructional materials.

The second stage, dealing with assessment of NSF education programs, recommends adopting proactive funding strategies, increasing expenditures on assessment studies, and scrapping self-assessment by principal investigators.

Asked how NSF has reacted, Andrew Zucker of SRI, co-author of the report, characterized the official response as "a deafening silence." He noted that at the program level there has been a favorable response to the recommendations for increased evaluation, which he hopes means the report will have an impact, at least over the long-term. Bolstering Zucker's view is William Schmidt, head of the SEE Office of Studies and Program Assessment, who acknowledged that while there has been no formal response from NSF, "parts [of the report] seemed reasonable and consistent with what we are doing" and will therefore "influence" SEE's internal evaluation of program assessment.

One aspect of the report that is drawing criticism is the definition of "science education" as "education in mathematics, the natural sciences, engineering, and technology." The social and behavioral sciences were excluded because there are so few projects in SEE in those fields, according to Zucker. In FY 1986, however, SEE awarded 22 grants totaling \$1,214,701 in the fields of social science, psychology, geography, ethics, and public attitudes, compared with 24 grants worth \$864,975 in engineering (SEE Directory of Awards, FY 1986). Zucker later admitted that the exclusion of social and behavioral science fields was "a mistake, an accident on our part." With any luck, the next report will avoid making a similar "mistake."<<

ARCTIC SOCIAL SCIENCE NEEDS BEGIN TO GARNER ATTENTION

Social science research in and on the Arctic, so long given the cold shoulder by researchers and federal agencies, has experienced a warming trend over the past year. A number of federal and nongovernmental efforts have been initiated recently in response to the need for further research into issues such as the impact of economic and social transformation on native peoples, protecting cultural integrity in times of change, and collecting the data needed to assist rational development in the Arctic region. Slowly but surely, a coordinated Arctic social science research agenda is emerging.

The federal government's effort is coordinated by the Interagency Arctic Research Policy Committee (IARPC), an ad hoc body drawn from 11 federal agencies chaired by the National Science Foundation (NSF). The members of IARPC prepared a United States Arctic Research Plan in 1987, a statement of research needs and priorities in the areas of national security, rational resource development, and scientific research. The plan includes an extensive section on "People" which is divided into chapters on health and social science. The report documents the "exceedingly small" (less than \$1 million) federal investment in Arctic social science research, drawing from this the lesson "that social science research has low priority, low visibility,

and little base funding within the Federal system compared to other Arctic research." To remedy this situation, IARPC calls for designating an advocate for Arctic social science within the federal government.

Further evidence of increasing attention to Arctic social science (and of support for the IARPC lead-agency recommendation) comes from Congress. The Senate Appropriations Committee urges NSF "to act to fill this gap between national needs and capabilities, in the area of Arctic social sciences" in FY 1989. The committee calls on NSF to acknowledge its responsibility under the Arctic Research and Policy Act of 1984 to act as lead agency in the federal arctic research effort by developing a plan "for a broad-gauged program of research on Arctic topics in the social and behavioral sciences before the end of FY 1989."

The National Science Board has taken up the challenge on a general basis. The Committee on the NSF Role in Polar Regions reported to the National Science Board on the need for NSF to "strengthen its leadership role as the...coordinator for basic research in the Arctic." The NSF Committee's report, published in 1987 and drawing extensively on the work of IARPC, notes the "diverse and often urgent needs for behavioral and social science research" in the Arctic. The Committee contrasted the disarray of Arctic social and behavioral science research in the 1970s with the "potential contributions to more effective operation and improved quality of life in polar and polar-analogous settings" offered by current research methodologies.

A related effort is being spearheaded by the Committee on Arctic Social Sciences (CASS) of the National Academy of Sciences, which is reviewing the Interagency Arctic Research Plan with an eye to its revision in 1989. The members of CASS are drawn from universities and federal agencies in the United States and Canada, representing ten social and behavioral science fields. The co-chairs of the Committee are Dr. Oran Young (Institute for Northern Studies, Vermont) and Dr. Mim Dixon (Chief Andrew Isaac Health Center, Alaska). At the July 15 meeting of the Committee, agency representatives reported on problems facing social and behavioral scientists, including the need to draft a revised Arctic Research Plan which would enable the agencies to begin implementing some of the recommendations made in the first plan.

One concrete recommendation to come out of the July 15 meeting was the need for a mechanism to coordinate Arctic social and behavioral science projects in the federal government. Multiagency cooperation was seen as vital to the success of the Arctic research plan, and further discussions are planned for the next meeting of CASS, to be held October 7, 1988, in conjunction with the Arctic Science Conference in Fairbanks, Alaska. For more information on this and other Arctic social and behavioral science initiatives, contact Andrea Smith at the Polar Research Board, National Academy of Sciences, 2101 Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20418; 202/334-3479.<<

HOUSE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE PASSES VISA-REFORM BILL

Despite the reservations of some supporters, a bill to amend the ideological-exclusion provisions of the McCarran-Walter Act was passed by the House Judiciary Committee--chaired by Rep. Peter J. Rodino, Jr. (D-NJ)--at a June 22 mark up. The bill, the Immigration Exclusion and Deportation Amendments of 1988 (H.R.4427), passed on a 21-14 vote, causing Rep. Barney Frank (D-MA), who had shepherded the bill through committee, to express himself "pleased that the bill has been approved by the full Judiciary Committee, a step which gives the legislation more credibility."

The bill replaces the ideological test for excluding foreigners (established under McCarran-Walter) with standards for admission based on behavior and health (see Update, April 15, 1988). The alien-exclusion provisions of McCarran-Walter have been temporarily repealed by current State Department authorization legislation, although that expires in January, 1989 (see Update, January 22, 1988). The State Department would retain broad authority under H.R.4427 to ban terrorists and others whose entry into the U.S. "may have adverse foreign policy consequences," but political beliefs alone would no longer be sufficient cause to deny entry. The next step for H.R.4427 is the House floor--although no date has been set for debate--and then the Senate.

There were some sticky moments at the mark up. Several Republicans voiced opposition to dropping homosexuality, Communist Party membership, or advocacy of the violent overthrow of the U.S. government as sufficient criteria for exclusion. Amendments addressing these concerns were defeated, but one offered by Rep. Lawrence J. Smith (D-FL) excluding "any member, officer, official, representative, or spokesman" of the Palastine Liberation Organization was adopted. Despite the argument of Reps. Frank and Mazzoli (D-KY) that the amendment was unnecessary given the content of the bill, it was accepted in an amended form, with the word "member" deleted.<<

CHOMSKY WINS KYOTO PRIZE

Massachusetts Institute of Technology linguist Noam Chomsky has been awarded the Kyoto Prize in basic sciences for 1988. The Kyoto Prize, funded by the Inamori Foundation of Japan, makes annual awards of \$350,000 in basic science, advanced technology, and the creative arts. The other prize winners are John McCarthy of Stanford University, an expert in artificial intelligence, and Paul Thieme of the University of Tübingen, an authority in the field of classical Indian literature. Chomsky is widely credited with creating and leading what has become known as the "generative school" of linguistics, which conceptualizes language (and linguistic similarities between languages) as the result of basic similarities in the intellectual makeup of humans.<<

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 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
Eastern Sociological Society
Federation of State Humanities Councils
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 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 of Management Sciences

CONTRIBUTORS

American Council of Learned Societies
Boston University
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
Duke University
Florida State University
Harvard University
Howard 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
University of Maryland
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Maxwell School of Citizenship and
Public Affairs, Syracuse University
University of Michigan
University of Missouri
National Opinion Research Center
University of Nebraska
Graduate Faculty, New School
for Social Research
New York University
University of North Carolina,
Chapel Hill
Northwestern University
Ohio State University
University of Oregon
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

1625 I STREET, N.W., SUITE 911, WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006

FIRST CLASS