
CONSORTIUM OF SOCIAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATIONS

COSSA WASHINGTON UPDATE

Volume VIII, Number 13
July 14, 1989

This Week . . .

- House Subcommittee Sets Appropriations Levels for NSF *HS*
- NSF Takes Stock of the Past, Peers into the Future *HS*
- House Takes Another Look at Scientific Misconduct *BD*
- Woolsey Replaces Caplan as CBASSE Executive Director *BD*
- Sources of Research Support: Department of Health and Human Services *BD*

* * *

HOUSE SUBCOMMITTEE SETS APPROPRIATIONS LEVELS FOR NSF

The House Veterans Affairs-Housing and Urban Development-Independent Agencies Appropriations Subcommittee made its FY 1990 allocation decisions on July 11. The National Science Foundation (NSF) received \$1.999 billion, a \$114 million (6%) increase over FY 1989, but \$150 million less than what the administration requested.

The Subcommittee, chaired by Rep. Bob Traxler (D-MI), set the Research and Related Activities appropriation at \$1.715 billion, an increase of \$132 million (8.3%) over FY 1989, but \$88 million below the administration request. The Science and Engineering Education appropriation was set at \$210 million, a \$39 million (22.8%) increase above FY 1989, and \$20 million more than the administration request. The Subcommittee indicated that almost all of the increase should be allotted to programs to enhance pre-college teacher training.

The Subcommittee reduced funding of NSF's Antarctica program from \$131 million in FY 1989 to \$74 million in FY 1990. While this falls a good deal short of the administration's request of \$156 million, the \$82 million difference is expected to be met through funds from Defense Department appropriations.

In its report, the Subcommittee expects to include language regarding NSF's planned reductions from FY 1990 request levels for research programs. Those reductions will be outlined in the Foundation's FY 1990 operating plan, to be issued when the fiscal

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 from COSSA for \$50.00; institutional subscriptions, \$90.00; overseas airmail, \$90.00. 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, Stacey E. Beckhardt, 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.

Raymond E. Wolfinger, *President*

Howard J. Silver, *Executive Director*

year starts in October. The Subcommittee's language offers social and behavioral science some protection from those reductions.

In other action, the Subcommittee funded the Office of Policy Development and Research at the Department of Housing and Urban Development at the requested level of \$21.4 million, a 24% increase over FY 1989. Part of the increase will go to fund a congressionally-mandated study of lead paint in housing.

The funding bill is expected to go to the full House Appropriations Committee on July 18 or 19 and could be on the House floor on July 21.

In other appropriations news, the House passed the Interior and Related Agencies (including the National Endowment for the Humanities [NEH]) appropriations bill on July 12, accepting an amendment devised by Subcommittee Chairman Rep. Sidney Yates (D-IL) that would restrict, rather than prohibit, the practice of "re-granting" federal funds. All proposed re-grants would have to be submitted to NEH for final review and approval. Also on July 12, the House Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations Subcommittee completed the markup of its funding bill. Details will appear in the next issue of Update.<<

NSF TAKES STOCK OF THE PAST, PEERS INTO THE FUTURE

As in the past, this year's June meetings of the National Science Board (NSB) served as an opportunity for the National Science Foundation (NSF) to examine where it has been and where it is going. This time around, NSB members heard NSF officials describe their view of the next five years at the Foundation. It was a peek into a future marked by what NSB Chairman Mary Good called a changing Washington atmosphere as it pertains to science and technology.

At the NSB meetings, held June 15-16, NSF Director Erich Bloch elaborated by discussing the current congressional inquiries into scientific misconduct (see next story) and the implementation and enforcement of regulations on such things as technology transfer and drugs in the work place. For Bloch, who is entering what could be his last year at the helm of the Foundation, it was also a time to look back over the past eight years at NSF's changing role.

Reviewing events that have affected NSF during that period, Bloch pointed to the retrenchment of education programs in 1982 and the significant increase in the NSF budget in 1984, the latter event ushering in new programs, including engineering research centers, awards for presidential young investigators, and programs in advanced supercomputing. Bloch also noted the onslaught of the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings budget reductions in 1986, the commitment in 1988 of Congress (at least in its authorization

bill) and the Reagan administration to double the NSF budget, and the planned emphasis on education and human resources and technology in fiscal 1990.

The most significant change, Bloch observed, has been the transformation of NSF education programs from near elimination in the early 1980s to a position of "highest priority" over the next five years. In dollar terms, education and human resources programs have gone from expenditures of \$34.2 million in 1982 to \$347 million requested for FY 1990. Spending for undergraduate education, according to NSF, rose from zero in 1982 to \$105 million proposed for FY 1990. NSF Deputy Director John Moore admitted, however, that the Foundation was still lagging a year behind NSB recommendations for such spending, as outlined in the Neal report.

Looking to the future, Basaam Shakashiri, assistant director for Science and Engineering Education, asserted that NSF must take the lead at all levels of education to assure the continuing supply of scientists and engineers the country requires. Shakashiri also reported on discipline-based workshops to improve the undergraduate science curriculum. (None of these workshops, by the way, focused on the social and behavioral sciences.)

Shakashiri also noted NSF's attempts to cooperate with the Department of Education (DOE) in joint planning of programs. He neglected to note, however, the work of DOE's Office of Educational Research and Improvement or its National Center for Education Statistics, which conduct research on new curricula in many disciplines and collect data about what is happening in the nation's schools.

The NSF agenda Shakashiri outlined included preparation of teachers, curriculum development, curriculum utilization, instructional technology, and testing and evaluation. Chairman Good wondered whether this approach resembled an all-out attack on every education problem facing the nation and whether it was indeed, any of NSF's business. She also asked, as Congress has on many occasions, whether any of the education programs NSF is now supporting have been positively evaluated. Good suggested that NSF's education role be limited, since the job is difficult and the dollars are few; NSF, she said, must establish priorities.

Reviewing the past eight years, Bloch noted that there have been a number of changes in the realm of research at NSF. It is clear, for example, that NSF's emphasis on engineering, following a 1985 NSB resolution, has changed the nature of the Foundation itself. In addition, support for engineering research has grown at a much faster rate than support for science. The aforementioned creation of the engineering research centers also reflects this shift.

Moore noted that the 1980s have witnessed the growth of centers; for example: in FY 1982, 3% of the research budget went to center support; in FY 1990, 8% has been requested for the same purpose. NSF's support for groups of investigators has also increased: in FY 1982, 8% of NSF research funding went to such groups; they would receive 13% of funding in the requested FY 1990 budget. At the same time, support for individual investigator disciplinary research has grown very slowly.

Moore likewise pointed out the decline in the number of investigators receiving NSF support for the first time -- a situation Good called an "absolute disaster." Moore added that NSF has failed to meet its goal of increasing award size, even at the cost of decreasing the number of grantees. In addition, he presented data showing that the success rate for new and competing awards and renewals fell from 33.7% in 1985 to 29.8% in 1988.

What's ahead? Bloch emphasized the internationalization of science and NSF's need to increase its efforts in this area. He noted two of the major issues the NSB will examine in 1990 -- the impact of "Europe 1992" and global environmental change -- as evidence of the heightened importance of international science.

NSF has also become cognizant of the evidence (compiled by social scientists) of the changing nature of the U.S. work force. In response, the Foundation has appointed two task forces to examine ways to increase the numbers of women and minorities in science. Mary Clutter, assistant director for Biological, Behavioral and Social Sciences, reported to NSB on the work of the task force on women. Although Clutter suggested the importance of providing specific incentives to attract women into the sciences (except for psychology, which is doing quite well), a number of NSB members were quite contentious about some of the specific task force recommendations. Some argued that market place considerations would take care of the problem, as seems to have been the case with business and business school faculties, which women have entered in increasing numbers during the 1980s.

Moore, reporting for the task force on minorities, discussed a "decade of development" for increasing minority participation in the sciences. Aside from reporting the depressing statistics about the lack of minority participation, however, he admitted that the task force's specific plans have yet to be formulated.

Although the next five years may see a doubling of the NSF budget (ever more doubtful -- see previous story), Bloch made clear he expected this to simply cover the base of NSF operations -- its core research and education programs. Other demands made on NSF, such as the support of a new facilities program and the environmental cleanup of Antarctica, will have to be accomplished through add-ons to the budget. Bloch also strongly indicated the need to increase "leveraging" of NSF funds with industry, states, and localities. Finally, he suggested that NSF will need to

increasingly examine the trade-offs necessary within and between disciplines.

As this country attempts to face the basic scientific research needs of the 1990s, NSF's role will continue to evolve, as it has throughout the current decade. Whether the money sought will be available to accomplish all that is planned remains the major question facing the Foundation.<<

HOUSE TAKES ANOTHER LOOK AT SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT

A number of witnesses from various federal agencies and the research community at large told a congressional committee on June 28 that grantee institutions should retain primary responsibility for handling cases of alleged scientific misconduct. Speaking before the House Science, Space, and Technology Committee, chaired by Rep. Robert Roe (D-NJ), they also cautioned Congress to note the important distinctions between "honest error" and misconduct.

The House Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, chaired by Rep. John Dingell (D-MI) held hearings two months ago on the same subject (see Update, May 12, 1989). Unlike those hearings, which were marked by often heated discussion and focused almost exclusively on one particular, unsettled case, the June 28 hearings were relatively congenial and covered the topic in a much broader sense.

In his testimony before the Science Committee, Robert Andersen, deputy general counsel for the National Science Foundation (NSF), noted that the Foundation has "learned a great deal" since formal implementation of misconduct procedures in 1987. Among the lessons learned, he said, is the observation that NSF grantee institutions are capable of handling alleged cases of misconduct, particularly those institutions that have created competent, independent, investigative panels for the task.

Lyle Bivens, acting director of the new Office of Scientific Integrity Review (OSIR) within the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS), defended research scientists in his testimony, noting that despite the recent uproar over cases of alleged misconduct, "we do not believe that it is a wide-spread problem. By far, the vast majority of scientists are scrupulous in adhering to the highest professional standards and responsible conduct of research."

As for the federal agencies' role in the matter, Bivens outlined the recent establishment of OSIR and the Office of Scientific Integrity (OSI) as two "complimentary but not overlapping" offices that can strengthen Public Health Service (PHS) oversight and investigative functions in detecting and preventing cases of misconduct. OSIR reports to the assistant secretary for health, while OSI reports to the director of the

National Institutes of Health (NIH) and the administrator of the Alcohol, Drug Abuse, and Mental Health Administration.

Bivens noted that in establishing OSIR and OSI, PHS has operated on the conviction that the primary responsibility for investigating misconduct should remain with grantee institutions. Any new framework resulting from a current OSIR-OSI review of federal policies should remain just that: a framework. Grantee institutions, Bivens said, "should have the latitude to tailor their policies to their own special needs or purposes." He also pointed out that "good science is characterized by honest error," and that one must not confuse error with misconduct.

Howard Schachman, president of the Federation of American Societies for Experimental Biology (FASEB), echoed Bivens's concern about distinguishing error from misconduct. He also recommended that HHS define misconduct as "fabrication, falsification, or plagiarism [but excluding] those factors intrinsic to the process of science, such as honest error, conflicting data, or differences in interpretations or judgments of data or experimental design."

Rep. Robert Walker (R-PA), ranking Republican on the Committee, voiced his concern about the possible intrusion of Congress into matters best left to scientists. Even with the best of intentions, Congress could "do real harm" by trying to micro-manage the research process in the name of scientific integrity, he said.

When asked by Walker whether scientific fraud is occurring with more frequency than it did 30 or more years ago, NIH Deputy Director William Raub said there is simply "a greater willingness to report it" nowadays. Another witness, OSI Acting Director Brian Kimes, said no one really knows whether scientific misconduct is occurring with more frequency. He said it is an issue that deserves -- and is already attracting -- further exploration.<<

WOOLSEY REPLACES CAPLAN AS CBASSE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

The National Academy of Sciences has announced the appointment of Suzanne Woolsey as executive director of the Commission on Behavioral and Social Sciences and Education (CBASSE). She replaces Robert Caplan, who resigned in May.

Woolsey, who will join CBASSE on a full-time basis on September 1, holds a PhD from Harvard in clinical and social psychology. She is currently the partner in charge of governance and strategic consulting to educational and non-profit organizations at the international consulting and accounting firm of Coopers & Lybrand. Prior to joining the firm, she served as associate director for Human Resources, Veterans, and Labor at the Office of Management and Budget from 1977 to 1980.<<

SOURCES OF RESEARCH SUPPORT: DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND 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.

National Institute on Aging

The National Institute on Aging (NIA) is offering support to qualified social and behavioral scientists for training in behavioral geriatrics research. Through NIA's Special Emphasis Research Career Award (SERCA) in behavioral geriatrics, the Institute hopes to identify common ground between psychosocial and biomedical approaches as they relate to the prevention and treatment of disease in the middle and later years of life.

This award offers an opportunity for established social and behavioral scientists to acquire supplementary biomedical research knowledge and interdisciplinary research experience. Each SERCA provides up to five years of support for a program of full-time research training and interdisciplinary experience in a clinical or biomedical setting. Throughout the grant period, the sponsoring institution is expected to arrange significant collaboration between the SERCA recipient and an advisor with expertise in biomedical or biobehavioral science.

Each SERCA recipient is expected to develop capabilities for conducting interdisciplinary behavioral geriatric research. The plan should include exposure to at least one biomedical specialty, excluding psychiatry, and should be designed as a basis for more extended research. It can take such forms as an exploratory or feasibility study, a test of a new technique, or development of a new biobehavioral measure.

Application Procedure: Further information, including eligibility requirements for SERCA candidates and sponsoring institutions, can be obtained from the contact listed below.

Budget: Each SERCA, made annually to the sponsoring institution, allows up to \$40,000 for full-time salary support in addition to supplemental support for the primary advisor and funding for research expenses and, if needed, tuition for training.

Deadline: October 1, 1989, is the next application receipt deadline for the ongoing SERCA competition.

Contact: Behavioral Geriatrics Research -- SERCA
Behavioral and Social Research Program
NIA, Building 31, Room 5C32
Bethesda, MD 20892-4500
301/496-3136 <<

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 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
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
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
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
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

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

FIRST CLASS