



Grinnell College
Grinnell, Iowa 50112

December 29, 1981

TO: Luther Erickson

FROM: Jim Swartz

RE: Notes on Research Funding discussion of MATLAC Meeting

Jim Swartz presented information concerning NSF Science Education funding from Karen Davis of the Independent Colleges Office.

NSF budget is tacked on the HUD and Independent agency funding bill - passed House and Senate - compromise bill passed by House - not yet scheduled for Senate. Senate is waiting on negotiations with administration on further spending reductions. This bill is way over administration request ^{and} will probably be vetoed if prior compromise ^{is} not reached. ~~This bill~~ provides 27.5 million for Science Education (\$15 million for graduate fellowships and \$12.5 million for the rest of the programs - not specified in bill). The Independent Colleges Office has suggested they accept proposals in 3 broad categories, personal, instrumentation, and curriculum and that widely differing proposals be allowed to compete in those categories. URP would not be a separate category but lumped in with personnel.

Research Equipment for two and four year colleges was specifically mentioned in several appropriations and authorizing committee reports, and is likely to survive at approximately 1981 levels (after budget ^{recession}, 2.8 million). Howard Hines, the director, is accepting proposals and giving them a screening. Proposals which would not have been funded in 1981 are being rejected, and those which have a chance of funding are being sent out for review. When the funding situation is clear, a review panel will be convened or the proposals will be passed on to the appropriate research equipment directorate.

NSF is correctly operating on authorization which funds it at 1981 levels through November 20, but the administration had requested that agencies not spend any more money than necessary prior to specific congressional appropriation. If no compromise between Congress and the administration ^{occurs}, it is possible that funding at 1981 levels could be extended for the entire fiscal year. This, however, is unlikely.

Science Education is likely to survive, but at drastically reduced levels. It will be necessary for us to lobby our legislators to boost the program to reasonable funding levels in coming years.

Brian Andreen discussed the availability of funding from ACS-Petroleum Research Fund (Type B) and from Research Corporation. The overall funds available from both programs has been on a gradual increase. The success rate with PRF is on the order of 40-50% and 50-60% for Reserach Corporation.

Several participants indicated that they had been successful in soliciting alumni and/or chemical industry for summer research or equipment funding. The importance of the quality of writing in proposals was also stressed. It was suggested that draft proposals be sent to colleagues, Ph.D and Postdoctoral mentors or potential reviewers prior to submission.